



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 2006

No. 70

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 6, 2006.

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

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:  
Lord God, You alone are holy and almighty.

As the noble creatures of Your own making, all of us try to avoid any form of humiliation. Probably because of our deep sense of unconscious mortality, the sheer force of a powerful enemy or unbridled nature can diminish us with fear. The brash awakening of public embarrassment or the subtle put-down by a peer can humble anyone in a moment's notice.

From personal experience, we also know how You, O Lord, can breathe on our conscience or artfully collapse the falsehoods which uphold us. Then overwhelmed by the truth of ourselves, we stand humbly before You.

This afternoon, we as intelligent and responsible persons come before You and prayerfully bow our heads in humble submission to Your powerful presence. To seek Your blessing or to ask for Your pardon of our sins is simply to humble ourselves sincerely before You.

Guide us individually, as a government and as a nation, both now and forever. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GINGREY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 26, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. 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 May 26, 2006, at 4:00 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3829.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 418.

That the Senate passed S. 3322.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk of the House.*

### IN RECOGNITION OF EUSEBIO PENALVER MAZORRA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Eusebio Penalver Mazorra, who was one of the longest serving political prisoners and a man who President George W. Bush called a Cuban patriot. I would like to recognize his widow, Francis Martinez, who is with us today.

In Miami, Penalver led a group called "Plantados until Freedom and Democracy Comes to Cuba," whose five founding members each spent more than 20 years in Castro's prisons. Eusebio himself spent 28 years in jail.

Penalver was a Cuban political prisoner who fought long and hard against Castro's tyranny. Born in Ciego de Avila, in Camaguey, Cuba, Penalver was a Plantado, a prisoner who firmly plants his feet in his cell and does not cooperate with his captors, and he struggled for freedom and democracy throughout his life.

He came to the United States as an exile in 1988, and he dedicated his life to fighting Castro's tyranny. He was loved and admired by our Cuban-American community for his dedication and courage in the fight for Cuba's liberty, and his presence will be sorely missed.

### CONCERNS ABOUT LEVEL OF FUNDING OF AIDS DRUG ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my grave concerns about the level of funding for ADAP, the AIDS Drug Assistance Program, which is inadequate to support the more than 136,000 Americans currently

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3365

dependent on ADAP for their life-saving HIV/AIDS medication, plus the 10,000 more who are likely to be added next year.

The 6-year historical ADAP underfunding is evident in the growing waiting lists, unacceptable eligibility rules and insufficient medication.

Current initiatives emphasis testing, which, I agree, is critical to addressing this epidemic. However, as a doctor, I am troubled by the ethics of testing Americans for HIV when we are not guaranteeing them access to treatment.

I am also disturbed that this underfunding will primarily impact low-income, uninsured Americans who are disproportionately from communities of color. And as a Member of Congress, I am ashamed that we are not doing all that we could and should to take care of the needs of all Americans with HIV disease.

I call on my colleagues to support full funding for Ryan White, including the \$986.5 million level as identified by the National ADAP Working Group. Only by fully funding ADAP will we step up to our public health responsibility to treat all HIV positive Americans.

#### HONORING VETERANS ON THE 62ND ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there are no greater patriots than our veterans and those who proudly wear the uniform today.

On this day, 62 years ago, 3,393 brave, young American men lost their life storming the beaches of Normandy in defense of freedom. We must never forget their sacrifice.

I rise today, June 6, to say thank you to the greatest generation.

Today, our generation is faced with a similar choice, sit on the sidelines or defend freedom. And like World War II, our Nation has once again chosen to answer the call. America will always be freedom's defender.

D-Day was a turning point for Allied Forces in the European Theater, and 3 years after America joined the global war, victory seemed attainable.

I am honored to represent over 100 D-Day survivors, and I plan to call some of them today and let them know how grateful I am for their service. I encourage all Americans to reach out to a veteran today and thank them for their service and sacrifice.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CUTS TO NEW YORK AND WASHINGTON NEED RETHINKING

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that on September 11, 2001, near-

ly 3,000 New Yorkers were killed in the attack on the World Trade Center and, of course, several hundred as well here in Washington at the Pentagon. Yet the Department of Homeland Security has chosen to cut both New York and Washington by 40 percent of Homeland security funds for this year. It is absolutely mind-boggling and unbelievable and outrageous that New York and Washington would face these cuts. New York's money is scheduled to go down from \$207.6 million in 2005 to \$124.5 million in 2006.

Now, to add insult to injury, we hear that the Department of Homeland Security is cutting New York's bioterrorism money 15 percent as well, so that in New York, per capita New York would receive \$2.99 per resident to fight bioterrorism, while the good people of Wyoming would receive \$9.72 cents per person to fight bioterrorism, and the good people of North Dakota would receive \$8.09 per person to fight terrorism.

We all know the threat in North Dakota and Wyoming is not nearly as great as New York. What is Secretary Chertoff thinking? What are they thinking over there? Their policies and their thoughts need to change.

#### CONGRATULATING UPSON-LEE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THOMASTON, GEORGIA

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Upson-Lee Middle School in Thomaston, Georgia, on being recognized as a "School to Watch" by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform.

This award recognizes Upson-Lee's academic excellence, especially the school's commitment to challenging every student's mind. Upson-Lee was one of only 82 schools nationwide to receive this honor.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Upson-Thomaston Superintendent Howard Hendley, Upson-Lee Principal Patsy Dean and all the Upson-Lee teachers, administrators and parents for the dedicated work on behalf of Georgia's children.

As a former school board chairman, I know the importance of a good middle school education. Our children learn more when they are inspired by the leadership of teachers and principals, and Upson-Lee is doing a great job inspiring the youth of Thomaston.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in congratulating Upson-Lee Middle School on this exciting recognition.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 26, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. 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 May 26, 2006, at 9:45 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1953.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5401.

That the Senate passed S. 633.

That the Senate passed S. 2784.

That the Senate passed S. 2856.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk of the House.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO PUBLIC INTEREST DECLASSIFICATION BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 703(c) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (50 U.S.C. 435 note), and the order of the House of December 18, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Public Interest Declassification Board for a term of 3 years:

Admiral William O. Studeman, Great Falls, Virginia.

#### HOUSE LEADERSHIP DOING RIGHT THING ON IMMIGRATION

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we have all just returned from being in our districts talking with our constituents about the issues that are important to them.

One thing that I have heard over and over in my district, Mr. Speaker, is border security. This is an issue that my constituents and Americans care about. This is an issue where they want to see some action. It is the problem that most of them want to see us address, and they will not accept any sort of amnesty for those who have chosen to enter this country by breaking the law.

We need to secure the border. We need to get a hold on illegal entry into this country. That is the number one priority. And I thank the House leadership for doing the right thing on this issue. Chairman SENSENBRENNER has passed a good, solid bill that addresses the problem. The Senate has not. The American people know it.

We look forward to continuing this debate and encouraging all to join in securing the border as our first step toward controlling illegal entry into this great Nation.

□ 1415

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5441, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 836 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5441.

□ 1415

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5441) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. McHUGH (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, May 25, 2006, the amendment by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 62, line 17.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, no further amendments to the bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House of that day, which is at the desk.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CULBERSON:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to process applications or petitions for immigration benefits submitted to the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services until October 1, 2007. This section shall not apply with respect to—

(1) processing applications or petitions submitted before October 1, 2006, for such benefits; and

(2) processing applications or petitions relating to visas under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)) (commonly referred to as H-1B non-immigrant visas).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 2006,

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I bring this amendment to the House today to focus the attention of the House, of the White House, of the country on an urgent and very serious problem with the Citizen Immigration Service.

CIS is responsible for reviewing and approving any application for citizenship, for green cards, for visas, for I-90s for people entering the United States temporarily or permanently.

Yet this agency is so incompetent and so poorly run, all of us know, those of us representing border States, that the level of illegal immigration in the country is overwhelming. We have got people entering the country literally at will over our borders.

Based on my own investigation, what I have learned from visiting the border firsthand, it is possible for terrorists to enter the United States just walking over the border, or frankly they can come right through the front door at the Citizenship and Immigration Service offices, the CIS offices, because the agency is not running criminal background checks on people applying for visas or green cards or I-90s or citizenship.

The agency, when they do run background checks, the Inspector General reports, that among people who are applying to enter the United States temporarily, there is a 90 percent error rate in security checks being run on these folks. If you are entering as a refugee, there is a 64 percent error rate.

Now, this is on running criminal background checks on foreign nationals seeking to enter the United States, at a time when we are at war with terrorists who we know are seeking to enter the United States to hurt us. The terrorists who attacked us on September 11 were using dozens and dozens and dozens of fraudulent driver's licenses, phony IDs; they were, many of them, visa overstays.

This agency is so incompetent, so poorly run that in fact they even hired an Iraqi spy and swore him in as an officer of the United States to interview foreign nationals applying to enter the United States. This was reported first in the Washington Times on April 6.

After this was confirmed that this guy was an Iraqi spy, he flew to Baghdad and walked out of the Green Zone and disappeared. This is a huge national security problem, Mr. Chairman. And the problem is really systemic throughout CIS, because their focus is not on national security, but customer service.

This agency's sole primary motivation is on the convenience of the foreign national, to make sure that

Osama bin Laden's cousin out in the lobby is not hindered or slowed down in any way, that his application is stamped and approved as rapidly as possible.

Chairman ROGERS has done a superb job in doing everything that he can to bring the CIS, and ICE and Homeland Security, to heel. I know he is aware of the severity of this problem.

My amendment would stop the use of any funds for CIS to process immigration applications other than H1Bs for 1 year, so they can catch up and catch their breath. We know the backlog is so bad right now that they are simply overwhelmed, they are years behind. We know they are not running criminal background checks, and the criminal background checks they do run on these foreign nationals are just riddled with errors.

My amendment is intended to shut that process down for a year to allow them to catch up. The Homeland Security reauthorization is coming up this summer. I intend to pursue this very aggressively with Chairman KING. I bring this amendment to the attention of the House today and do intend to withdraw it.

I understand we need to work through the Homeland Security authorization bill on this, Mr. Chairman. But it is an extraordinarily serious and dangerous problem that the country needs to be aware of. There has even been information brought to my attention and to the chairman's attention that the foreign intelligence agencies have probably penetrated CIS at very high levels and are able to remotely print out visas, I-90s, passports, citizenships to fraudulent individuals remotely on command using laptop computers from anywhere in the world.

This agency I think poses a very serious threat to the national security of the United States. I intend to pursue it very aggressively with the reauthorization of the homeland security bill.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the House today to focus the House's attention on it, bring it to the attention of the Nation. And I thank the chairman, Chairman ROGERS, on trying to clear up this agency and homeland security.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MATSUI

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. MATSUI:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the policy of the Department of Homeland Security

that the risk-based formula used for purposes of the Urban Area Security Initiative does not take into account strategic defense considerations, local government assets that serve the military, proximity to international borders, presence of visitors to the urban area, the presence of drug trafficking and other organized crime activities that relate to terrorism, or the catastrophic and cascading effects of an attack on critical infrastructure including dams and levees.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 2006, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, in January, the Department of Homeland Security made significant changes to our homeland security effort. They announced the areas eligible for fiscal year 2006 UASI grants.

For the first time, Sacramento and San Diego were not identified as high-risk areas. While Sacramento and San Diego did receive fiscal year 2006 funding, the new eligibility guidelines have put our funding for next year and beyond in jeopardy.

Sacramento is the capital of the sixth largest economy in the world and home to dozens of critical Federal and State governmental buildings. Much of the State's water, electricity, and telecommunications systems are managed from Sacramento. Of considerable concern is an attack on Sacramento's dams and levees, not only because of potential loss of life and impact to Sacramento's families, but an economic impact as well. According to a Sacramento Bee analysis, the economic impact of a major flood in Sacramento would cost the region \$35 billion. This is damage to homes, loss of jobs, and government revenues.

The San Diego area contains the Nation's seventh largest city adjacent to a heavily trafficked international border, a busy port, and tourist attractions. Nor should it be overlooked that a number of naval and Marine bases are located in San Diego, including the largest naval base in the country.

With fewer installations after four rounds of BRAC, an attack on even one could result in even greater impact. An attack of either of these cities would have repercussions well beyond our region.

Therefore, Congressman FILNER and I have very real concerns about DHS's new eligibility guidelines accurately addressing our homeland security needs. We all agree that a risk-based grant program is an effective use of our limited resources. However, policy is only as good as the information that goes into it.

DHS has already acknowledged that it failed to take into account the catastrophic downstream impact to my district if there were an attack on Folsom Dam. This only raises the question of

what other targets have they overlooked.

That is why we need to ensure that DHS properly considers the catastrophic and cascading effects of an attack on critical infrastructure such as dams and levees, as well as determine a way to factor in the presence of drug trafficking and other organized crime activities that relate to terrorism and strategic defense considerations.

This amendment would withhold funding until DHS has properly addressed these issues. It would ensure accountability. It is important that DHS address these concerns. We need increased transparency and understanding of the process before the next UASI review is conducted.

Unfortunately, it is unlikely that a DHS reauthorization bill will come to the floor before the next risk assessment begins.

As a result, we must take this opportunity to require DHS to perform a thorough threat assessment of each urban area. We have an obligation to ensure we are meeting our national security needs. But the questions surrounding the UASI grant eligibility draw into question whether we are meeting that need.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI, which states, in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.

This amendment prescribes a policy. I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there Members desiring to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would withdraw his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment embodies a statement of policy, not by way of citation but instead by prescription. As such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:  
Page 62, after line 17, insert the following:  
SEC. 537. None of the the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 2006, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, today I am offering an amendment on behalf of Representative CAMPBELL. This amendment prevents State and local governments who refuse to share information with Federal immigration authorities by adopting sanctuary policies from getting Federal funds in this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, there are some cities and States around the country that have such laws, and they blatantly encourage illegal immigration. Such laws prohibit law enforcement officials from reporting to the Department of Homeland Security illegal aliens when they are discovered through the normal course of law enforcement practice.

Section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 makes it illegal for local and State governments to adopt such laws.

These laws, known as sanctuary policies, prevent open communication between local and Federal law enforcement and pose a great risk to all American citizens. We cannot risk letting a dangerous criminal walk out of the sanctuaried city and possibly into our community instead by being deported as the law dictates.

Across the Nation there are repeated examples of illegal aliens, who, on multiple occasions, have been apprehended by local governments only to be released to commit other crimes.

□ 1430

The Washington Times has reported that in a December rape of a woman in New York, four of the five men charged in the case were illegal immigrants, and three had prior convictions that, in keeping with Federal law, would have allowed their deportation. Unfortunately, because the New York City sanctuary policy which prevented city police from sharing information with Federal immigration authorities, these criminals were released by local law enforcement authorities rather than deported. Had New York not enacted a sanctuary policy, this rape may never have happened. Why take a chance on letting another rapist or potential terrorist walk out of a sanctuary city police station and possibly into your community instead of being deported.

Sanctuary policies allow local governments to effectively set up their own patchwork of individual immigration sanctuaries. This directly usurps the authority granted to the Federal Government under the Constitution to establish our Nation's immigration policies. Some may argue that this amendment would coerce State and local police officers to step into the role of Federal immigration agents.

This is a false argument, Mr. Chairman. The Campbell amendment would not require States and local officials to assume any new duties. It would merely ensure that local and State law enforcement agencies obey existing Federal law and cooperate with Federal officials.

It is clear that we need a mechanism to ensure compliance. This amendment provides one by withholding Federal funding from those localities that prohibit law enforcement from sharing information with our Federal enforcement authorities.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota insist upon his point of order?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, under my reservation, I would like to direct some questions to the gentleman from Iowa. I have trouble understanding the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may continue to reserve the point of order and be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABO. Under my reservation, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman tell me, does the Department have the authority, not the authority but is the Department doing what the gentleman suggests today?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Which department do you refer to?

Mr. SABO. The Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I don't believe that the Department of Homeland Security is enforcing this law currently, and I do believe they should. But this is the most expeditious method by which we can get enforcement of a law that has been on the books for 10 years and it is a clear law.

Mr. SABO. So the gentleman is suggesting that he wants the Department to be doing something that they are not doing today?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I am suggesting that local government is directly violating the law, and this is the most expeditious way to get compliance of the Federal law.

Mr. SABO. My question was not about local government. It was about whether DHS would be doing something under his amendment that they are not doing today.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I don't direct DHS to do anything under this amendment except to evaluate if the local governments are receiving funds under this appropriations and if they have a sanctuary policy that is on the books.

Mr. SABO. What DHS funding is used today in contravention of section 642(a) of the 1996 Immigration Act?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I think if the gentleman would, that we understand that funds are fungible, and when they go into an appropriations process to a local government, that there can be

interdepartmental transfers within those local governments that would be very difficult to track and give a precise answer to. But if funds are going into a local government and local government has a sanctuary policy, one can presume that some of those dollars are being used to support the sanctuary policy. And that is what this amendment seeks to prevent.

Mr. SABO. So DHS would have to clearly be tracking significantly more money than they track today?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Did you say keep track of?

Mr. SABO. Tracking of how the money is spent that they do not do today?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I think it is very clear that these sanctuary policies are printed, they are a matter of public record. There are a limited number of jurisdictions. Although it is a significant list, it is still limited. And it is not a difficult task to identify communities. They self-identify. And if it gets to be a bit too much work for DHS, I would be happy to provide the list to them, sir.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that from the answers this gentleman has given, that this clearly is putting additional responsibilities on the Department of Homeland Security.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman to insist upon a point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI?

Mr. SABO. Yes, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I point out that the language of the amendment merely requires the Federal official administering these funds to comply with Federal law. A new duty is not required in the face of the amendment, and because we are simply asking them to comply with current Federal law, I don't adjust that at all in this amendment. There is no policy change other than the requirement to comply with existing law that passed in 1996.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members desiring to be heard on the point? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair will judge the amendment on its face. It proposes to limit funds for a specified set of activities. The amendment does not impose new duties and, therefore, constitutes a valid limitation. The Chair would note that the same amendment was ruled in order on May 17, 2005. The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Iowa has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, having had that discussion, I think it does clarify this amendment significantly and that it is important for us to look across this Nation. Once the sanctuary cat got out of the bag some years ago and local governments began

passing for their own local interests sanctuary policies that directly contravene the 1996 Federal law, city after city picked up this policy, and we have three States that also have sanctuary policies.

The result of these sanctuary policies has been that we have had people who have been into these cities who have been picked up for a number of reasons, whether they be for traffic violations, minor crime, assault, issues of that nature where they come in the course of contact with law enforcement, and because of the sanctuary policies, the officers have been prohibited from passing these individuals along to, at that time, the INS, and now the Department of Homeland Security for deportation.

The result of that has been the death of at least one police officer in every major city in America. Not as a statement on the magnitude of this problem, but as samples of a magnitude that is far greater than that, we have got to have enforcement of our immigration laws. American people are not going to accept an immigration policy that would come at them without enforcement of our laws and this is one way to demonstrate the will of this Congress.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCHUGH). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

This amendment attempts to penalize States and localities that have confidentiality policies in place. These policies are supported by our State and our local law enforcement because they encourage immigrant communities to come forward and to report crimes without fearing that immigration status will come under scrutiny. And believe me, back in Orange County, in Anaheim, in Santa Ana and some of the other cities I represent, my police chiefs are very adamant about this issue.

If crimes are occurring and if the witnesses we have are immigrants, immigrants without documents, if they believe that they will be taken or deported, they are not going to want to come forward and tell us what is happening. This is very important. It is important in hit and drive car accidents, in execution style things that happen in some of the Asian communities. This is a very important issue for our local law enforcement.

The message of this amendment would say, it would intimidate immigrants and it would make them less likely to report the crimes to law enforcement or to assist law enforcement. It would hamper the State and local law enforcement's work by intimidating the potential witnesses and

community members that would help to solve these crimes. In fact, this is opposed by the National League of Cities, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the National Association of Counties. They all oppose this amendment.

So please protect local government's independence and choice. Keep local public safety decisions and resources local and oppose this amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I would oppose this amendment. I read the amendment. I am not sure it does what the gentleman from Iowa says it does. I am not sure it does anything, but if it does something, then it is very comprehensive. It either does nothing or else potentially has the ability to limit how DHS responds to emergency and disaster relief. It either does nothing or it may limit what border patrol can do in certain cities in this country. I am not sure which. It either does nothing or it does something significantly more than what the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the House, as it has the last 3 years, to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman and the gentlewoman's remarks, either this amendment does something or it does nothing. We thought when the 1996 Act was passed, it did something, and we found out it has done nothing because local government has defied Federal law. So I am not swayed by the argument that NSCSL or the League of Cities or the counties oppose this amendment. They are the people that are contravening Federal law today. It is the Congress that sets the Federal law, not local government. We need to support this amendment for those reasons.

With regard to the gentlewoman from California's remarks on her confidentiality policy which I had described as a sanctuary policy, undocumented immigrants would be intimidated not to take their cases to law enforcement. I understand that argument. And in fact, one is swayed by that to some degree. But the other side of this is that we have millions of American citizens that we need to attend to. And if we are going to enforce our laws, that argument will always be an argument that can come to this floor to make the case that we should not enforce them because it might intimidate people who are living beyond the law.

Mr. Chairman, I ask support for this amendment. It is prudent. It is reasonable. It supports existing Federal law.

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

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

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DEAL OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. DEAL of Georgia:

Page 62, after line 17, insert the following: SEC. 537. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to grant birthright citizenship to the children of those individuals who are not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, including the children of illegal aliens.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 2006, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to the issue of birthright citizenship and is a prohibitive amendment for using funds under this appropriations's bill for the purpose of implementing and granting birthright citizenship.

The issue is one that I think has now caught the attention of the American public and rightfully so. The Center for Immigration Studies estimates that some 383,000, or 42 percent of births to immigrants are to illegal alien mothers. Births to illegal immigrants now account for nearly one out of every ten births in the United States.

We are in a distinct minority in the world community in recognizing birthright citizenship. There are only 36 countries that do so, 122 do not. Of the 36 that do, the United States, Cuba, El Salvador, Guinea, and Venezuela are in that list. On the other hand, the vast majority of all westernized countries, including every single European country along with Israel and Japan, do not offer birthright citizenship.

□ 1445

In fact, Ireland in 2004 changed their law to no longer recognize birthright citizenship.

The magnitude of the problem is, in fact, astounding. The Center for Immigration Studies found that illegal immigrants cost the United States taxpayer about \$10.4 billion a year. A large part of that expense stems from the babies born each year to illegal immigrants.

In my State of Georgia, a normal, noncesarean section child delivery, with no complications, costs an average of \$2,720. Born United States citizens, these children are eligible for all benefits of citizenship, including, but not limited to, education, Medicaid, and welfare.

In one of their own publications, the Department of Homeland Security states: "An industry has developed around this practice of crossing the border illegally specifically to give birth, with travel agents specializing in birth tours and clinics providing post-natal care, which includes transportation services. For those seeking entry into this country, it is a small price for legal entry and social service benefits that accrue with citizenship."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), my colleague.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for the leadership on this amendment.

While I know there is a question about a point of order, I think it is important to point out that this legislation is also in the form of a bill which has over 80 cosponsors; and as I look at this, one thing to keep in mind is that if you are flying in an airplane right now, regardless of the origination, regardless of the destination, if you pass the south tip of Florida or the extreme islands of Alaska, if you are born while over those U.S. properties, you become an American citizen, which is an extremely liberal, broad policy in terms of granting one of the most precious things that we as Americans have and that is citizenship.

Now, recently, the U.S. Senate passed a bill which probably is not going to get a lot of support in the House on either side of the aisle, but one of the big criticisms of it is that it grants citizenship too easily to people and the reason why that criticism is there is not because, okay, you have got 11 million people who may be here illegally and those would become citizens overnight. It is that once those 11 million become citizens, they petition to have their mom, dad, cousin, brother, aunt brought in. So you actually have 11 million times three or 11 million times four. It depends on who is doing the calculation.

That is exactly what happens here when a mother comes in illegally and has a baby. The baby automatically can start petitioning to bring the illegal mom, the illegal dad, the illegal brother and sister in and break in line in front of people who have been going through the process for many years.

Recently on the Capitol steps, I had an opportunity to go to a reenlistment ceremony for a woman from Poland. She had already been in Iraq. She had already been deployed and served the United States of America for 1 year in Iraq and was a member of the U.S. Army Reserves, but she was not yet a citizen. I do not think it is right to

have somebody break in line in front of her, a war veteran, who got in here illegally.

I support ending the birthright citizenship. As I understand, 122 nations no longer have that, and I think America should become one of them.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to Deal Amendment to H.R. 5441 The Homeland Security Appropriations Act, changing the requirement for granting birthright citizenship.

At a time when Congress is trying to find a solution to immigration, a problem that tears at the very fabric of our Nation, the Deal Amendment is a hateful amendment that does nothing to improve our security or fix this country's immigration problem.

We cannot under the guise of security, specifically target undocumented individuals, who are here working and contributing to our economy. This amendment will turn children who are born in the United States into stateless babies, who will be forced to grow up and live in the shadows of our society.

This is another far-right Republican approach that does nothing to secure our borders or our country nor contributes in any positive way to this immigration debate. The people of the United States deserve hard work and legislation that helps solve problems and not create them.

All this amendment accomplishes is to create a permanent underclass that will be forced to live on the fringes of our society. Attempting to eliminate birthright citizenship will create a whole new immigration problem. And these poor children are going to stay here because they will not have a country to go to.

When will we learn that unjust and discriminatory legislation does not work? To deny citizenship to children born within our borders is not only unconstitutional but immoral. We are turning our backs on the very principle that this country was founded on. The notion of the American Dream is being trampled on by the Deal Amendment and by those who would support such legislation in this House.

Immigration is a serious problem that requires real solutions. And Homeland Security is too important to be used as a tool of discrimination. I oppose this Amendment.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order against the amendment. It clearly constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, which is in violation of clause 2, rule XXI.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCHUGH). Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imposing new duties, and the amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not order.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE VI—PREPARING FOR AND PREVENTING KNOWN THREATS AND IMPROVING BORDER SECURITY

##### CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$880,000,000, to remain available until expended, for 1,800 additional border patrol agents, 300 additional customs agents and inspectors, improvements to the automated targeting system as recommended by the Government Accountability Office, and expansion of the Container Security Initiative.

##### AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION, OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND PROCUREMENT

For an additional amount for "Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement", \$170,000,000, to remain available until expended, for additional operating hours, the purchase of additional air assets, aircraft recapitalization, and establishment of the final northern border airwing.

##### CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

##### IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$730,000,000, to remain available until expended, for not less than 9,000 additional detention beds and 800 additional immigration enforcement agents.

##### TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AVIATION SECURITY

For an additional amount for "Aviation Security", \$200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, for checkpoint support technology and passenger, baggage, and cargo screening.

##### UNITED STATES COAST GUARD OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating Expenses", \$50,000,000.

##### ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements", \$200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, for the automatic identification system.

##### PREPAREDNESS

##### OFFICE OF GRANTS AND TRAINING STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "State and Local Programs", \$1,090,000,000, of which \$536,000,000 shall be for formula-based grants; \$214,000,000 shall be for discretionary grants in high-threat, high-density urban areas; \$100,000,000 shall be for intercity rail passenger transportation (as defined in section 24102 of title 49, United States Code), freight rail, and transit security grants; \$200,000,000 shall be for port security grants; and \$40,000,000 shall be for grants to States pursuant to section 204(a) of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (division B of Public Law 109-13).

##### FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Firefighter Assistance Grants", \$150,000,000, of which

\$75,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 33 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2229) and \$75,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 34 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

##### EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Emergency Management Performance Grants", \$150,000,000.

##### FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY READINESS, MITIGATION, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY

For an additional amount for "Readiness, Mitigation, Response, and Recovery", \$50,000,000.

##### FLOOD MAP MODERNIZATION FUND

For an additional amount for "Flood Map Modernization Fund", \$150,000,000.

##### FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

##### DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

For an additional amount for "Domestic Nuclear Detection Office", \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the purchase and deployment of radiation detection equipment.

##### GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 601. In the case of taxpayers with income in excess of \$1,000,000, for calendar year 2007 the amount of tax reduction resulting from the enactment of Public Laws 107-16, 108-27, and 108-311 shall be reduced by 10.3 percent.

SEC. 602. The amounts appropriated by this title shall be available for obligation, and the authorities provided in this title shall apply, upon the enactment of this Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 2006, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, the President said in December of 2004 that the intelligence bill, "took an important step in strengthening our immigration laws by, among other items, increasing the number of Border Patrol agent." Yet neither the Congress nor this administration has provided the funding for those increased agents.

The committee bill falls short in meeting our border security responsibilities. The committee bill cuts 300 agents from the Bush Border Patrol agent request. It is 1,800 agents short of 4,000 additional Border Patrol agents called for in the Intelligence Reform Act. The committee bill cuts 1,846 detention beds from the Bush request. That is 9,000 detention beds short of the bed space called for in the Intelligence Reform.

My amendment would provide an additional \$2.1 billion to increase border enforcement. It would fund an additional 1,800 border patrol agents above

the committee bill and meet the Intelligence Reform Act requirements.

It would also fund an additional 9,000 detention beds above the committee bill and meet the Intelligence Reform Act requirements on that front. The detention bed space level funded by my amendment would meet the 34,653 detention bed level recommended by the DHS Inspector General as necessary to detain all criminal aliens and aliens from special interest countries.

My amendment would further increase our border detection capacities by providing funding for additional air patrols and operating hours, by cutting in half the number of unfunded radiation portal monitors, and by replacing old Border Patrol vehicles and expanding border facilities.

It would also provide for the port security grant program at the \$400 million level passed by the House in the Safe Port Act 2 weeks ago. The committee bill provides only \$200 million for those grants, and it contains a number of other increases.

Despite the lessons from Hurricane Katrina, the committee bill cuts funding for programs geared to improve the preparedness of local police, fire departments, and emergency responders by \$186 million, or almost 6 percent, from 2006. My amendment would provide additional funding for State emergency managers, for firefighters and for updating flood maps in critical, high-risk areas more quickly.

It would also provide an additional \$750 million for urban areas and State homeland security grants so that all States and urban areas would receive at least as much as they received in 2005 or 2006, whichever is the highest. That would mean, for instance, that New York would receive almost \$115 million more than it received in the recent DHS grant announcement. It would mean that Washington, D.C., would receive \$40 million more than it received in the recent grant announcement.

This amendment would also provide more funding for aviation explosive detection for air cargo and for passenger and carry-on bags.

The amendment is fiscally responsible. It would offset the \$4.5 billion in additional funding by capping the tax cut that people making over \$1 million this year would receive at \$102,400 instead of \$114,200.

I would urge the chairman to withdraw his point of order against the amendment so that the House could have an opportunity to meet these essential national obligations.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. I ask for a ruling.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to meet critical national responsibilities that the President of the United States has already indicated we should be meeting and that this Congress has indicated on previous occasions that we should be meeting.

Unfortunately, because of the rules under which the House is operating, the gentleman is technically correct. The House could vote on this amendment if the House Republican leadership saw fit to allow us to do so, but I must say that under the rules that the House is operating under I must reluctantly concede the point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise at this moment only because I intended to do this at the beginning of the presentation of the bill and I was unable to be on the floor, but it is very important for the Members to know that the combination of work between the chairman of this subcommittee and our ranking member, Mr. ROGERS and Mr. SABO, reflects the very best work of the House and the Appropriations Committee.

This is the fifth bill that will be coming off the floor in an effort to have all our bills completed with their work on the floor by the 4th of July break. Without their fabulous partnership, this would not have been possible today.

In the bill overall, they provide approximately \$32 billion for homeland defense, but I want to for those Members who are most concerned about that pattern whereby we are reducing patterns of growth in government to have them realize that this year's homeland security bill terminates six programs, resulting in \$154 million in taxpayer savings. More importantly, in the five appropriations bills considered on the House floor thus far this year, the Appropriations Committee has recommended the termination of 22 programs for a total savings of \$1.082 billion.

This is a very important piece of work. It shows the kind of imagination we need if we are going to be able to effectively carry forward this war on terrorism that is first international, but most important, important relative to our homeland defense and homeland security.

I want to congratulate the gentlemen and members of the committee on both sides of the aisle.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KINGSTON:  
Page 62, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 537. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide a foreign government information relating to the activities of an organized volunteer civilian action group, as defined by DHS OIG-06-4, operating in the State of California, Texas, New Mexico, or Arizona, unless required by international treaty.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 2006, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is it clarifies Congress' position on a Border Patrol practice or a practice of the U.S. Government that tips off illegal immigrants as to where citizen patrols may be located. As we know, we had lots of testimony and lots of visits from people along the border, and we have seen lots of cameras and lots of videos about just the total lawlessness of people coming illegally over the border at night.

As a response in that area, a group has sprung up called the Minutemen Project, and the Minutemen Project is definitely not politically correct in Washington, D.C. However, they filled a void which the government was unable to fill.

There are over 7,000 volunteers in the Minutemen organization, and I am sure, like any other group of 7,000 people, you could find a bad apple or two. Yet, at the same time overall, their help has been productive and good. In fact, the Border Patrol itself in a CRS study indicates how helpful they have been, and their involvement has reduced the number of apprehensions of people coming over. That is because their folks are watching the border.

What my amendment does is simply says that the U.S. Government cannot tip off the Mexican officials as to where these folks are located. Plain and simple, nothing fancy about it. I am sure the Border Patrol will say, oh, no, we are not doing that, and yet one of the Web pages of the Secretary of Mexico had the information very explicit, and we just do not believe that is a good practice.

So what we wanted to do is confirm Congress' position in an amendment.

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

□ 1500

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition; but, Mr. Chairman, I don't rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, we are told by Customs and Border Patrol that this amendment has no effect on its operation because it only shares information when it is required by international treaty, the same as what this amendment says. So to the best of my

knowledge this amendment simply restates what is policy.

If people want to put it in the bill, I guess that is okay because it apparently does nothing.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You know, the real shame of it is that we are even having to talk about this today. We ought to have a better neighbor on the border than Mexico has proven to be. I know they have economic incentives and reasons why they want their citizens to come illegally into our country, but they should not be put in a position of being tipped off to where citizens of this country are who are performing a service that, here again unfortunately is one that the Federal Government itself ought to be performing in a better fashion, and that is patrolling our borders.

It is regrettable that the Mexican government sometimes knows more about what is going on on our side of the border than we appear sometimes to know ourselves. The Minute Men have provided a service. It is a service that perhaps should be unnecessary if the Federal Government were doing its job adequately and appropriately.

I commend the gentleman from Georgia for offering this amendment, and I urge this body to support it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, and also I am thankful to hear from the other side of the aisle that they believe we should go forward and that this doesn't add anything to it other than what existing law is the case.

I hope that is the case, because it was last month I sent a letter to the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and I did that in response to an article in the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin and reports on various media outlets that stated the U.S. Border Patrol had in fact been informing the Mexican government of the location of the Minute Men and other similar U.S. patrols throughout the border. I sent that letter specifically to say what is our policy, or how are they conducting themselves.

It was also reported that the U.S. Customs and Border Protection spokesman told the media outlets that the policy is meant to ensure the Mexican government that the migrant rights are being observed.

I applaud the gentleman for doing the amendment because we know at the end of the day we here in this

House are most concerned about the rights of the American citizens and the safety and protection of the American citizens, and I think his amendment goes a long way to making sure that our rights, our citizens' rights and their safety will be protected so that this information is protected and kept here.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support and comments, and I thank my friend from Minnesota on it.

Out of an abundance of caution, I do plan to ask for a recorded vote on this. And the caution is not with anybody in this Chamber, but with our friends in the bureaucracy outside of here; that sometimes we need to have a little statement for them.

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

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BISHOP of New York:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available in the Act may be used to reimburse L.B. & B. Associates, Inc. or Olgoonik Logistics, LLC (or both) for attorneys fees related to pending litigation against Local 30 of the International Union of Operating Engineers.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funding in this bill from being used by the Department of Homeland Security to reimburse a private corporation for attorneys' fees and any other legal expenses incurred during their appeal from a recent and impartial National Labor Relations Board decision to reinstate employees who were unfairly fired from their jobs at the Plum Island Animal Disease Center, which is a DHS facility located off the North Fork of my district on Long Island.

The Plum Island employees were hard-working members of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 30. They were loyal to DHS and

to the research facility on Plum Island. In 2002, they were fired on grounds that the NLRB recently found were unjustified. Adding insult to injury, the employees were also denied back pay and benefits for over 3 years of missed work. And now their employer wants to appeal the administrative decision of an impartial arbiter to put them back to work and award them the back pay and benefits they are due.

I hope that my colleagues would agree that spending money in this bill to reimburse a privately-owned joint venture for attorneys' fees and to further extend this already long and protracted litigation is an entirely inappropriate use of DHS funds. More important, it would negate the intended use as appropriated by this Congress and detract from what should be the primary focus of the Department, defending our homeland and keeping Americans safe from foreign sources of terrorism.

For instance, the funds my amendment blocks would be a lot better spent protecting the two cities attacked on September 11th that are now short-changed \$114 million due to the Department's decision to slash anti-terrorism funds from major urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, it is long past time for this case to be resolved, to stop harassing the Plum Island employees, allow them to return to their jobs and restore their benefits. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek recognition in opposition to the amendment?

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer the amendment as the designee of Mr. KUHLM?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I do.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT", and increasing the amount made available for "OFFICE OF GRANTS AND TRAINING—FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS" (for increasing the amount under such heading to carry out section 33 of the Federal Fire Prevention Control Act of 1974 by \$2,100,000, and increasing the amount under such heading to carry out section 34 of such Act by \$2,100,000), by \$4,200,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 2006, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Department of Homeland Security awarded a contract to a private company for limousine and shuttle services for its employees for \$22 million. All of our budget discussions are indeed discussions about priorities, and Mr. KUHL and I would suggest that this simply is an issue of priorities. This amendment shifts \$22 million in funds previously used to pay for limousine services to increase the much-needed FIRE grants program.

Created by Congress in 2003, the SAFER Grants are meant to help communities with career, volunteer, and combination fire departments to meet industry minimum standards and attain 24-hour staffing to provide adequate protection from fire and fire-related hazards, and to fulfill traditional missions of fire departments that antedate the creation of the Department of Homeland Security. These SAFER Grants will help fire departments meet these minimum industry standards prescribed by National Fire Protection Association Standards 1710 and 1720.

It seems to both Mr. KUHL and to me that our priorities as a Nation should be for FIRE and SAFER Grants and not limousines, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first, let me say that, as written, this amendment does not accomplish what the gentleman, I think, has described, but I do understand the intent of the amendment, and I agree with the gentleman's concerns about the various allegations that have been made about this service.

However, I would like to point out that the Inspector General's office is investigating this 5-year contract to see if there is any impropriety. If there is, the contract will be terminated.

The intent of this amendment is to bar DHS employees from using "limousine services." But it does not define what that means. It could have some wide-ranging impacts if it is not defined.

For example, with no definition, it could be perhaps used to stop FEMA crews from contracting buses to get to disaster areas. It could shut down bus shuttle service between the various DHS campuses in the D.C. area. And it could prevent employees from taking taxis from airports while they are on official travel. These are very impractical limitations for a department we expect to act quickly in time of emergency.

So I would hope at some point in time, if this amendment passes, that there could be some way to define what is prohibited. But even with these concerns and these reservations, I am willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his comments and appreciate his concerns regarding the wording and the accuracy thereof, and we look forward to working with him as this process moves forward, and I appreciate his support of the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available in this Act (1) under the heading "OFFICE OF GRANTS AND TRAINING—STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS" may be used for puppet or clown shows, gym or fitness expenses (including equipment, training, memberships, and fees), or nutritional counseling, and (2) under the heading "FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY—ADMINISTRATIVE AND REGIONAL OPERATIONS" may be used to purchase or pay for adult entertainment, bail bond services, jewelry, weapons, or fines for prior traffic violations.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do recognize the point of order, and I will address that at the very end.

Mr. Chairman, I drafted an amendment here to highlight in essence the mismanagement of money in two specific agencies or programs funded by this bill, FEMA and the Homeland Security Grants program.

There is no one in this body that knows our threat to this Nation better than I. The district that I have the honor and privilege of representing borders the Hudson River and downtown New York City is basically within eyesight of our district. There were tragically far too many people from the Fifth District of New Jersey who

lost their lives on September 11. So my top priority since coming to this body has been and will remain homeland security.

The threat to our Nation and the residents of northern New Jersey is still very real. Law enforcement agencies are stretching every penny to purchase equipment, vehicles, medical supplies, and radios, but they do not have enough resources. On too many occasions in this body, I have fought for more resources to be brought to New Jersey and other high-risk areas.

With that being said, it pains me that as my neighbors and friends, living in my region of such high risk, the Department of Homeland Security is still using a portion of our limited resources for things that will keep no one safer and make no taxpayer happier.

It has come to my attention that the DHS has provided grants for example to fire departments to pay for things such as fitness equipment, nutritional counseling, clown and puppet shows, no less. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think clowns are as funny as the next guy, but I don't think the ability to be funny is what it is about when we are trying to help people during the next terrorist attack.

Looking next to FEMA, similar examples illustrate the need for additional oversight of FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Since Hurricane Katrina tragically hit the gulf coast, we have heard of numerous examples of mismanagement, neglect, wasteful spending, and even fraud that has prevented hundreds of millions of dollars from helping any of the victims of the storm.

Now, my time is limited here, so I will highlight just some of the most egregious examples. There have been five, five separate government reports by the GAO and other bodies that detail these problems. They have provoked the universal outrage in mismanagement, and here in this amendment we try to address it.

Specifically, my amendment calls attention to the utter mismanagement of the debit card program. As you may recall, FEMA gave out \$2,000 debit cards with no verification process for eligibility. People took advantage of it.

□ 1515

Among the many "necessary" items that people did for survival were adult entertainment, bail bond services, jewelry, and of course what every victim of a hurricane has to worry about, traffic tickets.

Another example of waste, FEMA spent almost \$900 million to store nearly 25,000 manufactured homes around the country mainly because they prohibited themselves from putting them in flood plains, such as New Orleans. In addition, FEMA let almost 11,000 unused manufactured homes sit in open fields in Arkansas, while at the same time paying people's hotel bills of \$438 per night to stay in a hotel in New York City.

Further, a GAO report said 2.5 million Hurricane Katrina evacuee registrations were done, and 60 percent were done over the telephone, meaning there was no verification process at all as to who these people were who were getting these dollars.

A study found that as many as 900,000 applicants used bogus Social Security numbers, duplicate Social Security numbers or false addresses and still received funding. There are other examples more numerous.

As we pass this bill today and provide billions of taxpayer dollars to an agency that has practiced questionable responsibility for the funds that we appropriate, I strongly urge this body to work on methods to hold FEMA even more accountable, to a higher standard of level of accountability. There has been too much waste, fraud and abuse in these very important areas of homeland security and dealing with natural disasters.

We can and must do a better job with our security dollars. I look forward to working with the chairman as we move forward to work for better oversight in these areas in this Congress and in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have my amendment withdrawn because I acknowledge that it is not in order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount made available for "United States Secret Service—Protection, Administration, and Training" and the amount made available for "Federal Emergency Management Agency—Readiness, Mitigation, Response, and Recovery" by \$2,000,000 respectively.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 2006, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Now that pretty much everything is said and done on this appropriations bill, according to CBO scoring, the bill is now under its section 302(b) allocation by \$4 million. My amendment simply takes that \$4 million and makes modest funding adjustments to two accounts: FEMA's Readiness Mitigation Response and Recovery program and the U.S. Secret Services Protection Administration and Training program.

Mr. Chairman, the FEMA dollars will be used to continue work to upgrade the National Response Plan. For the

Secret Service, funds will be used to support critical protective operations.

This amendment has been cleared by both sides of the aisle, and I ask that it be agreed to.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. I thank the gentleman for his amendment. It is a good amendment, and I hope it is passed.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and yield to the gentleman from New York for a colloquy.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy regarding the fiscal year 2006 high-density high-threat urban area security initiatives, and I do so recognizing that we are in the process of debating and discussing the 2007 bill, and so the relevance is of some importance.

Last week, DHS released the funding allocations for the 2006 homeland security grants program. I was extremely disappointed to see New York's overall allocation for the UASI program decreased by almost \$83 million.

It is tough to understand why, considering New York City remains the highest target to terrorism. New York has been attacked and targeted not once, but multiple times; and its security is a national concern.

In fact, a Pakistani immigrant was just convicted last week for attempting to blow up a subway station at Herald Square.

I have been fighting for a threat-based funding formula for several years because homeland security funding should be based on population, threat, vulnerability, and consequence. The program should never be used for pork spending. The formula I have been fighting for will benefit the areas that need it the most: those that face threats like New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, San Diego, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles and many others where we know real threats exist.

This debate is not a fight between rural and urban areas, and I would point out that I represent the 32nd most rural district in the country, and I know rural areas have essential infrastructure to protect as well. I learned from 9/11 that urban and rural areas are linked in terms of economics; and, frankly, as Americans, we all have the same concerns, so we must look for productive investments from DHS.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request your consideration to join with me in working toward a solution in addressing the process in an oversight hearing.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member again for their hard work on this bill. The challenges of this bill and this subcommittee include not only setting these essential priorities for our country's security, but also keeping a close watch on the Department to make sure that those priorities are carried out and that the resources provided are well spent.

Chairman ROGERS and Mr. SABO have done a great job on both accounts, and it is in recognition of their past vigilance that we now raise our concern.

As my friend from New York mentioned, last week the Office of Grants and Training, and I should note that this office has changed management and changed names twice in 3 years, announced the State allocations under the Urban Areas Security Initiative. The allocation for the State of New York through this program is 42 percent less than its allocation from last year.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that the process for distributing these funds is a complicated one, but here is also what I know. I know that New York City remains the highest density urban area in the country and by far dedicates more of its own funds to fighting terrorism than any other municipality. I also know that New York City continues to be the financial center of the country. It is the site of Yankee Stadium and Shea Stadium, the site of the Empire State Building and the Statue of Liberty, and the former site of the World Trade Center.

I know that as the Department is still working out its processes for determining risk and threat, there is much room for error.

I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he shares my concerns and if he would be willing to hold additional hearings into this matter to make sure that every homeland security dollar is protecting as many Americans as possible.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I understand the concerns of both gentlemen from New York, both very valued, hardworking members of the subcommittee, I might add.

I agree that the subcommittee should hold further hearings into this matter. We will be working to set up a closed briefing because we are dealing with classified material here. We will work with the gentlemen to set up a closed hearing to further look into the matter.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCHUGH, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that

Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5441) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

---

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:15 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:15 p.m.

---

□ 1716

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan) at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.

---

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5254, REFINERY PERMIT PROCESS SCHEDULE ACT

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 842 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 842

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5254) to set schedules for the consideration of permits for refineries. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule also provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, over the last several years, we have seen gasoline prices increase steadily in the United States. The rising cost of gasoline can be attributed to several factors, including

increased demand in the United States and in other countries such as China and elsewhere, decreases in oil production in politically unstable countries, including Venezuela and Nigeria, and a lack of refinery capacity in the United States.

In the last 24 years, our refinery capacity has dropped from 18.62 million barrels a day to less than 17 million barrels a day. This at the same time that our gross domestic product has increased in current dollars from 3.1 trillion to 12.4 trillion. Because of the sustained growth of our economy and the fact that we have not built a new refinery in almost 30 years, we are now forced to import over 4 million barrels a day in refined products, and that is when our refineries are running at full capacity.

Any changes in our refinery capacity can cause supply constraints and price spikes, especially in the gulf coast, where we have approximately half of our refinery capacity. And that is exactly what happened when the Hurricanes Katrina and Rita hit the gulf coast, causing gasoline prices to rise almost 50 cent a gallon. 2 months after the storms hit we still had lost almost about 18 percent of our refining capacity, leading to sharp price increases.

In order to prevent the steep increases in gasoline prices that we saw after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and to try to moderate the continuing price increase, we must make certain that we build new refineries to meet our current demand and to prevent a loss of capacity due to another hurricane, or a terrorist attack for that matter. Without an increase in our refinery capacity, we will be at the mercy of countries such as Venezuela for the importation of refined oil products. Now, these countries are not reliable sources of refined products due to their politically unstable and/or unfriendly governments.

One of the biggest challenges to the building of new refineries was pointed out by Daniel Yergin of the Cambridge Energy Research Associates during a hearing in the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Mr. Yergin stated that, and I quote, "the building of new refineries has been hampered by costs, citing and permitting."

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5254 would help alleviate some of the problems associated with the building of new refineries. The legislation directs the President to appoint a Federal coordinator to manage the multi-agency refinery permitting process. Working with the governor of any State where a refinery is proposed, the coordinator will begin by identifying and then convening all relevant agencies to coordinate the schedules for action so that no process called for in statute or regulation is short-changed, and public input opportunities are preserved, but also to allow the project to proceed as fast as otherwise possible. The goal of this legislation is to eliminate needless delay from agencies that are either dragging

their feet or simply acting in sequence when parallel action would be more efficient.

Bringing new refineries online will ease our reliance on foreign sources of refined products and will also allow us to have enough refinery capacity to meet the needs of our growing economy while providing a back up if any of our refineries are shut down for an extended period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the House has already taken steps to help lower the cost of gasoline. Last month we passed legislation to combat price gouging as well as legislation to open up ANWR to environmentally friendly energy development. However, more must be done. The underlying legislation is just another step in our continued efforts to provide relief from the high cost of gasoline.

H.R. 5254 was introduced by Representative BASS. A majority of the House has already voted in favor of this legislation. However, the bill did not pass because it was brought up under suspension of the rules and it did not obtain a two-thirds majority. Now we have another chance to pass this bill which is important to our energy needs and our growing economy.

I would like to thank Chairman BARTON and Representative BASS for their leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

And at this time, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me time.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, when I was home in Sacramento last week, one constant topic of conversation was gas prices and energy policy. I heard several different perspectives on the issues.

Many working families told me they are having to adjust their monthly budgets to offset the cost of \$3 a gallon gas. Other individuals expressed concern about global warming and how our dependence on fossil fuels is driving dangerous climate change.

Still others told me they are worried that our economy and our national security are frighteningly dependent on unstable oil producing countries like Iran, Venezuela and Nigeria.

From speaking with my colleagues, it is clear that Americans are echoing these concerns across the country. So I would hope that we could all agree that our constituents, from Sacramento to Miami, want Congress to do something substantive about gas prices and energy policy.

Unfortunately, today's debate represents another missed opportunity for strategic long-term national energy policy. Today we could be addressing the pressing issues raised by my constituents and yours. But we are not.

This resolution would provide for debate for H.R. 5254. This bill purports to address the problem we saw in the wake of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita, the vulnerability of America's energy infrastructure to supply disruptions.

Because of last year's hurricanes, many refineries in the gulf are running at reduced capacity, or were knocked offline entirely. This tightened supplies and played a role in the rapid rise in gas prices. So there is an issue here for Congress to address. But there is some disagreement on exactly what the problem is.

During debate on this bill, you will hear conflicting explanations for why no new refineries have been built in the United States since 1976. The majority might cite the environmental permitting process saying it has impeded the ability of companies to build new refineries.

They will argue that if Congress just pushed the permitting process harder, if we can do some more streamlining, then new refineries will start sprouting up across the country.

However, the reality is a different matter. The central provisions of this bill are designed to streamline the environmental permitting process for new refineries. Yet, there is no evidence these changes would actually lead to the construction of one new refinery.

That is because there has not been one convincing example of a situation where the permitting process prevented, held up or stalled the construction of a refinery.

You don't have to take my word for it. You can refer to the testimony of the energy company executives. During Senate testimony last year, even they could not cite such an occasion. The fact is, new refineries have not been constructed because it has not been in the interest of industry to do so. And that is fine. It is their right to not to construct refineries. But Congress should not respond to profit motivated decisions by altering permitting processes that are functioning just fine.

Furthermore, the refinery permitting process was altered just last year in section 103 of the energy bill so why are we doing it again? Let's see if that process works before revising it again.

This flawed bill reflects the manner in which it was brought to the floor. The Energy and Commerce Committee has not held hearings on H.R. 5254. It hasn't been marked up either. If this is truly an important piece of legislation, shouldn't it come to the floor in regular order?

If the House wanted to truly address the issue of refinery capacity, we should be taking up H.R. 5365, offered by Congressmen DINGELL and BOUCHER. Their legislation would enhance America's refinery capacity by creating a Strategic Refinery Reserve to complement the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Unfortunately the majority on the Rules Committee did not allow a vote on this legislation.

This is a commonsense proposal because in emergencies like Katrina, even when the President releases crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, we may not have the refinery capacity to process it.

The Dingell/Boucher bill would direct the Energy Department to establish a Strategic Refinery Reserve that can produce 5 percent of daily demand for gasoline.

This reserve would ensure that additional refinery capacity is available during emergencies, strengthening our national security while helping to mitigate upward price pressures. And in non emergencies, it would provide refined products to the Federal fleet, easing demand on the rest of the market.

This is a forward-thinking and logical proposal. I was disappointed that the Rules Committee voted against making it in order as a substitute, because if we had passed a Dingell/Boucher bill, at least I could tell my constituents Congress did something substantive to deal with America's energy challenges.

When I return to my district next week and in the coming weeks and months, I would like to be able to tell my constituents that Congress understands what you are dealing with in terms of gas prices and energy.

We know we can't fix everything overnight. But we have got a real plan for the future.

I want to be able to tell them that we are going to reduce demand by promoting energy conservation and fuel efficient forms of transportation. And we are going to work to develop renewable sources of fuel and other innovative technologies.

Taken together, these will help America move towards energy independence. And we are going to stop providing subsidies to companies that are making record profits, and instead, we are going to help working Americans deal with high gas prices.

I really wish I could say all of those things. But that is not going to be possible if the House continues to consider unnecessary and misguided legislation like this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule because this bill did not go through regular order, because it comes to the floor under a closed rule which does not allow for its improvement, and because it does not allow the commonsense Dingell/Boucher substitute.

□ 1730

I urge my colleagues to vote against the underlying bill. Such a vote will reject this misguided approach to energy policy. A "no" vote on this legislation would send a message that Congress is ready to consider truly substantive legislation that addresses the energy crisis this Nation faces. Please join me in sending that important message.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, of course, providing for consideration of H.R. 5254, the Refinery Permit Process Schedule Act.

First, let me explain the bill. It will create a new system for coordinating the myriad permits and authorizations required under Federal law in order to get refineries built and operating.

Mr. Speaker, a Federal coordinator will call a meeting of all officials involved in issuing permits under Federal law. For those permits that require State officials to implement Federal law, the governor of the State where the refinery would be located selects the participants. Under the leadership of the coordinator, the officials will hammer out a coordinated schedule for acting up or down on permit applications. The schedule will be published in Federal Register. Once the regulatory work begins, if an agency slips behind schedule, the applicant may go to court to get the schedule restored.

The bill also calls on the President to suggest that we use closed military bases as possible candidates for siting refineries, subject to local approval.

H.R. 5254 explicitly preserves the letter and intent of all laws for environmental protection and public participation, and, for the first time, it gives priority to EPA in scheduling permit processing. But it also instills discipline and interagency teamwork into the system so that needless bureaucratic delay can be eliminated.

Why do we need this bill? Witness after witness at our Energy and Commerce Committee hearings have testified to the shortage of refinery capacity in the United States. It is shocking to most Americans that we are importing more gasoline every day and that our domestic capacity to make gasoline is at its upper limits. This causes upward pressure on prices, which we all experience at each fill-up.

One reason that refinery capacity is so tight is the regulatory costs and uncertainty of permitting. We want to take that excuse off the table. But what we really want to do is open the U.S. market to new entrants who will refine traditional fuels and alternatives such as coal-to-liquid and biofuels, both of which are set out in H.R. 5254.

The process for H.R. 5254 started last year on September 7, 2005, just days after Katrina struck the gulf coast. We held hearings that led to H.R. 3893, the Gasoline For America's Security Act. Sections 101, 102 and 103 of H.R. 3893 on refinery streamlining formed the foundation of H.R. 5254.

After a vigorous floor debate, H.R. 3893 passed the House, but it has not been taken up by the Senate. So on May 2 of this year, our colleague from New Hampshire, Mr. BASS, introduced this new version of refinery streamlining that provides for State input

and, more explicitly, preserves underlying Federal environmental laws.

A bipartisan majority of the House voted for H.R. 5254 when it was brought up under suspension of the rules. During that debate, some Members suggested that the bill does not defer adequately to the role of States in permitting decisions. After the debate was over and the bill had garnered 237 votes, but shy of the two-thirds needed under suspension, we reached out to our friends on the other side of the aisle to explore common language. In fact, we offered an amendment designed to address the State role issue, even more than we had already in the underlying bill.

The chairman of the full committee asked that this bill be pulled from the schedule several weeks ago so that bipartisan discussions could be given a chance. Our colleagues in the minority really had three options. Their first option was to accept the new language as fully answering their concern, which I believe it did; option two was to suggest modifications or alternatives to achieve the same purpose; option three was to take their ball and go home. The alternative to “take their ball and go home” meant to decide that negotiations would not produce an agreement.

They chose option three, which surprised us. We thought a deal was possible, and we made suggestions to address their concerns.

We are here today with the same bill that received 237 votes last month because the bill already deferred to governors on the designation of State officials to participate in the development of the coordinated plan, and because 237 of us confirmed our support for H.R. 5254 earlier this month, without any further changes, I think that no amendments to the bill are necessary.

I urge a “yes” vote on the rule.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and urge its defeat. It is sadly typical of the way this Republican House has operated that the members of the committee of jurisdiction, including the distinguished ranking member Mr. DINGELL, are not allowed to offer amendments during floor debate. I say that is typical, but it doesn't make it right. We need reform of the way this House is being run.

Mr. Speaker, I offered a simple amendment in the Rules Committee to strike section 5 of the bill, the section of the bill that requires the President to designate three closed military bases as sites for an oil refinery. For bases that are chosen, section 5 requires local redevelopment authorities, or LRAs, to halt their re-use planning and consider an oil refinery even if the local community doesn't want one. My amendment was denied.

I would have offered the amendment in an Energy and Commerce Com-

mittee markup, but the committee never held a markup. So the bill will arrive on the floor not once, but twice, without the opportunity to debate amendments and without a committee markup.

Communities that have suffered under the impact of a closed military base do not need the President of the United States or the Congress usurping authority for local land use decision making.

Moreover, section 5 is unnecessary. There is nothing, I repeat, nothing in the current statutes or Defense Department regulations that prevents a community from developing a closed base into an oil refinery. If the local community wants an oil refinery, then it certainly can develop one on a closed military base.

Here is the main point: The underlying bill, when read together with the BRAC statutes and regulations, has the effect of forcing an LRA, if designated by the President, to spend local resources and valuable time developing a reuse plan for an oil refinery, even if the community the LRA represents has no interest in a refinery.

Moreover, because under the BRAC law the Secretary of Defense has the final and sole authority to accept a reuse plan and to determine the future use of the base, the effect of section 5 of this bill is to force a community to accept an oil refinery, even if it doesn't want one.

I have no problem with an oil refinery being built in a closed military base in a community that wants the refinery built. But that should be decided by the community, not by the President, not by the Secretary of Defense and not by the Congress. My amendment protected local control. It should have been allowed. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the author of this important legislation.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for recognizing me, and I want to thank the staff, the chairman of the Commerce Committee and the chairman of the energy committee, Chairman BOEHLERT, for their participation in working out this piece of legislation.

As has been said before, this legislation passed the House a few weeks ago 237-188. Although it prevailed by a pretty good margin, it wasn't enough to make the two-thirds margin required for suspension, so we bring it up today under regular order.

I just want to point out exactly what this bill does. It directs the President to appoint a coordinator for the process of considering refinery citing permits.

It requires that coordinator to work with, not against, but with Federal, State and local entities to issue the needed permits and approvals and set

an agreed upon schedule for each approval.

It also allows this coordinator to establish a memorandum of agreement with all the relevant parties which will set forth the most expeditious path toward a coordinated schedule for permitting.

It allows the local Federal district court to enforce this agreed upon schedule, giving proper opportunity for good faith delays and setbacks.

It instructs the President, as we heard a minute ago from my friend from Maine, to designate at least three closed military installations as potentially suitable areas for the construction of a refinery. And, by the way, at least one of those must be designated as usable for a biorefinery, not an oil refinery.

I would point out, as had been debated the last time the bill came up, we haven't built a new refinery in this country since 1976. Gasoline demand in the United States has doubled since then; doubled. Our current capacity for refining gasoline is about 17 million barrels a day. Our consumption is over 21 million barrels a day, which means that the deficit is being imported as a finished goods product from abroad. We are indeed importing an enormous quantity of gasoline every day, which is adding to the instability of gasoline prices as well as availability.

Secondly, too much of our refining capacity is in one part of the country. We learned last year when energy prices climbed 50 cents a gallon at gas stations that Katrina, going through Louisiana and the Gulf of Mexico, can have a devastating impact on availability when refineries are shut down for short periods of time or even longer periods of time. We need to have a more diverse geographic location for refinery capacity in our country.

Furthermore, our current refinery capacity is too reliant on crude oil as a feedstock. Less than 2 percent of our motor fuel is based only anything other than crude. Our national agriculture and forest industry resources can sustainably provide feedstock to displace more than one-third of our transportation fuels. I am hopeful. I would welcome a biorefinery in my neck of the woods. We need refined ethanol to replace MTBE as an oxygenate for gasoline.

We have heard the opponents of this legislation say that even big oil industry, the oil companies, don't think that expediting the permitting process is necessary. Well, I would rather not take the word of the big oil companies as to whether or not they think tight refinery supply is good or bad for business. I don't want to give them any excuse for saying that they can't build new refinery capacity.

Nothing in this legislation will circumvent any existing regulation that exists today. All it does is make it quicker and more expeditious and more efficient, but it doesn't eliminate nor short circuit any local protections.

Others say we are better off expanding current refinery capacity. Well, I addressed that a little bit a minute ago. The danger we face in having a few very large refineries and not other refinery capacity in this country is serious. The impact on consumers, on the economy, can be devastating if we only have a dozen or two. The increased dependence on foreign oil that we may face under these circumstances is significant.

My friend from California earlier mentioned that there is no evidence that the passage of this legislation would lead to the construction of any new refinery. That is a difficult question to answer, because if you don't make it easier, how are you going to know that making it easier doesn't work? The fact is that we know that it can take up to 10 years to get the permitting process done.

I would point out that this bill does no harm whatsoever to the current process, but it makes it work better. If the industry doesn't like it, I don't want to be on the side of an industry that wants to restrict increasing refinery capacity.

I believe that what we envision in this bill protects the environment, it protects the process, it can potentially lead to more diverse and better and modern refinery capacity in this country, which will lead to a stronger economy, lower gas prices in my part of the world, and yet at the same time protecting our fragile environment.

□ 1745

So I urge the Congress to not oppose this rule, bring this bill to the floor, and pass it on to the Senate.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to point out again, as Mr. BASS did, that nothing in this bill forces communities designated by the President to submit to Secretary Rumsfeld a reuse plan that includes a refinery, even if they do not want to build one.

The opposite is true. Actually, this is going to go to districts that want them, and we have districts who do want them. I hold in my hand a letter from the Texarkana Chamber of Commerce, Texarkana, Texas, signed by the president of that chamber, the county judge, the Bowie County judge, the mayor, both mayors on the Arkansas side and Texas side.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to go to places who really want them, and the bill requires that the Secretary of Defense give substantial deference to the local redevelopment authority's recommendation, even if that recommendation rejects the refinery.

And the President has no power to direct. He has power only to suggest. And you can see that by looking at section 5, line 16. That simply says: "The

President shall designate no less than three closed military installations, or portions thereof, as potentially suitable for the construction of a refinery."

So these places are going to be sought after. Maine has nothing to fear. If they do not want it, they can cancel it by simply saying they do not want it. We would be very happy to have it over in Texarkana, Texas and serve four States there that come together.

I urge, of course, the support of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking Members to vote "no" on the previous question so I can amend this rule, closed rule, and allow the House to consider the Boucher-Dingell Strategic Refinery Reserve substitute.

This substitute was offered in the Rules Committee when this rule was reported last month, but was blocked on a straight party-line vote.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, whatever position Members have on this legislation, they should vote against the previous question so we can consider a much better approach to our Nation's refinery shortage.

The Boucher-Dingell substitute, which is identical to the text of H.R. 5365, will establish a strategic refinery reserve. This reserve would complement the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. It would provide a much needed safety net for this Nation during times when existing refineries are temporarily or even permanently unavailable.

It would also be used to supply fuel to the Federal Government and the military during those times when oil production is not compromised.

Vote "no" on the previous question so we can consider this important and responsible substitute. I want to make it very clear that a "no" vote will not stop us from considering H.R. 5254, but a "yes" vote will block consideration of the Boucher-Dingell substitute.

Again, I urge all Members to vote "no" on the previous question.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of our distinguished colleagues that have spoken on this rule today. It brings to the floor an important piece of legislation, a bill that this House considered and voted with the solid majority under suspension of the rules just some weeks ago, but it did not obtain the

two-thirds vote necessary to pass under suspension of the rules. That is why we have brought it forth again under the regular order with a rule.

It will help. It will contribute to helping our country with the energy crisis that we face, when we recognize the fact that the economy has grown, as it has so tremendously in the last 30 years and yet not one single refinery has been constructed. Evidently, there is a problem. This seeks to do something about it.

So that is why we are bringing again this legislation for consideration of the House under this rule. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, in order to consider that legislation, we have brought this rule forward, and I would ask all of my colleagues to support it as well as the underlying legislation.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Rule and to the underlying bill.

Let me begin by saying that I've been in Congress for 30 years now, and this is absolutely the worst energy bill I've seen since the bill the House defeated just over one month ago!

In fact, it is the same exact bill—risen from the grave like some horror movie monstrosity to haunt this House yet again.

The Rule we are considering for this bill is an absolute insult to this House and to the Members. It is a complete and total gag Rule. It makes absolutely no amendments in order. It allows only one hour of debate on the bill. It waives all points of order against the bill.

The Rules Committee Republicans voted down Democratic motions to report this bill with an open rule.

The Rules Committee Republicans voted down a Democratic Motion to make in order an amendment by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) to strike provisions from the bill that would require the designation of no less than 3 closed military bases for use as refineries.

The Rules Committee Republicans voted down a Democratic Motion to make in order an amendment by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) to establish a Strategic Refinery Reserve to help cushion the shock of extreme supply disruptions with a federal refinery that would have surge capacity to produce refined products when needed.

Why are the Republicans afraid of having a debate and a vote on these Democratic amendments?

Are they afraid of giving the Members an opportunity to approve a measure that might actually do something to reduce gas prices, and ensure that the rights of local communities are not trampled upon in order to advance the interests of the oil industry? We should be able to have that debate and vote on these amendments today.

We shouldn't be forced to put our amendments into a recommittal motion at the end of the bill in which we will only have 10 minutes of total debate time.

Once again, the Republican Majority that controls this Congress is abusing its power and trampling upon the rights of the Minority.

This bill has never been the subject of any legislative hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee. It was introduced by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), on May 2nd of this year and then brought immediately to the House floor on the Suspension Calendar one day later.

Now, the Suspension Calendar is normally used for non-controversial bills that have approved on a bipartisan basis. Most of the time, we use the Suspension Calendar to bring up bills to name post offices, pass commemorations, or enact Sense of Congress resolutions. It is entirely inappropriate to use the Suspension process for a bill as contentious as the Bass bill, because that process bars any amendments and sharply limits floor debate.

Thankfully, the Bass bill failed when brought up as a Suspension. It deserves to fail again here on the Floor today.

There still have never been any legislative hearings on this bill.

Hearings has been no Subcommittee or Committee process.

The Democratic Members of the Energy and Commerce Committee have been walled out.

This is a bad bill. It deserves to be defeated.

I urge the Members to reject this Rule, to reject this unfair process, and to reject the Bass Refinery bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. MATSUI is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 842

H.R. 5254—REFINERY PERMIT PROCESS SCHEDULE ACT

Text:

In the resolution strike “and (2)” and insert the following:

“(2) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed consisting of the text of H.R. 5365 if offered by Representative Boucher of Virginia or Representative Dingell of Michigan or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3)”.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say “the vote on the previous question is simply a

vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Ms. MATSUI. 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5521, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-487) on the resolution (H. Res. 849) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5521) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o’clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan) at 6 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 836 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5441.

□ 1831

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5441) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. BONNER (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 62, line 17.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mr. KINGSTON of Georgia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 179, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

AYES—218

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Neugebauer
Akin	Gillmor	Ney
Alexander	Gingrey	Northup
Bachus	Gohmert	Norwood
Baker	Goode	Nunes
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Otter
Barrow	Gordon	Oxley
Bartlett (MD)	Granger	Paul
Barton (TX)	Graves	Peterson (MN)
Bass	Green (WI)	Peterson (PA)
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Petri
Berry	Hall	Pickering
Biggert	Harris	Pitts
Bilirakis	Hart	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Hayworth	Putnam
Boehlert	Hefley	Radanovich
Boehner	Hensarling	Ramstad
Bonilla	Herger	Regula
Bonner	Hobson	Rehberg
Boozman	Hoekstra	Renzi
Boren	Holden	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Hostettler	Rogers (KY)
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Hyde	Ross
Brown-Waite,	Inglis (SC)	Royce
Ginny	Isa	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Jenkins	Ryun (KS)
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Saxton
Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Schmidt
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Schwarz (MI)
Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Jones (NC)	Sessions
Capito	Kanjorski	Shadegg
Carter	Keller	Shaw
Case	Kelly	Shays
Chabot	King (IA)	Sherwood
Chandler	King (NY)	Shimkus
Chocola	Kingston	Shuster
Coble	Kirk	Simmons
Cole (OK)	Kline	Simpson
Conaway	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Kuhl (NY)	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	LaHood	Sodrel
Cubin	Latham	Souder
Culberson	LaTourette	Spratt
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Davis (TN)	Lewis (KY)	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Tancredo
Davis, Tom	LoBiondo	Taylor (MS)
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Lungren, Daniel	E.
Dent	E.	Terry
Doolittle	Mack	Thomas
Drake	Marchant	Thornberry
Dreier	Matheson	Tiahrt
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Tiberi
Emerson	McCotter	Turner
English (PA)	McCrery	Upton
Everett	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Feeney	McHugh	Wamp
Ferguson	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McMorris	Weller
Flake	Melancon	Westmoreland
Foley	Mica	Whitfield
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Wilson (NM)
Fox	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Murphy	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Murtha	Young (AK)
Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave	Young (FL)
Gerlach	Myrick	

NOES—179

Abercrombie	Cannon	Davis (IL)
Ackerman	Capps	DeFazio
Allen	Capuano	DeGette
Andrews	Cardin	Delahunt
Baird	Cardoza	DeLauro
Baldwin	Carnahan	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bean	Carson	Diaz-Balart, M.
Becerra	Castle	Dicks
Berkley	Clay	Dingell
Berman	Cleaver	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Doyle
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Edwards
Blumenauer	Cooper	Ehlers
Boswell	Costa	Emanuel
Boucher	Costello	Engel
Boyd	Crowley	Eshoo
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Etheridge
Brown (OH)	Cummings	Farr
Brown, Corrine	Davis (CA)	Fattah
Butterfield	Davis (FL)	Ford

Fossella	Maloney	Rothman
Frank (MA)	Markey	Roybal-Allard
Gonzalez	Matsui	Ruppersberger
Green, Al	McCarthy	Rush
Green, Gene	McCollum (MN)	Ryan (OH)
Grijalva	McDermott	Sabo
Gutierrez	McGovern	Salazar
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Sánchez, Linda
Herseht	McKinney	T.
Higgins	McNulty	Sanchez, Loretta
Hinchey	Meehan	Sanders
Hinojosa	Meek (FL)	Schiff
Holt	Meeks (NY)	Schwartz (PA)
Honda	Michaud	Scott (GA)
Hoolley	Millender-	Serrano
Hoyer	McDonald	Skelton
Insee	Miller (NC)	Slaughter
Israel	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Jackson (IL)	Mollohan	Snyder
Jackson-Lee	Moore (KS)	Solis
(TX)	Moore (WI)	Stark
Jefferson	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Johnson, E. B.	Nader	Sweeney
Jones (OH)	Napolitano	Tanner
Kaptur	Neal (MA)	Tauscher
Kennedy (RI)	Obey	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Oliver	Tierney
Kilpatrick (MI)	Ortiz	Towns
Kind	Owens	Udall (CO)
Kolbe	Pallone	Van Hollen
Kucinich	Pascrell	Velázquez
Langevin	Pastor	Visclosky
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Walsh
Larsen (CT)	Pomeroy	Watson
Leach	Porter	Watt
Levin	Price (NC)	Waxman
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Weiner
Lipinski	Rangel	Wexler
Lofgren, Zoe	Reichert	Wu
Lowey	Reynolds	Wynn
Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen	

NOT VOTING—35

Baca	Lee	Reyes
Bono	Manzullo	Schakowsky
Campbell (CA)	Marshall	Scott (VA)
Davis (AL)	Miller (MI)	Sherman
Evans	Nussle	Strickland
Filner	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Galleghy	Osborne	Udall (NM)
Gibbons	Payne	Wasserman
Harman	Pearce	Schultz
Istook	Pence	Waters
Kennedy (MN)	Platts	Weldon (PA)
Lantos	Pombo	Woolsey

□ 1903

Messrs. CLEAVER, ACKERMAN, CASTLE and FOSSELLA and Mrs. DAVIS of California changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 223, the King of Iowa amendment to H.R. 5441, I was in my Congressional district on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 293, noes 107, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

AYES—293

Aderholt	Fitzpatrick (PA)	McNulty
Akin	Flake	Meeks (NY)
Alexander	Foley	Melancon
Allen	Forbes	Mica
Bachus	Ford	Michaud
Baker	Fortenberry	Miller (FL)
Barrett (SC)	Fossella	Miller (NC)
Barrow	Fox	Miller, Gary
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	Mollohan
Barton (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Moore (KS)
Bass	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Bean	Gerlach	Murphy
Beauprez	Gilchrest	Musgrave
Berkley	Gillmor	Myrick
Berry	Gingrey	Neugebauer
Biggert	Gohmert	Ney
Bilirakis	Goode	Northup
Bishop (GA)	Goodlatte	Norwood
Bishop (NY)	Gordon	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Obey
Blackburn	Graves	Otter
Blunt	Green (WI)	Oxley
Boehlert	Gutknecht	Paul
Boehner	Hall	Peterson (MN)
Bonilla	Harris	Peterson (PA)
Bonner	Hart	Petri
Boozman	Hastings (WA)	Pickering
Boren	Hayes	Pitts
Boustany	Hayworth	Platts
Bradley (NH)	Hefley	Poe
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Pomeroy
Brown (OH)	Herger	Porter
Brown (SC)	Herseth	Price (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Hobson	Price (NC)
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Ginny	Holden	Putnam
Burgess	Hoolley	Radanovich
Burton (IN)	Hostettler	Rahall
Buyer	Hulshof	Ramstad
Calvert	Hunter	Regula
Camp (MI)	Hyde	Rehberg
Cannon	Inglis (SC)	Renzi
Cantor	Israel	Reynolds
Capito	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Capuano	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Carnahan	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Carter	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Castle	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Chandler	Jones (NC)	Royce
Chocola	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger
Clay	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Coble	Kelly	Ryun (KS)
Cole (OK)	Kildee	Sabo
Conaway	Kind	Sanders
Cooper	King (IA)	Saxton
Costello	King (NY)	Schmidt
Cramer	Kingston	Schwartz (PA)
Crenshaw	Kirk	Schwarz (MI)
Cubin	Kline	Scott (GA)
Culberson	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Davis (FL)	Kolbe	Sessions
Davis (TN)	Kuhl (NY)	Shadegg
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	Shaw
Davis, Tom	Langevin	Shays
Deal (GA)	Latham	Sherwood
DeFazio	LaTourette	Shimkus
Delahunt	Leach	Shuster
DeLay	Levin	Simmons
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (KY)	Skelton
Diaz-Balart, M.	Linder	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Lipinski	Smith (TX)
Dingell	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)
Doolittle	Lucas	Snyder
Drake	Lungren, Daniel	Sodrel
Dreier	E.	Souder
Duncan	Lynch	Spratt
Edwards	Mack	Stearns
Ehlers	Marchant	Stupak
Emanuel	Matheson	Sullivan
Engel	McCarthy	Sweeney
Eshoo	McCaul (TX)	Tancredo
Etheridge	McCollum (MN)	Tanner
Farr	McCotter	Taylor (MS)
Fattah	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Ford	McHenry	Terry
	McHugh	Thomas
	McIntyre	Thornberry
	McKeon	Tiahrt
	McKinney	Tiberi
	McMorris	Tierney

Turner	Weldon (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Udall (CO)	Weldon (PA)	Wolf
Upton	Weller	Wu
Visclosky	Westmoreland	Young (AK)
Walden (OR)	Whitfield	Young (FL)
Walsh	Wicker	
Wamp	Wilson (NM)	

## NOES—107

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano
Ackerman	Higgins	Neal (MA)
Andrews	Hinche	Oliver
Baird	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Baldwin	Holt	Owens
Becerra	Honda	Pallone
Berman	Hoyer	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Inslee	Pastor
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Butterfield	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Capps	(TX)	Reichert
Cardin	Jefferson	Rothman
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Case	Jones (OH)	Rush
Cleaver	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Salazar
Conyers	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sánchez, Linda
Crowley	Kucinich	T.
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
DeGette	Lowe	Slaughter
DeLauro	Maloney	Solis
Doggett	Markey	Stark
Doyle	Matsui	Tauscher
Emanuel	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McGovern	Towns
Eshoo	Meehan	Van Hollen
Farr	Meek (FL)	Velázquez
Fattah	Millender-	Watson
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Watt
Gonzalez	Miller, George	Waxman
Green, Al	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Green, Gene	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Grijalva	Murtha	Wynn
Gutierrez	Nadler	

## NOT VOTING—32

Baca	Lantos	Pombo
Bono	Lee	Reyes
Campbell (CA)	Manzullo	Schakowsky
Davis (AL)	Marshall	Sherman
Evans	Miller (MI)	Strickland
Filner	Nussle	Thompson (MS)
Gallegly	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
Gibbons	Osborne	Wasserman
Harman	Payne	Schultz
Istook	Pearce	Waters
Kennedy (MN)	Pence	Woolsey

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

1909

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 224, the Kingston amendment to H.R. 5441, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and yield to the gentlewoman from New York so that the Members might understand what is going to be in the motion to recommit and what will come next.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I will soon offer a motion to recommit. This motion seeks to increase first responder grants by \$750 million. This amount will keep each State and locality funded at whichever is higher, fiscal year 2005 or fiscal year 2006. It is critically important that we increase the allocation for first responder grants.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard to believe, but it is true, that DHS has announced that New York, which remains the likeliest target of a terrorist attack, will receive a \$106 million reduction in funding for fiscal year 2007. Short memories. Such a cut is unconscionable.

New York is the only city that has been attacked by terrorists twice. And the New York Police Department has prevented efforts to destroy the Brooklyn Bridge and other critical infrastructure.

Reducing funding to New York and Washington, D.C., the two targets of the September 11 attack, is a slap in the face to every first responder who rushed to the emergency scene that morning and every individual living in those regions.

In a letter sent to the New York congressional delegation last week, Secretary Chertoff stated that New York is at the top of the national risk ranking. Yet, inexplicably, New York's share of funding decreased.

Now, the allocation method that DHS uses, frankly, defies common sense. The Statue of Liberty was not considered part of New York City because, technically, the Federal Government owns the property.

DHS classified over 200,000 entities into four risk quadrants, with all items in each quadrant receiving equal value. This means that something that is clearly a target, such as the Capitol, the Empire State Building, and the Golden Gate Bridge is considered the same as whatever target was number 50,000 on the list. And Washington, D.C., as a whole, was placed in the lower risk quadrant because DHS claims it does not have significant critical infrastructure. And by the way, if you call DHS to get an explanation, they respond, it is classified; we can't tell you.

Now, remember, DHS claims that Washington, D.C. does not have significant critical infrastructure.

1915

The September 11 hijackers did not care about the total amount of critical infrastructure in a specific region. They sought to destroy symbolic targets full of thousands of Americans. Our preparedness effort should reflect this fact.

Unless the motion to recommit is adopted, first responder funding will once again be slashed. In the last 5 years, terrorists have murdered thousands in New York, Washington, Madrid and London. Within the past 2 hours, the Canadian government has stated that the terrorists they arrested last week planned to storm Parliament and behead the prime minister.

Now, my colleagues, this should sound an alarm that now is not the time to reduce funding to prevent, prepare and respond to attacks in areas that face the greatest risk. We must pay now to protect our country or we will pay later.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply explain that the Lowey motion to recommit will be with instructions to report it back forthwith to the House with an amendment adding an additional \$750 million for State and local formula-based grants and high-threat, high-density urban area grants so that no State or urban area receives funding below which it received in 2005 or 2006, whichever is higher, and is offset by a 1.8 percent reduction in the tax reduction resulting from the enactment of Public Laws 107-16, et cetera, for taxpayers with incomes in excess of \$1 million for calendar year 2007.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, if there was any doubt, FEMA's performance during Hurricane Katrina proved the Department of Homeland Security's incompetence. I had hoped that more than 3 years after its creation, the Department would use common sense. But as DHS continues to violate Americans' civil liberties, pursue policies that make us no more secure, and misallocate funds, I cannot vote to throw good money after bad.

H.R. 5441 will allow the TSA to spend \$6.4 billion strip-searching grandmothers and small children. Yet multiple auditors have found that despite this and other invasive techniques, the Department is no more likely to detect a weapon than were security personnel prior to September 11, 2001. Under this bill, DHS will continue to screen only 5 percent of port containers and virtually no air cargo. Wyoming will still get about \$27.80 per capita in homeland security funding while California will receive only about \$8.05. I shudder to think how FEMA will handle the next large earthquake in the Bay Area when they can't even handle a hurricane with a week's warning.

I vote "no" to DHS's misplaced priorities and urge my colleagues to stop supporting a dysfunctional agency.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the FY 2007 Homeland Security Appropriations bill. This isn't a perfect bill, but it provides much needed funds to make our country safer.

Total funding in the bill is increased by nearly \$2 billion from this year's levels, with some increases from FY06 in Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Transportation Security Administration.

Still, I'm concerned about shortfalls in the bill. First, although the bill increases funding for Border Patrol salaries and expenses over FY06 levels, it only funds 1,200 new Border Patrol agents, 300 less than requested by the Administration and 800 less than the 2007 level called for in the Intelligence Reform bill. Similarly, although the bill increases funding for salaries and expenses for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, it only funds about 4,800 additional detention beds, almost 2,000 less than requested by the administration and 3,200 less than the 2007 level called for in the Intelligence Reform bill.

The bill also cuts firefighter and SAFER grants by 11 percent, cuts air cargo security by \$30 million, and cuts urban area security grants from FY06 levels.

I opposed the amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL which would block any Homeland

Security funding from going to State and local governments if their law enforcement is prohibited from reporting immigration information to the federal government.

I believe that linking this provision to vital homeland security funds could have unintended consequences for our national security. Since 9/11, national security has become a national priority, and State and local governments play an essential role in assisting the Department of Homeland Security to improve the security in this country.

Under current law passed in 1996, it is already illegal for law enforcement to restrict the reporting of immigration information to the federal government. I support this law, and believe it should be fully enforced. The efforts of state and local governments to enhance our security should not be undermined because the federal government has not properly enforced immigration law.

We should be providing states with resources to improve security, not taking these resources away. By under-funding and allowing the weakening of security in some states and localities due to their lack of reporting illegal immigrants to immigration officials, the federal government would in effect be contributing to the weakening of our national security.

Mr. Chairman, much remains to be done to improve our defenses against terrorism, but this bill is an important step, and I will vote for it.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleague from New York in expressing my extreme displeasure with the Department of Homeland Security's recent announcement regarding Urban Area Security Initiative grants.

The outcome of DHS's process defies common sense. I am hard pressed to understand how the National Capital Region, one of the regions deemed most at risk in the United States, should incur such a drastic reduction in funding. The nation's capital bears a disproportionate burden in terms of homeland security costs and ensuring public safety needs. This region was one of two targets on September 11; it was the target of anthrax attacks and sniper shootings.

To the best of my understanding, DHS's decision to reduce funding for the national capital area was based on the opinion that region's planning was inadequate. As of this date, I have not been briefed in detail on the process or criteria used to make this determination. This will be rectified when the Government Reform Committee holds a hearing on the subject on June 15th. For the time being, the entire evolution suggests unnecessary secrecy and an overemphasis on bureaucratic expertise.

The risk doesn't go away if a region is planning poorly; rather, the risk to the citizen increases. I truly hope DHS would take the necessary steps to remediate an inadequate plan for UASI funds—to offer a region the help it apparently needs. Cutting funding should not be the method to address any alleged planning deficiencies.

We have to protect the interests of the taxpayer, but we also have to protect the taxpayer. Much was made about the Department of Homeland Security's renewed emphasis on sending funds where the need was greatest. We're not getting off to a good start.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last two lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007".

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5441) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 836, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. In its present form, I am, Madam Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Lowey moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5441, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same forthwith back to the House with an amendment providing for an additional \$750 million for state and local formula based grants and high-threat, high-density urban area grants so that no state or urban area receive funding below what it received in 2005 or 2006, whichever is higher, and offset by a 1.8 percent reduction in the tax reduction resulting from the enactment of Public Laws 107-16, 108-27, and 108-311 for taxpayers with income in excess of \$1,000,000 for calendar year 2007.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit because it violates clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I wish to speak on the point of order.

Madam Speaker, I wish to speak on the point of order because, frankly, it is beyond belief to me that this committee could appropriate less to major cities like New York and Washington than they received last year. Given the current threats that are still out there loud and clear, we should not be cut-

ting back on these important critical homeland security dollars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to speak on the point of order?

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

Madam Speaker, a fundamental element of the rules of the House is that Members get an opportunity to debate and have their views heard on issues. We have lost the opportunity to have an amendment such as this because of a unanimous consent that was entered into before these events happened. We, in good faith, entered into a unanimous consent agreement on limiting the number of amendments we offered to this bill. Then in the intervening period, news happened. The Department of Homeland Security issued a formula and issued a distribution of funds that gave less money to places that were at the highest need.

What happened was we entered into a unanimous consent agreement to limit the number of amendments that were offered.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, regular order. The gentleman needs to speak to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from New York intending to address the point of order?

Mr. WEINER. I certainly am, and, if I were permitted to finish, you would see that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. WEINER. Certainly. That is what I am doing, Madam Speaker.

What happened was during the intervening period, after the unanimous consent was entered into, this formula was issued giving Members no opportunity other than this motion in order to make this point, that in order to have funds allocated where they are needed most, the Lowey motion is the only way to do it.

If you vote yes on tabling this motion, you are voting to essentially sustain this allocation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I am seeking to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is that the motion to recommit legislates. The gentleman will confine his remarks to that.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I understand.

The motion to recommit that we are voting on today that we are seeking to have an up or down vote on, I would say, would give us an opportunity to hear this.

You don't need to raise the point of order. If you want to simply go vote to sustain this ridiculous formula, vote on the Lowey amendment in an act of

good faith that we showed by entering into the unanimous consent. That is why the point of order should be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The motion to recommit proposes an amendment prescribing a new rule of law regarding the Federal income tax. As such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained. The motion to recommit is not in order.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, because this ruling defies the imagination of anybody living here in the United States of America, because of this ruling and the decision of this committee to cut back on homeland security funds and refuse to adjust them according to risk-threat vulnerability, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 191, answered “present” 2, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

AYES—207

Aderholt	Camp (MI)	Ferguson
Akin	Cannon	Pitzpatrick (PA)
Alexander	Cantor	Flake
Bachus	Capito	Foley
Baker	Carter	Forbes
Barrett (SC)	Castle	Fortenberry
Bartlett (MD)	Chabot	Fox
Barton (TX)	Chocola	Franks (AZ)
Bass	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Beauprez	Cole (OK)	Garrett (NJ)
Biggart	Conaway	Gilchrest
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Gillmor
Bishop (UT)	Cubin	Gingrey
Blackburn	Culberson	Gohmert
Blunt	Davis (KY)	Goode
Boehrlert	Davis, Jo Ann	Goodlatte
Boehner	Deal (GA)	Granger
Bonilla	DeLay	Graves
Bonner	Dent	Green (WI)
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Gutknecht
Boustany	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hall
Bradley (NH)	Doolittle	Harris
Brady (TX)	Drake	Hart
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Hastert
Brown-Waite,	Duncan	Hastings (WA)
Ginny	Ehlers	Hayes
Burgess	Emerson	Hayworth
Burton (IN)	English (PA)	Hefley
Buyer	Everett	Hensarling
Calvert	Feeney	Herger

Hobson	Mica	Saxton
Hoekstra	Miller (FL)	Schmidt
Hostettler	Miller, Gary	Schwarz (MI)
Hulshof	Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Hunter	Murphy	Sessions
Hyde	Musgrave	Shadegg
Inglis (SC)	Myrick	Shaw
Issa	Neugebauer	Sherwood
Jenkins	Ney	Shimkus
Jindal	Northup	Shuster
Johnson (IL)	Norwood	Simpson
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Smith (NJ)
Keller	Otter	Smith (TX)
King (IA)	Oxley	Sodrel
Kingston	Paul	Souder
Kirk	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
Kline	Petri	Sullivan
Knollenberg	Pickering	Tancredo
Kolbe	Pitts	Taylor (NC)
Kuhl (NY)	Platts	Terry
LaHood	Poe	Thomas
Latham	Porter	Thornberry
LaTourette	Price (GA)	Tiahrt
Leach	Pryce (OH)	Tiberi
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Turner
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Upton
Linder	Ramstad	Walden (OR)
LoBiondo	Regula	Walsh
Lucas	Rehberg	Wamp
Lungren, Daniel	Reichert	Weldon (FL)
E.	Renzi	Weldon (PA)
Mack	Reynolds	Weller
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
McCaul (TX)	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
McCotter	Rogers (MD)	Wicker
McCrery	Rohrabacher	Wilson (NM)
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)
McHugh	Royce	Young (AK)
McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)
McMorris	Ryun (KS)	

NOES—191

Abercrombie	Eshoo	McDermott
Ackerman	Etheridge	McGovern
Allen	Farr	McIntyre
Andrews	Fattah	McKinney
Baird	Ford	McNulty
Baldwin	Fossella	Meehan
Barrow	Frank (MA)	Meek (FL)
Bean	Gerlach	Meeks (NY)
Becerra	Gonzalez	Melancon
Berkley	Gordon	Michaud
Berman	Green, Al	Millender-
Berry	Green, Gene	McDonald
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Miller (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Blumenauer	Herseth	Mollohan
Boren	Higgins	Moore (KS)
Boswell	Hinche	Moore (WI)
Boucher	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Boyd	Holden	Murtha
Brady (PA)	Holt	Nadler
Brown (OH)	Honda	Napolitano
Brown, Corrine	Hooley	Neal (MA)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Obey
Capps	Inslee	Olver
Capuano	Israel	Ortiz
Cardin	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Cardoza	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Carnahan	(TX)	Pascrell
Carson	Jefferson	Pastor
Case	Johnson (CT)	Pelosi
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Clay	Jones (NC)	Pomeroy
Cleaver	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Rahall
Conyers	Kaptur	Rangel
Cooper	Kelly	Ross
Costa	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Costello	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Cramer	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kind	Rush
Cuellar	King (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Kucinich	Sabo
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Salazar
Davis (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	T.
Davis (TN)	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
DeGette	Lipinski	Schiff
Delahunt	Lofgren, Zoe	Schwartz (PA)
DeLauro	Lowe	Scott (GA)
Dicks	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Maloney	Serrano
Doggett	Markey	Shays
Doyle	Matheson	Simmons
Edwards	Matsui	Skelton
Emanuel	McCarthy	Slaughter
Engel	McCollum (MN)	Smith (WA)

Snyder	Taylor (MS)	Watson
Solis	Thompson (CA)	Watt
Spratt	Tierney	Waxman
Stark	Towns	Weiner
Stupak	Udall (CO)	Wexler
Sweeney	Van Hollen	Wu
Tanner	Velázquez	Wynn
Tauscher	Visclosky	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Davis, Tom	Wolf
------------	------

NOT VOTING—33

Baca	Lantos	Reyes
Bono	Lee	Schakowsky
Campbell (CA)	Manzullo	Sherman
Davis (AL)	Marshall	Strickland
Evans	Miller (MI)	Thompson (MS)
Filner	Nussle	Udall (NM)
Gallely	Oberstar	Wasserman
Gibbons	Osborne	Schultz
Gutierrez	Payne	Waters
Harman	Pearce	Woolsey
Istook	Pence	
Kennedy (MN)	Pombo	

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.

□ 1942

Mr. SMITH of Washington changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. FEENEY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the motion to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 225, table the Motion to Recommit H.R. 5441, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

RECOGNIZING SPEAKER HASTERT

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

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to salute Speaker HASTERT for becoming the longest serving Republican Speaker in history. Long may his record stand.

This milestone is a testament to his leadership within the Republican Conference and within the Halls of Congress. DENNIS HASTERT spent 16 years as a teacher and coach at Yorkville High School in Illinois. He has put the skills he learned there to good use in this body.

After 6 years in the Illinois State House, he came to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1986. In 1999, DENNY HASTERT's colleagues elected him Speaker of the House, the third highest Government official in the United States.

While we often disagree on issues, we agree on the importance of public service. That kind of public service has been the hallmark of Speaker HASTERT's career whether in the classroom or in the House of Representatives.

□ 1945

Today I also salute the Speaker's wife, Jean, and his two children, Ethan and Joshua, for this milestone.

Through the trying moments and the moments like this, one of great triumph, they have stood by his side. They are watching you on television now.

In Congress we all hold the title "honorable" by virtue of our office. Dennis Hastert holds it by virtue of his character. I salute him for his service to our Nation and look forward to many future opportunities to work together.

Congratulations, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, I want to first of all say, again, my appreciation to my family who have sacrificed over the years like all our families do when we come to this place. But I am very humbled that I was able to serve this body. I really am not one to keep records because records are made to be broken, but I just want to thank you as Members of the House for the times that we have been able to work together and the times when we have disagreed but we have disagreed in an honorable way.

I think the process that this place offers all of us is something that is unique in all the world. And I look around this room and chairmen that I have worked under who have taught me sometimes the hard way. I see people who have mentored, to try to bring Members along and bring them to places of leadership. I have to reflect and thank one person who I think has been very special in my life in this place, and that is Bob Michel, who served as Republican leader for years. The honor and civility that he brought to this place, I hope that I can pass on as well.

Again, I want to thank you for serving with me because this is a place where we work together and do things together. God bless you and God bless this Congress. Thank you very much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 9, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—389

Ackerman	DeLauro	Kelly
Aderholt	DeLay	Kennedy (RI)
Akin	Dent	Kildee
Alexander	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kilpatrick (MI)
Allen	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kind
Andrews	Dicks	King (IA)
Bachus	Dingell	King (NY)
Baird	Doggett	Kingston
Baker	Doolittle	Kirk
Baldwin	Doyle	Kline
Barrett (SC)	Drake	Knollenberg
Barrow	Dreier	Kolbe
Bartlett (MD)	Duncan	Kucinich
Barton (TX)	Edwards	Kuhl (NY)
Bass	Ehlers	LaHood
Bean	Emanuel	Langevin
Beauprez	Emerson	Larsen (WA)
Becerra	Engel	Latham
Berkley	English (PA)	LaTourette
Berman	Eshoo	Leach
Berry	Etheridge	Levin
Biggert	Everett	Lewis (CA)
Bilirakis	Farr	Lewis (KY)
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Feeney	Lipinski
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	LoBiondo
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lofgren, Zoe
Blumenauer	Foley	Lowey
Blunt	Forbes	Lucas
Boehlert	Ford	Lungren, Daniel
Boehner	Fortenberry	E.
Bonilla	Fossella	Lynch
Bonner	Fox	Mack
Boozman	Frank (MA)	Maloney
Boren	Franks (AZ)	Marchant
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Matheson
Boucher	Garrett (NJ)	Matsui
Boustany	Gerlach	McCarthy
Boyd	Gilchrest	McCaul (TX)
Bradley (NH)	Gillmor	McCollum (MN)
Brady (PA)	Gingrey	McCotter
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	McCrary
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	McGovern
Brown (SC)	Goode	McHenry
Brown, Corrine	Goodlatte	McHugh
Brown-Waite,	Gordon	McIntyre
Ginny	Granger	McKeon
Burgess	Graves	McKinney
Burton (IN)	Green (WI)	McMorris
Butterfield	Green, Al	McNulty
Buyer	Green, Gene	McNulty
Calvert	Grijalva	Meehan
Camp (MI)	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)
Cannon	Gutknecht	Meeks (NY)
Cantor	Hall	Melancon
Capito	Harris	Mica
Capps	Hart	Michaud
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Millender-
Cardin	Hastings (WA)	McDonald
Cardoza	Hayes	Miller (FL)
Carnahan	Hayworth	Miller (NC)
Carson	Hefley	Miller, Gary
Carter	Hensarling	Miller, George
Case	Herger	Mollohan
Castle	Herseth	Moore (KS)
Chabot	Higgins	Moore (WI)
Chandler	Hinojosa	Moran (KS)
Chocola	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Clay	Hoekstra	Murphy
Cleaver	Holden	Murtha
Clyburn	Holt	Musgrave
Coble	Honda	Myrick
Cole (OK)	Hooley	Nadler
Conaway	Hostettler	Napolitano
Conyers	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Cooper	Hulshof	Neugebauer
Costa	Hunter	Ney
Costello	Hyde	Northup
Cramer	Inslee	Norwood
Crenshaw	Israel	Nunes
Crowley	Issa	Obey
Cubin	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Cuellar	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Culberson	(TX)	Otter
Cummings	Jefferson	Owens
Davis (CA)	Jenkins	Oxley
Davis (FL)	Jindal	Pallone
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Pascarell
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Pastor
Davis (TN)	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)
Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)
Deal (GA)	Jones (OH)	Petri
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Pickering
DeGette	Kaptur	Pitts
Delahunt	Keller	Platts
		Poe

Pomeroy	Schiff	Thomas
Porter	Schmidt	Thompson (CA)
Price (GA)	Schwartz (PA)	Thornberry
Price (NC)	Schwarz (MI)	Tiahrt
Pryce (OH)	Scott (GA)	Tiberi
Putnam	Scott (VA)	Tierney
Radanovich	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Rahall	Serrano	Turner
Ramstad	Sessions	Udall (CO)
Rangel	Shadegg	Upton
Regula	Shaw	Van Hollen
Rehberg	Shays	Velázquez
Reichert	Sherwood	Visclosky
Renzi	Shimkus	Walden (OR)
Reynolds	Shuster	Walsh
Rogers (AL)	Simmons	Wamp
Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Watson
Rogers (MI)	Skelton	Watt
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Waxman
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Weiner
Ross	Smith (WA)	Weldon (FL)
Rothman	Snyder	Weldon (PA)
Roybal-Allard	Sodrel	Weller
Leach	Solis	Westmoreland
Royce	Souder	Wexler
Ruppersberger	Spratt	Whitfield
Rush	Stearns	Wicker
Ryan (OH)	Stupak	Wilson (NM)
Ryan (WI)	Sullivan	Wilson (SC)
Ryun (KS)	Sullivan	Wilson (SC)
Sabo	Sweeney	Wolf
Salazar	Tancredo	Wu
Sánchez, Linda	Tanner	Wynn
T.	Tauscher	Young (AK)
Sanchez, Loretta	Taylor (MS)	Young (FL)
Sanders	Taylor (NC)	
Saxton	Terry	

NAYS—9

Abercrombie	Inglis (SC)	Paul
Flake	Markey	Slaughter
Hinchey	McDermott	Stark

NOT VOTING—34

Baca	Larson (CT)	Pombo
Bono	Lee	Reyes
Campbell (CA)	Linder	Schakowsky
Davis (AL)	Manzullo	Sherman
Evans	Marshall	Strickland
Filner	Miller (MI)	Thompson (MS)
Gallely	Nussle	Udall (NM)
Gibbons	Oberstar	Wasserman
Harman	Osborne	Schultz
Istook	Payne	Waters
Kennedy (MN)	Pearce	Woolsey
Lantos	Pence	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2001

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, due to a D-Day ceremony, I was unfortunately unable to catch a train that would have gotten me to Washington in time for this evening's votes. I would have voted in favor of H.R. 5441, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, especially given the inclusion of the Marshall-Miller amendment which will fully fund the Employment Eligibility Verification Program.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 226, final passage of H.R. 5441, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I was detained earlier this evening. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: Rollcall 223 (Campbell Amendment to H.R. 5441)—"aye"; rollcall 224 (Kingston Amendment to H.R. 5441)—"aye"; rollcall 225 (Mo-

tion to Recommit H.R. 5441)—“no”; rollcall 226 (On Passage of H.R. 5441)—“yea.”

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 457. An act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance for, and provide oversight of, the management of micropurchases made with Governmentwide commercial purchase cards, and for other purposes.

S. 2013. An act to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to implement the Agreement on the Conservation and Management of the Alaska-Chukotka Polar Bear Population.

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 5441, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 5441, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4341

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove as a cosponsor Representative Rick Boucher of Virginia from H.R. 4341.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 5252, COMMUNICATIONS OPPORTUNITY, PROMOTION, AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2006

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be allowed to file a supplemental report on the bill (H.R. 5252) to promote the deployment of broadband networks and services.

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

There was no objection.

#### 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 tomorrow.

#### TRUTH IN CALLER ID ACT OF 2006

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5126) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit manipulation of caller identification information, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5126

*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 “Truth in Caller ID Act of 2006”.

##### SEC. 2. PROHIBITION REGARDING MANIPULATION OF CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.

Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF DECEPTIVE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States, in connection with any telecommunications service or VOIP service, to cause any caller identification service to transmit misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, with the intent to defraud or cause harm.

“(2) PROTECTION FOR BLOCKING CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent or restrict any person from blocking the capability of any caller identification service to transmit caller identification information.

“(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement this subsection.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—The term ‘caller identification information’ means information provided to an end user by a caller identification service regarding the telephone number of, or other information regarding the origination of, a call made using a telecommunications service or VOIP service.

“(B) CALLER IDENTIFICATION SERVICE.—The term ‘caller identification service’ means any service or device designed to provide the user of the service or device with the telephone number of, or other information regarding the origination of, a call made using a telecommunications service or VOIP service. Such term includes automatic number identification services.

“(C) VOIP SERVICE.—The term ‘VOIP service’ means a service that—

“(i) provides real-time voice communications transmitted through end user equipment using TCP/IP protocol, or a successor protocol, for a fee or without a fee;

“(ii) is offered to the public, or such classes of users as to be effectively available to the public (whether part of a bundle of services or separately); and

“(iii) has the capability to originate traffic to, and terminate traffic from, the public switched telephone network.

“(5) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to affect or alter the

application of the Commission’s regulations regarding the requirements for transmission of caller identification information for telemarketing calls, issued pursuant to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-243) and the amendments made by such Act.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. 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 on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5126, the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2006, which was introduced by Chairman BARTON and my friend Mr. ENGEL from New York. I also am a proud cosponsor, original sponsor, of the bill which was the subject of a legislative hearing in the Telecommunications and Internet Subcommittee and favorably reported by the House Energy and Commerce Committee on May 24, 2006.

This legislation protects consumers by prohibiting the deceptive practice of manipulating, or spoofing, caller identification information. Caller ID spoofing occurs when a caller fakes his caller ID information, so that the numbers which appear on their caller ID screen is not the caller’s actual phone number. In many cases, such spoofers are actually transmitting someone else’s caller ID information instead of their own.

Apparently, some spoofers just do it to play a practical joke on their friends, but there have been reports of much more sinister uses of spoofing.

In some instances, spoofing is being used to trick people into thinking that the person on the other end of the phone is someone from a government agency or perhaps another trustworthy party. For example, in last month’s AARP bulletin, there is a consumer alert describing a prevalent scam whereby spoofers get the local courthouse’s phone number to pop up on peoples’ caller ID screens and then tell the recipients of the calls that they are judicial officials in order to get unsuspecting victims to divulge personal information, whether it be Social Security numbers or driver’s license numbers, who knows. Law enforcement officials are particularly concerned about senior citizens’ susceptibility to such scams.

Another reported case involved a SWAT team surrounding an apartment building after police received a call from a woman who said that she was

being held hostage in an apartment; and as it turned out, it was a false alarm. Caller ID was spoofed to make it look like it was coming from the apartment. Apparently, it was somebody's idea of a bad prank.

In other instances, criminals are stealing credit card numbers, getting the phone number of the actual card holders, and then using those credit cards to get unauthorized wire transfers. In such cases, the criminals spoof their caller ID information so that the number which pops up on the wire transfer company operator's screen is that of the actual card holder, and because such caller ID information matches the actual card holder's phone number on record with the credit card company, the wire transfer company uses it to authorize the wire transfer. Thus, spoofing enables the crime to be consummated.

And, of course, many of us are familiar with our own credit card companies which may ask us to call from our home phones to authenticate and activate those new cards. If our new cards are stolen out of the mail, then criminals may be able to spoof our home phone numbers and authenticate and activate our new cards from the convenience of their own homes, hotel rooms, or wherever else they might call from.

While such spoofing has been technically possible for some time, it used to require specific phone connections and expensive equipment. However, with the advent of VoIP, voice over Internet protocol, over the computer it has become easier for callers to transmit any caller ID information that the caller might choose. Moreover, there are online companies which offer spoofing services for just a couple of bucks for anyone with any phone.

Unfortunately, nefarious uses of spoofing appear to be proliferating, and there is no law, no law, that protects the American public from it. The Truth in Caller ID Act of 2006 would make spoofing illegal.

More specifically, this legislation adds a new subsection (e) to section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934. New subsection (e)(1) makes it unlawful for any person within the United States in connection with any telecommunications service or VoIP service to cause any caller identification service to transmit misleading or inaccurate caller identification information with the intent to defraud or cause harm.

The carefully crafted language in this legislation ensures that other spoofing activities which are legitimate, such as the uses for domestic violence services or to route-enhanced 911 calls, are not prohibited. Additionally, the bill provides a savings clause to clarify that nothing in the act is intended to alter the obligations of telemarketers under the existing FCC do-not-call regulations.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good strong piece of consumer protection legisla-

tion that clearly is bipartisan. I want to thank my friends on both sides of the aisle who have worked particularly hard to create this good bill, including Chairman BARTON, Ranking Member DINGELL, Ranking Member MARKEY and, of course, the sponsor of this bill, Congressman ENGEL from New York. I would urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, spoofing is when a caller masks or changes the caller ID information of their call in a way that disguises the true origination number of the caller. In many instances, a call recipient may be subject to pretexting through spoofing, which can lead to fraud, personal ID theft, harassment or otherwise with the safety of the call recipient in danger. On the other hand, lest we think that spoofing always has nefarious aims, we must recognize that there may be circumstances when a person's safety may be put in danger if the true and accurate call origination information is disclosed as well.

What we seek in caller ID policy is balance, and I believe the legislation before us today, after changes were made in committee consideration, more adequately strikes the historic balance we have sought to achieve for consumer privacy and security.

For instance, Members of Congress often have direct lines in their office, but in order to ensure that such lines do not become generally public and, therefore, remain useful to us, it may be necessary to keep such direct numbers confidential and have the outgoing caller ID information indicate a different number at which our offices can be reached for return calls. That gives the recipient a legitimate phone number to call back, but keeps confidential lines private.

There are many doctors, psychiatrists, lawyers and other professionals who would similarly like to keep direct, confidential lines private in this way who have no direct intention of misleading anyone. In addition, there may be instances, for example, when a woman at a shelter seeks to reach her children, when spoofing is important to safeguard someone's safety. Moreover, informants to law enforcement tip lines or whistleblowers have additional reasons for why their calling information should remain private. We should not outlaw any of these practices, and I think the legislation now incorporates the notion that the intent of the caller is vitally important in gauging whether spoofing unfairly violates privacy and security.

With that, I commend the chairman for the changes he was willing to make in the committee deliberations of the bill, and I congratulate him and I congratulate Mr. ENGEL from New York for his splendid work on this legislation. Mr. DINGELL and I have enjoyed working on this legislation.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT), an original cosponsor of the bill.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for giving me the time to speak on this very important bill.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5126, the Truth in Caller ID Act, and I commend Chairman BARTON for introducing this legislation and moving it forward.

I know firsthand that there is a need for this legislation. In my own congressional district, just as in many others, prerecorded telephone call campaigns have misidentified the sponsors by forging the caller identification number to make it appear that my own congressional office was doing the calling. You can imagine how surprised I was to see my number appear on a screen from political prerecorded messages attacking me. It is called spoofing.

H.R. 5126 would prohibit the manipulation of caller identification information, or call spoofing, which occurs when a caller falsifies the caller identification number displayed in the caller ID screen. Many companies now offer sophisticated software that permits caller identification information to be manipulated and increasingly allows con artists to scam consumers, sometimes with complicated schemes that ask consumers to provide personal identification data, such as names, addresses, Social Security numbers, and bank account information.

□ 2015

With the increasing frequency of identity theft, we must do all that we can to end opportunities for falsification of this data.

I introduced similar legislation to prohibit caller identification last year. Let us make caller identification truthful and accurate. I strongly support Chairman BARTON's legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me, and I am proud to rise in strong support of this legislation and proud to be the lead Democrat on the bill. All too often we hear and experience the partisan divide in Washington, but this bill and the process that so quickly got this bill to the floor has been truly bipartisan.

I must start with thanking my friend and chairman, Mr. BARTON, for his leadership on this bill; and I must also note the invaluable assistance of our subcommittee Chairman Upton, and I thank him for his kind words. I also would like to thank our ranking Democrats, Mr. MARKEY and Mr. DINGELL as well.

When someone looks at caller ID, they have the right to expect that the

person or phone number listed is truly that person. The average citizen has no idea that caller ID can be manipulated so that the person or number appearing is totally false.

I first learned of caller ID spoofing when I read news articles about our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) becoming a victim of it. His own constituents thought they were receiving calls from his district office, and these calls were far from appropriate.

I then learned that this technology is being used across the country to allow unscrupulous people to trick unsuspecting people to release personal information. It is so easy for someone to pretend to be Chase Manhattan or Citibank or even a person's doctor. These services even provide technology to change the sound of a person's voice. I could set it to sound like a 25-year-old woman or an 80-year-old man.

Mr. Speaker, I quickly became convinced we needed to address this issue quickly, because obviously what these people are doing is legal and we are playing catch-up to catch up with them. Having thought about this issue in great depth, I became convinced what happened to our colleague from Pennsylvania was just a harbinger of what is to come.

I believe that right now there are people in our country who plan to use this technology to interfere with our elections. Just imagine, the day before an election, a group of people using this technology make hundreds of calls pretending to be leaving a message from the office of a candidate. That message could be rude, insulting, crude, slanderous, sexist, or racist, and it would look like the candidate or the candidate's organization made the calls. The damage would be done, and these people who will do anything to destroy our democracy will have won. But today, the House takes a bold step toward protecting our Nation from these insidious criminals.

Finally, I would like to thank my staff and the committee's staff who worked on this legislation. Pete Leon of my staff, Kelly Cole and Will Norwind from the majority, and Johanna Shelton, Pete Filon, and Colin Crowell from the minority.

I hope we can pass this without any opposition.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5126, the "Truth in Caller ID Act." And I commend the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, JOE BARTON, and Representative ELIOT ENGEL for introducing this bipartisan bill.

Many consumers subscribe to caller ID services that let them know the number of an incoming telephone call and the name of the caller. Consumers often rely on this caller ID information to decide whether to answer a call. Consumers should be able to trust that the caller ID information has not been changed for fraudulent or harmful purposes.

Until recently, manipulating caller ID information, also called "spoofing," was difficult

and required expensive equipment. Unfortunately, advances in technology have allowed individuals with fraudulent intent, and others seeking to do harm, to easily spoof their caller ID information, making calls appear to originate from a different person, organization, or location. As such, the recipient of a call that has been spoofed may answer the call thinking that it is coming from someone from whom it is not.

There are legitimate reasons to spoof caller ID information. For example, a domestic violence clinic may alter its caller ID information to mask its identity. This is important for the safety of victims of domestic violence since many victims seek help while they are still living with their abuser.

Caller ID spoofing, however, can be used for nefarious purposes. In a widely reported case, SWAT teams were dispatched to an apartment building in New Brunswick, New Jersey, last year after authorities received a call from a woman saying that she was being held hostage. The caller had spoofed the caller ID information to make it appear as though the call was coming from inside the building.

Caller ID spoofing is also used to gain personal information from a consumer so a criminal can more easily steal the consumer's identity. Equally troubling is the use of such spoofing by predators to cause physical or emotional harm to their victims.

H.R. 5126 will help put an end to caller ID spoofing for fraudulent or harmful purposes. Specifically, the Act makes it unlawful for someone to change their caller ID information with the intent to defraud or cause harm to another person.

This bill is good consumer protection legislation. I am pleased to support it and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5126, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BROADCAST DECENCY ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 193) to increase the penalties for violations by television and radio broadcasters of the prohibitions against transmission of obscene, indecent, and profane language.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 193

*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 "Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005".

#### SEC. 2. INCREASE IN PENALTIES FOR OBSCENE, INDECENT, AND PROFANE BROADCASTS.

Section 503(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 503(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if the violator is—

“(i)(I) a broadcast station licensee or permittee; or

“(II) an applicant for any broadcast license, permit, certificate, or other instrument or authorization issued by the Commission; and

“(ii) determined by the Commission under paragraph (1) to have broadcast obscene, indecent, or profane language, the amount of any forfeiture penalty determined under this subsection shall not exceed \$325,000 for each violation or each day of a continuing violation, except that the amount assessed for any continuing violation shall not exceed a total of \$3,000,000 for any single act or failure to act.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “subparagraph (A) or (B)” and inserting “subparagraph (A), (B), or (C)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I again 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 on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of S. 193 the Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005. This legislation is virtually identical to H.R. 3717, as introduced by my good friend, Mr. MARKEY, Chairman BARTON, Mr. DINGELL, and myself in the last Congress on January 21, 2004, which I would note was about a week and a half before the infamous Janet Jackson/Justin Timberlake Superbowl halftime show. That legislation was the predecessor of H.R. 310, which the House passed in this Congress on February 16, 2005 by a vote of 389–38.

While S. 193 omits a number of important provisions contained in H.R. 310, I believe that passage of this legislation will help us achieve our ultimate goal, which is to help ensure American families that broadcast television and radio programming will be free of indecency, obscenity, and profanity at times when their children are likely to

be tuning in, whether that be in the living room watching TV or in the car listening to the radio.

This is about protecting the public airwaves, and Congress has given the FCC the responsibility to help protect American families in that regard. The courts have upheld the constitutionality of our broadcast decency laws, although they have limited the FCC's enforcement to only that content which is aired between the hours of 6 in the morning and 10 at night, when children are most likely to be listening or viewing.

What compelled me to act on this, even before the infamous half-time show, was a review of the Notices of Apparent Liability issued by the FCC in but a few of its radio broadcast indecency cases. And, of course, each case had a transcript of the content that was at issue.

My friends, public decorum on this floor precludes me from reading those transcripts out loud, but what I will say is that what I read was disgusting, vile, and had no place on our public airwaves.

I was glad to see my colleagues, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BARTON, former Congressman Tauzin, and Mr. DINGELL agreed with me as well. These cases included descriptions of people having sex in Saint Patrick's Cathedral, lewd scenes of a daughter having oral sex with her dad, and a case in which radio hosts interviewed high school girls about their sexual activities with crude reference to oral sex, with the sound effects to match, and I could go on and on and on.

More recently, on March 15, 2006, the FCC issued a Notice of Apparent Liability regarding a scene in a broadcast network program which graphically depicted teenage boys and girls in various stages of undress participating in a sexual orgy. Again, I will not describe everything that was said there, but I can say that the program aired at 9:00 P.M. in the central and mountain time zones and it drew a significant number of citizen complaints from across the country.

We have no place for that on the public airwaves. And while I am not a lawyer, I would hope it would be beyond dispute that such content is indecent under the law and does not belong on the public airwaves, particularly at times when children might be viewing or listening.

In many of those most egregious cases, the radio and TV stations are owned by huge media conglomerates, but the current statutory maximum fine which the FCC can impose upon them for indecency violations remains at \$32,500. In the words of former FCC Chairman Michael Powell, he said this, "Some of these fines are peanuts. They are peanuts because they haven't been touched in decades. They are just the cost of doing business to a lot of producers. And that has to change."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this legislation in fact changes that. We have a chance to

increase by tenfold the existing statutory maximum penalty for indecency violations. The bill would raise the cap per violation from \$32,500 to \$325,000.

I believe that broadcasters do have a special place in our society, given that they are stewards of the public airwaves. And with that stewardship comes the responsibility, including adherence to our Nation's indecency laws. Most broadcasters are responsible, and many recently have taken steps to redouble their commitment to keeping indecency off the public airwaves. But for those broadcasters who are less than responsible, the FCC needs to have the teeth to enforce the law, and this bill, S. 193, will give the FCC that teeth.

The bottom line is this: We do not change the standards that the courts have affirmed are permissible for the public airwaves, particularly when children might be listening. This bill simply raises the fine on the violators of the existing standards, and it needs to be passed tomorrow.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman UPTON for this legislation and commend as well Chairman BARTON, Ranking Member DINGELL for the cooperative bipartisan way this bill has been handled.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, S. 193, is similar to legislation that previously passed the House. It was approved by the Senate unanimously a few weeks ago. This bill, simply put, raises the cap on possible fines that the FCC can levy for violations of its broadcast indecency rules from \$32,500 per broadcast licensee to \$325,000.

I would like to emphasize that this legislation does not make indecent broadcast illegal, nor does the bill define what is or is not indecent material. Indecent content aired over broadcast TV and radio is already illegal between the hours of 6 a.m. and 10 p.m. What speech constitutes indecent material will be left to the FCC and the courts to determine.

Again, this legislation simply updates the statute with respect to the amount of money that the FCC can levy as a fine for violations of its rules, and establishes procedures for considering broadcast license awards, renewal, or revocation when repeated violations are found.

I think this legislation has obvious broad support on both sides of the aisle because it merely increases the amount of fines available to the FCC to enforce its existing rules. I intend to support it, and again commend Chairman UPTON, Chairman BARTON, and Ranking Member JOHN DINGELL, and our other colleagues on this bill as well.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

(Mr. WALDEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I plan to support this legislation, as I supported the House legislation, to clear up the public's airwaves and punish those broadcasters who violate the law and the standards of the community that they are licensed to serve.

I am perhaps the only Member of the House of Representatives who is a broadcast licensee. For 20 years, my wife and I have owned and operated radio stations in Oregon. I grew up in a pioneer broadcast family. I rise tonight, however, to express concern about the FCC's recent decisions regarding indecency and profanity.

Frankly, the decisions of the Commission leave me and many of my colleagues in the broadcast world a bit confused about where the boundaries are, which has been a problem for the Commission for many years. The Commission found that certain words, which we would find very offensive, could be used in the context of airing Saving Private Ryan. However, perhaps words that would be found less offensive could not be used in an episode of NYPD Blue.

Mr. Chairman, given the tenfold increase in fines that this legislation authorizes, I think it is exceedingly important for broadcast licensees to have a clear understanding of the rules from the FCC. So I would ask you to lend your good office to encourage the FCC to achieve clarification in these areas.

I think it is also important, Mr. Speaker, that Americans understand what we are doing here tonight only affects over-the-air public airwaves, radio and television broadcast licensees. If you think that the TV in your family room is suddenly going to have every program cleaned up, you are mistaken, because we are not allowed at this point to deal with issues involving cable television or satellite television or satellite radio. Indeed, when we began having hearings on this very issue of profanity in the radio broadcast spectrum, one of the individuals who probably caused the most ruckus on the public airwaves shifted over to satellite radio so that he could carry on there unfettered.

I realize these are subscription services, but I think for many Americans, when they catch cable television in their homes, they don't really differentiate any more about the four channels that may be public broadcast channels, over-the-air broadcasts, from those that are on up the dial for the next 400.

□ 2030

So they may wonder why it is that we can take this action tonight against licensees of the Federal Government. Now, cable services do have the ability to regulate individually within the home and block certain programs, so perhaps parents will take it upon themselves to self-regulate the home.

Meanwhile, broadcasters are going to need clarification when the fines are

going to be increased ten-fold, and not all broadcasters are parts of conglomerates. Some are mom-and-pop operators in small communities across America who rise to the challenges of serving their communities in times of natural disaster and just in terms of community events. They will need this guidance because a fine of \$32,500 today on the books could bankrupt many of those small, independent broadcasters.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will work to clarify this so the broadcasters know the rules under which they need to operate and do not violate them unintentionally.

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the gentleman to clarify the rules. It is very important that broadcasters know precisely what the rules are. We can do a better job.

We are taking the Senate legislation as it was passed. I think we had some better language in the House. I look forward to working with you and other Members on both sides of the aisle to make this a bipartisan effort and lay those ground rules out so everyone, whether it is listeners or broadcasters, knows precisely the rules of the road and hopefully will not get into trouble for it. I thank the gentleman for his input all along in the process.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership in this area as we clean up the public air waves and also come to standards that are clearly understood by all so that inadvertent violations do not occur. And also, a recognition of small-market broadcasters versus the big major ones where even \$300,000 may seem insignificant in their revenue stream.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the third time in 3 years to speak out against what I consider the wrong approach to media indecency, and that is increasing FCC fines.

S. 193, the Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act, represents a weak attempt at improving our media, an uncreative policy that will harm our creative community.

Mr. Speaker, we all believe in the need to reduce indecency in media. Parents should not have to worry about what they might encounter with their children when they sit down together to watch TV. But indecency fines will not solve this problem because they do not address its root cause: media concentration and a lack of competition.

When big media gets bigger, conglomerates move further away from quality programming and the principles of diversity, localism and competition, crucial for the service of public interest. Will monetary penalties encourage return to these principles? I sincerely doubt it.

Instead, we need a competitive media environment that provides viewers and listeners with real choices in their entertainment. We need programming that respects the public and performers rather than catering to the lowest common denominator and dumbing down our culture. A consolidated media market controlled by a profit-driven conglomerate is bound to offer cheaply made, shocking entertainment for the sake of increasing viewership and making a spectacle of itself.

Our artists need to be able to work in an environment where creativity is honored. This will never happen under a system of censorship. Creators cannot read the FCC's minds on their definition of indecency. We must work with our creative community to encourage quality media content, not simply offer vague guidelines with high consequences.

That is why I have supported making the fulfillment of public interest obligations an element of the broadcast licensee's renewal requirement and the restoration of the fairness doctrine. It is why I encourage the FCC to think about the impact that media consolidation has on media content and our national character as they begin rewriting their ownership rules, rules that upset millions of Americans and lawmakers on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, the indecent media culture we witness today will not be modified by simply increasing fines. It must be transformed through less media consolidation and greater requirements to serve the public interest.

I am sorely disappointed that both Houses have chosen the easy route of increasing fines rather than making a serious attempt to curb indecency by addressing the major problems in our media.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote against this bill, and let's try over again.

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

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

I would just like to make a couple of closing comments. Again, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his help on this from the start. It was in December 2003 I called him at his home in Massachusetts and asked if he would like to co-author this with me. With that support came the support of then-Chairman Tauzin and the gentleman from the great State of Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The four of us introduced this legislation. A week and a half before the Super Bowl, we had our first hearing, in fact, before the Super Bowl came about where it got a lot of publicity. I know all of us on the committee and subcommittee when we held hearings were absolutely disgusted with some of the trash that was said on the radio that was fined. I would like to use a different word than "trash" or "stuff," but we would probably get fined for

doing that on the House floor, and maybe our words would get taken down. I'm not sure. But it was awful, particularly knowing that kids were listening to that kind of talk.

It was a bipartisan effort. As I recall, I think we had a vote of 49-1 to get that legislation through. I think the bipartisan spirit we have had from the beginning, and I think our House bill was a little better than what the Senate has here in S. 193, but we need to get it done. That is why I was glad to work with the Senators on both sides of the aisle. And I would note this, not a single Senator, not a single one from any State, opposed the legislation that we are going to pass with this bill, S. 193.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 193, the "Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005".

More than a year ago, the House overwhelmingly passed a broad measure to ensure that viewers and listeners would be properly protected from indecent broadcasts over the public airwaves. The Senate has now sent back just one piece of that more comprehensive measure.

The legislation before us will raise the maximum fine for indecent broadcasts tenfold, from \$32,500 to \$325,000. Increasing the amount that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) can fine a company that broadcasts obscene or indecent programming is important, particularly given the growing size of these companies due to media consolidation.

Raising the level of potential fines is a good first step, so I support this measure. But it falls short of being a comprehensive solution to hold the FCC's feet to the fire on this issue.

People who are offended by indecent broadcasts on the public airwaves deserve prompt and thorough consideration of their complaints. Previously, the FCC had let some complaints languish for years, resulting in their dismissal. Unfortunately, delays continue. The viewing and listening public still does not receive prompt evaluation of their complaints, and the Commission's treatment of many consumer indecency complaints remains haphazard.

The House last year approved a much stronger and more comprehensive bill by a vote of 389 to 38. The bill would have increased the fines to \$500,000 and given the FCC additional tools to fight indecency over the public airwaves. More importantly, it would have required the FCC to act on consumer complaints within a specific timeframe. It would have also made the Commission more accountable by requiring regular reports to Congress on its enforcement activities. This reporting requirement would have ensured that Congress was aware of any FCC action or inaction regarding complaints from our constituents regarding indecent broadcasts. The Senate bill does not take these steps to make the Commission more responsive or accountable.

Consumers would have been better served if the House and Senate had negotiated a compromise bill that included several of the provisions from the House bill to keep the FCC accountable. Nonetheless, S. 193 is a step in the right direction. As such, I support this bill and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, most of us remember Super Bowl XXXVIII, but

not for the reason that most of us Houstonians would like.

The game was a great showcase for Houston and one of the best in Super Bowl history. The New England Patriots edged out the Carolina Panthers by a score of 32 to 29 in a wild fourth quarter that ended with an Adam Vinatieri field goal with four seconds left.

Unfortunately, Americans remember that game for the offensive halftime show featuring Justin Timberlake and Janet Jackson.

Performers can do whatever they like on their albums, or on subscription services like HBO, and as a Member of Congress I swore an oath to uphold the Constitution and protect all Americans' First Amendment rights of freedom of speech and expression.

But public obscenity purely designed to shock people has no place on primetime broadcast television using the public's airwaves.

Almost every American home has a television and there is nothing a parent can do to protect against indecency on broadcast radio or television.

American families should have the right to watch the Super Bowl without expecting indecent performances, and the current FCC fines were clearly not a deterrent. Therefore, this legislation increases the fines for broadcast indecency by 10 times.

However, the Commission should only use this power against blameworthy broadcasters. A \$325,000 fine is a much bigger stick for the FCC to use against indecent broadcasters, so the level of responsibility of the FCC must also increase.

When an independent affiliate airs network programming that turns out to be indecent, the FCC should only punish an affiliate if there was a reasonable opportunity to review questionable taped material or reason to know that such material was likely.

In cases where only the network knows what is going on the air, it stands to reason that only the network should bear the burden for such violations.

Section 503(b)(2)(D) allows the FCC to consider the circumstances of a violation in determining the amount of a penalty. The Commission should use that power wisely and recognize that you cannot deter indecent programming by fining independent affiliates with no control over the content.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for S. 193, The Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2006, our constituents should expect that when they turn on their local broadcast television and radio stations, they will not be subjected to obscene, indecent, and profane material. I believe this legislation does take the necessary steps to ensure that there is a sufficient deterrence to broadcasters who are careless as to their responsibilities to the general public.

But, Mr. Speaker I am concerned that this legislation may fail to take into sufficient account the economic conditions of a broadcaster. There are numerous small broadcasters who serve small or niche market. This is particularly true of minority owned stations or stations that target the minority viewers. I urge the Federal Communications Commission when it uses its power under Section 503(b)(2)(D) of the Communications Act of 1934 to consider the size of the market that the broadcaster serves and its ability to pay when assessing a fine for airing questionable

material, as this body approved when it passed the companion House legislation to this bill—H.R. 310 several weeks ago.

I also believe that the Commission should consider the source of the obscene, indecent, or profane programming when levying a fine. When a local affiliate not owned or controlled by a network airs questionable programming supplied by the network, the FCC should penalize the party who was really at fault. If the local affiliate was not given a reasonable time to review an offensive taped or scripted program before it aired, or if it aired an offensive live or unscripted program without reason to believe it was offensive, the fault arguably lies not with the local affiliate but with the network that supplied the program. Section 503(b)(2)(D) allows the Commission to adjust a penalty based on the culpability of the violator, the circumstances of the violation, or any other matters as justice requires. I believe that a situation where a local affiliate was left "in the dark" about obscene, indecent, or profane material in a program from the network calls for just such an adjustment.

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, for moving this important legislation forward.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am continually amazed that defending our Constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech is such a lonely job in the House of Representatives. I believe in decency and protecting children as much as any Member, but what is at stake here is freedom of speech and whether it will be nibbled to death by election-minded politicians and self-righteous pietists.

If you don't believe that this so-called Broadcast Decency Act will have a chilling effect on free speech, let's take a look at a few examples of how the culture of censorship has spread to the airwaves over the past few years.

Numerous ABC affiliates refused to commemorate Veteran's Day by airing the movie "Saving Private Ryan" because they feared an FCC fine. Ironically, ABC had previously aired unedited versions of the World War II movie in 2001 and 2002 without incident.

Many PBS stations refused to air an episode of the children's show "Postcards with Buster" because Buster, an 8-year-old bunny, learned how to make maple syrup from a Vermont family with two mothers.

CBS refused to air a political advertisement during the Super Bowl because it was critical of President Bush's role in creating the Federal deficit.

CBS and NBC refused to run a 30-second ad from the United Church of Christ because it suggested that gay couples were welcome to their church, and the networks felt that it was "too controversial" to air.

This is how free speech dies: with the pruning of self-satisfied politicians and the whimpering of fearful citizens. These are just a few examples that occurred before this ill-conceived bill has even been signed into law. Broadcasters will certainly increase these practices and bite their tongues when "decency" enforcers can slap them with a \$325,000 fine, multiplied by numerous stations. How much farther down the slippery slope of censorship will we slide?

Even more galling is that this free-speech assault is coming from a mere fragment of the public, one organization—the Parents Television Council—representing the religious right and their far right-wing political agenda. This

organization, which is responsible for 99.9 percent of the so-called indecency complaints filed with the FCC, boasts "nearly 1 million members." True or not, while that may be a sizable number for an individual organization, when compared to the almost 300 million people currently living in the United States, it really amounts to a small handful of people—less than one percent. Why should this tiny population of scolds be allowed to censure what the remaining 99.66 percent of us listen to?

It is not for this Congress to put limits on free speech. The public decides what they want to listen to and what they want to hear. They can change the channel, they can change the station, they can turn it off. It is not just speech that we agree with and we think is right that we have to tolerate. The true test of freedom of speech is if we tolerate ugly speech, obnoxious speech, and speech that we disagree with.

We need to defend our Constitution. We need to defend freedom of speech, and that is really what is at stake here. Passing this bill is a huge mistake and this vote will mark a very dark day in American history. We are going down a slippery slope and no one can honestly say where it will stop. A vote for this bill is a frontal assault on our Constitution and the protections that it gives to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I for one will be voting against this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this when we take the vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 193.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITH REGARD TO THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL WOMEN'S HEALTH WEEK

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 833) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with regard to the importance of National Women's Health Week, which promotes awareness of diseases that affect women and which encourages women to take preventive measures to ensure good health, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 833

Whereas women of all backgrounds have the power to greatly reduce their risk of common diseases through preventive measures such as a healthy lifestyle and frequent medical screenings;

Whereas significant disparities exist in the prevalence of disease among women of different backgrounds, including women with disabilities, African American women, Asian/Pacific Islander women, Latinas, and American Indian/Alaska Native women;

Whereas since healthy habits should begin at a young age, and preventive care saves Federal dollars designated to health care, it is important to raise awareness among women and girls of key female health issues;

Whereas National Women's Health Week begins on Mother's Day annually and celebrates the efforts of national and community organizations working with partners and volunteers to improve awareness of key women's health issues; and

Whereas in 2006, the week of May 14 through May 20, is dedicated as the National Women's Health Week: Now therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the importance of preventing diseases that commonly affect women;

(2) calls on the people of the United States to use National Women's Health Week as an opportunity to learn about health issues that face women;

(3) calls on the women of the United States to observe National Women's Check-Up Day by receiving preventive screenings from their health care providers; and

(4) recognizes the importance of programs that provide research and collect data on common diseases in women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 833, authored by Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. BONO and Mrs. CAPPS, expressing the sense of Congress on the importance of Women's Health Week.

Each year Women's Health Week promotes awareness about steps women can take to improve their health. The focus is on the importance of incorporating simple, preventative, and positive health behaviors into women's everyday lives.

When women take simple steps to improve their health, the results can be significant. Many of the leading causes of death among women, such as heart disease, cancer, stroke and diabetes are preventable and treatable if the warning signs are recognized.

Events like National Women's Health Week and National Women's Checkup Day are great opportunities to tell someone you love that their health is important. Remind a mother, sister, spouse, daughter or friend to get regu-

lar checkups, exercise regularly, eat a healthy diet, quit smoking, and follow safety rules.

I commend the hundreds of volunteers, women's groups, health organizations, businesses, and charitable organizations who have helped to make National Women's Health Week a success.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution in recognition of National Women's Health Week.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 833, which celebrates National Women's Health Week. I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. HAYWORTH, for their work on this issue, as well as our chairman, Mr. DEAL.

This week is celebrated annually in order to raise awareness about diseases and conditions that specifically affect women. This also includes how common diseases affect women differently than they affect men. For too long research lacked gender specificity, and because of that, we lacked vital information about how women experience disease differently from men. This is especially true with respect to heart disease, and that happens to be the number one killer of women.

Women's Health Week is also a time to raise awareness about important preventive care measures that all women should take. With the growing number of uninsured in this country, it is no surprise that women are skipping doctor visits that ought to be routine. Knowing that this is especially true for low-income women and minority women, I applaud national efforts to use National Women's Health Week as a time to offer free screenings and conduct outreach to communities that are often left behind.

National Women's Health Week is not just a concept, but it truly is a large-scale effort by individuals, government, local and national organizations in order to highlight practical steps women can take to improve their lives and their health.

During this week, women can access essential checkups, services like mammograms and bone density screenings. These screenings can catch serious conditions like breast cancer early before it is life-threatening, and osteoporosis before it results in fractures.

I support this resolution celebrating National Women's Health Week because it focuses attention on gender disparities in health care delivery. I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend and colleague, the gen-

tlewoman from California, for organizing the time for this discussion this evening.

I think this resolution before us at the moment is very, very important. It calls upon the House of Representatives to recognize the importance of National Women's Health Week. The importance of National Women's Health Week is to draw people's attention from all across our country to the issues that affect the health of women in America. And those issues affect women of all ages.

One of the things that we are attempting to do with regard to National Women's Health Week is to draw attention to the necessity to try to live better lifestyles, healthier lifestyles, and to take advantage of the opportunities for medical screening.

□ 2045

One of the unfortunate situations that we confront in our country, of course, is the fact that we still do not have a system of national health insurance. And so consequently, many women will not be able to take advantage of opportunities to get medical screening because they do not have insurance.

But, in the meantime, this resolution focuses attention on the need to live healthier lifestyles, to be aware of the various diseases and other health concerns that affect women, to take the necessary precautions to deal with those issues, to live the healthiest possible lifestyle, and to get the best appropriate medical attention.

It also thanks all of the agencies, and organizations across our country that devote their time and attention to the issue of women's health. Women's health is important for all of us, and that is why this resolution is so important for the Members of this House and for all of our constituents all across America.

I ask my colleagues to devote their attention to this resolution, to support it favorably, and to ensure its passage, because this issue is critically important to every single family in America. I ask that we give it the appropriate attention that it deserves and that the resolution be passed unanimously.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I do have an additional speaker who has arrived. I am pleased to recognize my colleague from Georgia, Dr. PHIL GINGREY, for 2 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Chairman DEAL of the Health Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce. I thank Representative HINCHEY and Representative CAPPS and all Members who bring this resolution, 833, before us this evening.

Those of us involved in health care, like Representative CAPPS, as a registered nurse, and myself, as a physician, and not only a physician, but also a specialist dealing with women's health issues, as an OB-GYN, understand the importance of recognizing that this is National Women's Health

Week. It promotes awareness of diseases that specifically affect women and encourage them to take preventive measures to ensure good health.

It is a time when we need to tell all the women in our lives, our mothers, our wives, our sisters, our daughters, our aunts, in my case, my children and grandchildren, and friends, how important it is to take time out for their health. It can be as simple as taking the stairs instead of an elevator, eating healthier or scheduling an appointment with a health care provider.

Mr. Speaker, as an OB-GYN physician for nearly 30 years, I cannot stress enough how important a good relationship with your doctor is in maintaining your health. Women need to have conversations with their physicians regarding family history. They clearly need to understand the importance of screening tests and how to manage chronic diseases.

I want all of America's women to take a moment to focus on promoting health and preventing disease and illness by taking very simple steps to improve their physical, mental, social and spiritual health.

And I thank the chairman for allowing me to address this issue.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I actually have no additional speakers, and so I would yield back the balance of my time, by urging our entire body to follow as we seem to be in unanimity here this evening discussing this legislation that we adopt this resolution unanimously in the House as well.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and therefore, I would yield back the balance of my time and urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 833, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL OSTEOPOROSIS AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 265) supporting the goals and ideals of National Osteoporosis Awareness and Prevention Month, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### H. RES. 265

Whereas osteoporosis, a disease characterized by low bone mass, structural deterioration of bone, and increased susceptibility to fractures, is a public health threat for an estimated 44 million Americans;

Whereas in the United States, 10 million individuals already have the disease and al-

most 34 million more are estimated to have low bone mass, placing them at increased risk for osteoporosis;

Whereas one in two women and one in four men over age 50 will have an osteoporosis-related fracture in her or his remaining lifetime;

Whereas building strong bones during childhood and adolescence can be the best defense against developing osteoporosis later;

Whereas osteoporosis is often thought of as an older person's disease, but bone health is a concern for any age;

Whereas substantial risk has been reported in people of all ethnic backgrounds;

Whereas osteoporosis is responsible for more than 1.5 million fractures annually;

Whereas the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service says that caring for bone fractures from osteoporosis costs America \$18 billion annually;

Whereas the Surgeon General believes that bone health is critically important to the overall health and quality of the life of Americans; that it is in jeopardy and will only get worse if left unchecked; and that great improvements in the bone health status of Americans can be made by applying what is already known about early prevention, assessment, diagnosis, and treatment;

Whereas optimum bone health and prevention of osteoporosis can be maximized by a balanced diet rich in calcium and vitamin D; weight-bearing exercise; and a healthy lifestyle with no smoking or excessive alcohol intake; and

Whereas May 2006 would be an appropriate month to observe National Osteoporosis Awareness and Prevention Month: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives supports the goals and ideals of National Osteoporosis Awareness and Prevention Month and urges the people of the United States to observe appropriate programs and activities with respect to osteoporosis, including talking with their health care professionals about their bone health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. And I rise today in support of House Resolution 265, a resolution authored by Representatives BERKLEY and BURGESS, that establishes a National Osteoporosis Awareness and Prevention Month.

Osteoporosis is a disease characterized by low bone mass and structural deterioration of bone tissue which can lead to fragile bones and an increased susceptibility to fractures, especially the hip, spine and wrist.

Osteoporosis is a major health threat for an estimated 44 million Americans,

or a full 55 percent of people 50 years of age and older. In the United States, 10 million individuals are estimated to already have the disease and nearly 34 million more are at an increased risk for osteoporosis.

Of the 10 million Americans estimated to have osteoporosis, 8 million are women and 2 million are men.

Osteoporosis is often called a silent disease because it can progress very slowly over time without symptoms until a fracture occurs. The consequences of osteoporosis can be devastating, painful, costly and even deadly. Approximately 20 percent of hip fracture patients will die within a year after their fracture, usually from complications related to the fracture.

People tend to assume that osteoporosis is an inevitable part of aging. But for the most part, it is preventable. Prevention of osteoporosis should begin in early childhood and continue throughout life. Building a strong skeleton during childhood, adolescence and young adulthood can help people avoid osteoporosis later in life.

The National Osteoporosis Foundation recommends five steps that can optimize bone health and help prevent osteoporosis. First, eat a balanced diet rich in calcium and vitamin D to build and maintain strong bones. Foods rich in calcium include dairy products like milk and cheese and fish like salmon. Very few foods are rich in vitamin D, but milk is often fortified with vitamin D. Sunlight exposure to the hands, face and arms for 5 to 15 minutes, two to three times a week, helps the body produce its own vitamin D.

Second, engage in weightbearing exercise.

Third, don't smoke or drink too much.

Fourth, talk to your doctor about bone health.

And fifth, have your bone density tested and take medication as directed by a physician.

The activities of National Osteoporosis Awareness and Prevention Month encourage Americans to take the proper steps to protect themselves from osteoporosis, including talking with their health care professionals about their bone health.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the chairman of our committee.

I particularly want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman BERKLEY, for her work on raising awareness about osteoporosis. It has been a particular mission of hers and it is making a difference around the country, that women are stepping forward on this issue.

As we may know, osteoporosis affects around 10 million Americans, most of whom are over 55, and it is the cause of an estimated 1.5 million fractures annually.

It is often called the silent disease because this bone loss occurs without

any outward symptoms and, of course, 80 percent of all osteoporosis occurs in women.

The quality of life for those affected often takes a downward spiral, leaving those who suffer from osteoporosis unable to walk, to stand up or even to dress themselves.

National Osteoporosis Awareness and Prevention Month is celebrated each May, and becomes a chance for our Nation to become more familiar with the effects of this disease, and about the preventable steps that we can take to deal with it.

Unfortunately, too many people are not at all aware that osteoporosis can be prevented through diet and exercise, both of which help maintain bone density.

Research clearly shows us that the earlier women think about maintaining their bone mass and take the steps to do so, the better their health will be in the long run. And you know, these aren't difficult steps to take. Proper diet, including calcium, proper exercise, are good for very many reasons, but knowing that at the same time you are making yourself healthy, you are also preventing osteoporosis is an important message to get out to everyone. So I encourage the public to take advantage of National Osteoporosis Awareness and Prevention Month by speaking to their health care providers about their risks, and encouraging health care providers to proactively address this subject with their patients.

I proudly support this resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I now invite my colleague, Ms. BERKLEY, about whom I was speaking, who has now arrived, to speak for as long as she may wish to, 3 minutes or whatever.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Congresswoman, Mrs. CAPPS. She is an extraordinary advocate for health care, not only for women, but for families, men, everyone in this country, to make it a healthier country to live in. And I am so grateful for her, for her friendship and for the remarkable mark she has made on this Congress and on this country.

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 265 and ask for its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, May was National Osteoporosis Awareness and Prevention Month. Osteoporosis and low bone density affect 44 million Americans over the age of 50. It is a disease in which the bones become more fragile and prone to breaking. Many of those affected are unaware they have osteoporosis and therefore, they are unable to take steps to prevent it.

Like many Americans, I had no idea I was at risk for developing osteoporosis. I thought I simply had bad posture. And it never occurred to me to be screened for osteoporosis. Yet, when I was running for Congress in 1998, I was diagnosed with this disease. Fortunately, within 10 months of the diagnosis, with proper treatment, I was able to stop my bone loss and my bones actually began to strengthen again.

My bill will help raise awareness about the prevention and treatment of this increasingly common disease and encourage those at risk to have a quick and painless bone density test.

While more Americans than ever before have been diagnosed with osteoporosis and are receiving treatment, much more remains to be done to raise awareness about the importance of healthy bones.

Often called the silent disease because it goes undetected in many Americans until they actually break a bone, osteoporosis affects more than 10 million individuals and an estimated 34 million men and women. And yes, Mr. Speaker, men are susceptible to osteoporosis too. They suffer from osteoporosis and have low bone mass which places them at an increased risk for developing this condition.

As of 2003, there were an estimated 3.6 million people who have been diagnosed with osteoporosis. In my home State of Nevada, over 300,000 men and women suffer from osteoporosis and low bone mass. One in two women, and one in four men age 50 and older will have an osteoporosis related fracture in their lifetime.

The consequences of osteoporosis are devastating and very painful. Hip fractures, which occur about twice as often in women as men, are more serious than people realize. Approximately 20 percent of the hip fracture patients over the age of 70 will die in a year after that fracture, usually from complications such as pneumonia or blood clots in the lungs.

Prevention, diagnosis and treatment are the keys to tackling osteoporosis and as a Nation, we must teach people of all ages how to take the necessary steps to keep their bones healthy and strong for a lifetime.

Those at risk who have not yet been tested for osteoporosis need to make an appointment with their physician to have a bone density test. The exams are quick and they are painless and they can be done in conjunction with a regular checkup.

Because of my personal experience with osteoporosis, I am committed to ensuring that my fellow Americans are aware of the importance of early detection and prevention. Men and women can reduce their chances of developing this disease. I encourage everyone to see their doctor and get screened for osteoporosis. It is very silent, but it is a deadly disease.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution that will increase awareness of this disease. I thank my colleague and dear friend, Mrs. CAPPS, for working with me to ensure that this resolution becomes a reality. Thank you very much.

□ 2100

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 265.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5449) to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify bargaining requirements for proposed changes to the personnel management system of the Federal Aviation Administration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5449

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

#### SECTION 1. REPEAL.

Paragraph (2) of section 40122(a) of title 49, United States Code, is repealed.

#### SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by section 1 shall be effective as of April 1, 2006, including with respect to any proposed changes to the personnel management system of the Federal Aviation Administration that were transmitted to Congress, on or after that date and before the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with the provisions of section 40122(a)(2) of title 49, United States Code, as last in effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to request the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Illinois in opposition to the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will control the time in opposition.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that half of my time, 10 minutes, be yielded to Mr. COSTELLO, and that he be permitted to yield time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank Speaker HASTERT for allowing us to have this debate tonight and also Majority Leader BOEHNER. There are some people on our side of the aisle that are not so happy that we are doing it, but I have to tell you that when you have 80 Republican Members of Congress supporting a piece of legislation, I think it is important to have the debate and have it now.

I also want to thank Congressman LOBIONDO of New Jersey and Congresswoman SUE KELLY from New York for being my partners in this endeavor as we move this legislation forward, and I want to thank Mr. COSTELLO for standing up in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is pretty simple. There is a contract dispute currently going on between the air traffic controllers in this country and the Federal Aviation Administration, and this bill simply sends them back to the table and asks them to reach a fair and equitable conclusion.

Under current law, the FAA has unilaterally imposed their contract terms on the hard-working air traffic controllers in this country. Congress is not in the business of contract negotiations, nor should it be. The FAA is also at an impasse with four other bargaining units, and the Congress really shouldn't be in the business of constantly reviewing labor contracts.

When this bill passes, the sides will resume negotiating and the existing contract will remain in place, there will be no disruption in service.

If they are unable to bridge the gap, the matter then goes before the Federal Service Impasses Panel. The FSIP, as it is called, will assure that both sides are negotiating fairly, and if no agreement can be reached, FSIP then can impose contract terms on both parties.

Some people might say, oh, man, FSIP, that sounds like a tough place for the FAA or the administration to go to. The FSIP board is made up of seven members, all seven appointees of this president, President George W. Bush.

During the course of this debate tonight, we are going to hear, I think, some facts and figures, and I want to lay some of them to rest now. We may hear that the average salary for air traffic controllers is \$173,000. While that may be true if you include all of their benefits, anybody that is lucky enough to have health care or a retirement package knows that about 40 percent of that is made up in those benefits.

The average salary is really about \$127,000. I don't know a lot of people in Cleveland, Ohio, that thinks that is too much for people that land the millions of passengers that travel our Nation's airways. You may hear that air traffic controller salaries have increased 75 percent, and we will explore that a little bit later.

Some people are going to criticize the FSIP board saying, oh, man, there is no incentive for the air traffic controllers to go back and negotiate. I will tell you I have talked to both lead negotiators. There is a strong desire to get this done. And, again, at any time after the passage of this bill, if either side thinks that the other side isn't negotiating fairly, they can immediately call up FSIP and go to this seven-member panel, all appointed by President George W. Bush.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I hope our colleagues can support it with the two-thirds majority necessary.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5449. Unfortunately, my very good friend, Mr. LATOURETTE, the gentleman from Ohio, and Mr. COSTELLO, the gentleman from Illinois, support this proposal, but this, unfortunately, is a very seriously flawed bill and piece of legislation, and it comes at a time when we are trying to do everything we can to stabilize and provide economic reform for the aviation industry.

Let me talk a little bit about the history of how we got to this situation. Mr. LATOURETTE has also spoken to the increases that the air traffic controllers have received from 1998 to last year. They did receive some 75 percent, and maybe there was need to adjust the salaries. That translates into about 10 percent per year. But that contract did expire last year, and the air traffic controllers were required and FAA also began negotiations for a new contract.

Unfortunately, that drug out for some time, and by the terms of the existing contracts and agreement, as long as no contract was in place, the terms of the old contract prevailed, with some pretty hefty increases in place.

What has taken place in fact is an impasse occurred. Under existing law, when that impasse was declared by FAA, the matter was sent to Congress. That has all taken place. That is all history. For some 60 days, Congress had an opportunity to overturn that. And it is true that there was legislation with many Republican cosponsors sympathetic with changing some of the procedures. However, that bill was not retroactive, like the LaTourette proposal. This is a reach-back provision, and it also takes Congress completely out of the process, as opposed to the bill that others had cosponsored.

So, this is a bill, again, H.R. 5449, that, if enacted, will change the rules of the game at the bottom of the ninth inning just because one of the teams does not like the outcome of fair negotiations, a legislative process that has already been completed, and, again, we take Congress out of the process.

The Constitution provides in Article I that all bills relating to funding and appropriations come out of the House of Representatives, emanate in the House of Representatives. This legislation, again, reaches back and changes the rules of the game. It allows a panel that is not confirmed by Congress, by the Senate, again, a panel of seven, to make appropriations and also authorization decisions that are left to the Congress.

So, I have great concern about this procedure. I think it sets a horrible precedent.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5449, legislation that will send the FAA and the air traffic controllers back to the bargaining table. H.R. 5449 seeks to ensure a fair process to resolve impasses that arise during collective bargaining negotiations with the FAA instead of the current one-sided process.

The FAA and NATCA started contract negotiations in July of 2005. The FAA declared an impasse on April 5 and promptly sent the contract to Congress just days before we went out on our April district work period. The 60-day clock expired yesterday, June 5, with the FAA imposing its last offer immediately.

I believe the best way to get a fair contract between the two sides is for Members to sign Discharge Petition No. 13 to bring H.R. 4755, a bipartisan bill with 265 cosponsors, including 75 Republicans, to the House floor for a vote. Congresswoman SUE KELLY and I introduced H.R. 4755 which would insist on binding arbitration, ensuring an end to the dispute, protecting collective bargaining rights and to promote good faith, fair negotiations. One hundred ninety-five Members, all Democrats, signed the Costello discharge petition to bring H.R. 4755 to the floor.

Because I filed the discharge petition, the Republican leadership has decided to bring up H.R. 5449, introduced by my good friend, Mr. LATOURETTE, to the House floor today for consideration. While I would have preferred to see H.R. 4755 on the floor today, I support H.R. 5449, the legislation before us, as a means of reversing the current one-sided process that does not promote good faith negotiations.

I want to remind my colleagues as we hear a lot about salaries and working conditions and other issues that this bill is about process only, plain and simple. There are no mandates concerning salaries, benefits or anything concerning working conditions with the air traffic controllers. It simply gets both sides back to the bargaining table.

Today's debate really comes down to whether Members support the rights of workers and the rights of collective bargaining. Anytime one side comes to the bargaining table knowing that they will get what they want at the end of the day, which is exactly what the current law does, it gives the FAA what they want, their last proposal at the end of the day, then there is no incentive to reach an agreement.

The current law is grossly unfair and needs to be permanently changed. If you truly believe in collective bargaining, you will send both sides back to the bargaining table by supporting H.R. 5449.

I urge all Members to vote "yes."

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

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

Just for the record, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the average compensation for an air traffic controller today

is \$173,000. That is average. The highest paid controller earns \$277,937. That is the highest controller. I have 1,397 controllers earning \$213,500.

Just for the record, the average median household income in Illinois, the home State of the gentleman who just previously spoke, is \$48,953. For Mr. LATOURETTE, the sponsor of this legislation, the average median household income is \$42,240.

Further for the record, an air traffic controller for the military, and we have a whole corps of air traffic control servicemembers serving in the United States and across the world, right now a sergeant in the U.S. Air force with 10 years experience and those in the combat zone as we speak tonight serving in Iraq at Baghdad Airport, earn \$35,919. Of course, they get many benefits on top of this, such as housing. I want to be fair.

But that brings some of this debate and the amount of compensation we are talking about hopefully into perspective.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just briefly to the gentleman's baseball analogy, that is exactly why they make extra innings and we should have extra innings here.

Secondly, again, this \$173,000 figure, people in Cleveland, Ohio, that are sitting on their couch know that \$173,000 is a lot of money, but again, if they are lucky enough to have health care and pension, that is 40 percent of that cost. The average is \$127,000.

Now, again, people in Cleveland, Ohio, think that that is a lot of money as well, but I am going to tell you, they think that the guy that walked away from Exxon with a \$400 million retirement package, that really is a lot of money.

The sum of \$127,000 for someone who has dedicated his or her life to safely landing your family at an airport is not too much money.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), the sponsor of the original bill.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I have spent a lot of time working on aviation safety on this issue because we need to establish more fairness in the contract negotiation process between the Federal Aviation Agency and our air traffic controllers. When one side is able to cut off negotiations and impose its will on its employees at any time, it is difficult to argue that this is an environment for fair negotiation.

Unfortunately, this is the system we have in place right now for recruiting and maintaining America's best assets for keeping our air safe, our air traffic controllers. It is a flawed system that would weaken aviation safety. It is appropriate that Congress take action to correct this situation now, before prob-

lems grow to a point where we can no longer fix them.

□ 2115

Our air traffic controllers are absolutely essential to protecting our skies. We need to ensure that we are recruiting and maintaining the best possible personnel for our really vitally important jobs. That is why I introduced the legislation this year with my colleague, Mr. COSTELLO, to address this situation.

And as he pointed out, we had a bipartisan group of 267 Members behind our legislation that seeks to establish more fairness in the negotiation process. Well, it would be my preference that it would be our bill that would be up for debate today. I sincerely appreciate the leadership's recognition that this matter merits debate and action by this body. The bill that is offered by my colleagues, Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. LOBIONDO, provides us with a positive step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, it does not favor one side over the other. It does not speak in favor of one specific contract proposal over another. It simply sends them back to the negotiating table. This is the right thing to do to keep our negotiation process fair and our skies safe.

I support this legislation. I encourage the other 265 cosponsors that have cosponsored this bill with Mr. COSTELLO and myself to similarly support this bill offered by my colleagues, Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. LOBIONDO.

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

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of clarifying points, if I may. We heard the gentleman from Illinois talk about sending this contract back to the bargaining table. We heard reference by the previous speaker also of the panel that will get this.

I had the honor and privilege of chairing the House Civil Service Committee for some 4 years. I know a little bit about the Federal Service Impasse Panel. The Federal Service Impasse Panel is not confirmed by the Senate. It has no congressional confirmation. It has seven appointees by the President. Ninety-eight percent of the issues it has handled, and this is what the LaTourette bill would do is send it to this panel, 98 percent of the issues that it has handled are nonwage. That is a fact.

It deals primarily with quasi-governmental and nonappropriated, that is nonappropriated by Congress, mostly agencies that generate their own income through fees.

So this is unprecedented in sending it to this panel. Now, they do not have the staff to deal with this. Maybe it will go on to the Labor Relations Board and then maybe it will be further appealed. But remember, the name of this game is keeping this stirred up and not resolved as long as possible, because we have then the provisions of the Clinton contract, which expired on Monday.

In addition, there are differences between the bill by Mrs. KELLY, and I applaud her for her bill, first her bill did not reach back as the LaTourette bill did, and secondly, her bill kept Congress in the process.

The LaTourette bill takes Congress out of the process, turns this process really over to, again, a board that has really no congressional oversight or participation in even confirming the members in an unprecedented fashion. So that again provides us with some statistics.

Just to also further clarify cash compensation versus total compensation. The highest controller, if we take cash compensation, only is \$231,477 for the record. The 1,397 controllers about the statutory cap, they receive, again without benefits, \$175,366.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. COSTELLO for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, when two parties enter negotiations, it is generally expected that both sides play by the same rules. But there is an exception made for the FAA which enjoys a decided advantage over air traffic controllers.

For instance, there was no penalty or consequences for FAA negotiators when they walked away in the middle of negotiations expecting that congressional inaction would automatically impose a new contract with lower pay and benefits for the air traffic controllers have earned through their hard work and impeccable service record since the terrorist attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that this is not an argument about average compensation or cash compensation. This is an argument that is essentially about fairness. The current process is anything but fair. Whatever one's position might be on the underlying issue, most of us can agree that Congress should let the process run its course and refrain from dictating the terms of an agreement that should be settled like any other labor dispute.

Mr. Speaker, the diligent and hardworking men and women who guide America's air traffic serve a critically important role in our homeland security. At the very least we should level the playing field so that they can negotiate a fair contract.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again for the record, first of all, the gentleman from New York just talked about this unfair process. This is the same process that was put into effect during the Clinton administration in 1996, and in 1998 gave the air traffic controllers a 75 percent increase, the same exact process that we are working under.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY),

the average median household incomes by State that I have for New York is \$47,349. Now, I do not want anyone to think that we are cutting existing air traffic controllers. Under the contract that went into effect on Monday, their compensation and their benefits, they will rise from 2007 to 2011 from \$173,000 to \$185,000.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a brief comment before yielding to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. MICA continues to talk this bill reaching back. I just want to focus on the 60 days that was in the current law. It is inconceivable that anybody that has been here for any period of time thinks that this Congress can act in 60 calendar days on anything.

Mr. Speaker, I have been here 12 years. For that entire 12 years we have been trying to repeal a telephone tax that was put into effect to pay for a war. Now some people say, oh, was it the Iraq war? Maybe the gulf war? Maybe Korea? No, the Spanish-American War.

The Treasury Department just announced this week that they are going to let us repeal the tax that is 100 years old, but we were supposed to act in 60 days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5449. I would like to thank Congressman LATOURETTE for his dogged determination in pursuing this issue. Also I thank Congresswoman KELLY and Congressman COSTELLO for their help on this very important issue, and also Speaker HASTERT and Majority Leader BOEHNER.

H.R. 5449 is a fair way of resolving the contract dispute between the controllers and the FAA. It simply brings both parties back to the table to reach a mutually acceptable solution.

I share the concerns regarding the budget shortfall at the FAA and the need to free up funds to modernize our air traffic control system. But I do not think that forcing both parties back to the table to agree to a contract will undermine those goals in any way, shape, or form.

When the talks between the parties reached an impasse, the controllers were offering \$1.4 billion in cost savings. Let me repeat that: they were offering \$1.4 billion in cost savings. I believe that if the parties were to return to the table, consensus would be reached in a very short period of time.

Congress should encourage both parties to continue to negotiate and not allow the FAA to unilaterally impose their last offer. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this good piece of legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to take just a minute. I have the greatest respect for Mr. LOBIONDO. He is one of the hardest workers in Congress. I went up to some of the Federal aviation facilities, testing facilities and others in his district. He is one of the strongest advocates in Congress for good, sound aviation. I am sorry we disagree a bit. I know a lot of Members are under pressure.

I thought about this. And I thought this is one reason why we should not even have these issues before Congress. Ninety-eight percent of the Federal employees, in fact, have a general wage chart and schedule. You can see why countries like Argentina, Germany and others have the tail wagging the dog. I feel bad for Members who are in that predicament.

But our responsibility is to the taxpayer. It is also to a sound aviation system, which I think both Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COSTELLO, everyone agrees is important.

The dilemma that we face if we pass LaTourette, and we are working under existing law that did give us 60 days, that did expire on Monday, and we have a new contract. What happens is, given the nature of this impasse panel and its lack of any experience in dealing with these kinds of issues, this could go on and on.

Now, Mr. KNOLLENBERG was on his way. He is an appropriator and oversees appropriations and was to speak against Mr. LATOURETTE's proposal. But what happens here, Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, is, quite simply put, H.R. 5449 pulls the rug out from underneath actually our entire national aviation system and the whole funding process when we can least deal with it.

Airport projects, and Members should be aware of this, when you have to put 1.9, and I asked the attorneys from FAA, is this enough, at bay for a number of years, and they said, it will probably be double that figure that will be put at bay. I have right now \$1.9 billion, Mr. COSTELLO knows this, left in our entire airport improvement funds at this time.

So we put airport projects at risk with unpredictable costs and salaries, leaving this hanging out. Then we also hurt the core of other FAA employees. This chart shows the total compensation gap between controllers and other FAA employees. It is a gigantic gap, some 42 percent.

So we leave them hanging out. We leave all of our projects for funding around the country, we leave air traffic control modernization, which is the system that gives us the very best technology for safety. So that is of a great concern to me.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my good friend from Florida, when a Member stands here and makes an assertion about the pay that air traffic controllers receive, and then you make comparisons with what the average pay is in any area, the unstated implication is that, well, they are just getting paid so much or too much, and the remedy is then to deny them their collective bargaining rights. That seems to be an unstated conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that is not what my friend is saying, because if you carry that logic forward, then we are going to be here arguing about how much a brain surgeon makes, or how much an engineer makes or how much an architect makes.

If we get into that argument, well, you can always get a better deal on brain surgery, you just might end up dead. Or a better deal on a bridge, it just might fall. Or a better deal from an architect, and have plans with a house with no doors.

I mean, we are talking about highly specialized work here. And for the Congress at this point to make a simple statement that all we want to do, we are not talking about the conclusion, we are not saying that we want to shift or tilt in favor of one side or another, we are just saying, we stand for collective bargaining rights. Let the parties work out their disagreements, and in doing that, we perform a public service.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) for the purposes of entering into a colloquy.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the effects that this bill or the absence of this bill might have on my own region of California where we are, I believe in many cases at our major centers, to be at about 80 percent staffing, meaning that we have overtime because of shortages.

□ 2130

What will be the effect of either having or not having this bill on the staffing levels that we need to have to get to full staffing in California?

Mr. MICA. Again, I do think that we have some serious consequences. Not only would this unprecedented reach back and change in policy put us in turmoil for financing the entire system, what will happen is—this is simple math. If you are paying these people over \$200,000 per year on average, it allows you less entrants. And Congress is the appropriator. We decide on how many hires.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to myself to make a point.

The gentleman from Florida just stated that they are paying these people over \$200,000 on average, and I have to tell you that I do not believe that to be an accurate statement. I would just suggest to the gentleman that if you

think about over \$200,000 a year on average, and I think that is very misleading.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for his leadership along with the gentlewoman from New York. I rise to have hopefully supported 4755, but I support H.R. 5449, simply to give air traffic controllers the right to return to the bargaining table. But I really want Americans to learn as we sit here, stand here and debate this question, the airways of America are safe in the hands of sacrificing air traffic controllers who sit under the most intense, stressful occupations that you can ever have.

Let us not go back to the busting of these wonderful hard-working Americans, such as done under the Reagan administration. Let us, in a bipartisan manner, send these good working folk back to the bargaining table to be able to solve their problems. Is it not interesting that most Members fly to work and they take their flying for granted because they believe that the airways are safe because our air traffic controllers are on the front lines of handling their responsibilities.

As I respect the opposition to this bill, let us, as Members of Congress, not having done this timely, let us now do the right thing and give, if you will, the sense of appreciation to hard-working Americans, not to give them any particular benefits, but to allow them to go back to the table and have a matter resolved in the fair and practical way. Let us not repeat the busting of a union and let us go back to the negotiating table. I ask for support for H.R. 5449.

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

Again, for the record, and I believe these figures to be correct, that under the new contract which was put into place on Monday and which the LaTourette reachback would actually wipe out, the average salary with benefits would increase from \$173,000 to \$185,000 under this new proposal.

If we leave the contract that was negotiated during the Clinton administration in place, it is my understanding that compensation and benefit would reach \$211,000. That is not really the question here. Although it is an increase, it is, again, a question of fairness.

We have gone through the process adopted under the Clinton administration in 1996. They did receive, in fact, a 75 percent increase in 1998. The process worked then. The same processes work now. We had the 60 days to consider it. It was not overturned in Congress. The LaTourette proposal is, in fact, different than the Kelly proposal. The Kelly proposal would have gone for-

ward before the Monday deadline. The LaTourette proposal, it is in his legislation. It reaches back to April 6, the date of the impasse. It would overturn, again, all precedents, all laws. I am for fairness in dealing with labor, fairness in dealing with everyone.

I might point out for the record that the median household income for the State of Texas, the gentlewoman who just spoke, is \$41,759.

There is great concern about this proposal because again it leaves our safety, it leaves our airport projects, it leaves the future really of bringing on new hires which is so important and an aging workforce all in limbo. It would be an unprecedented reachback.

This is so serious that this afternoon the administration, the President, I am sure, checked off on this. It says, if a bill such as H.R. 5449 that changes or negates the impasse resolution process or the revised terms and conditions of employment that were presented to the President, the President's senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the President but on this issue, quite frankly, he is wrong. I think that if he talked to his FAA administrator, we might have a different conclusion.

I want to tell you what has my dander up this evening because Mr. MICA is right. This is an unusual procedure. This has happened once before since this legislation went into effect. The last time, 60 days went by, the Congress didn't do anything. Just like we didn't do anything this 60 days. The administrator of the FAA waited 19 months before she imposed the contract. This, the deadline was up Monday, the 5th of June. You get the feeling she was sitting with one of those desk calendar for left-handers that people get for Christmas and she could not flip to the 5th of June fast enough. I assume she reads the newspaper. She knew this debate was going to take place this week and that action of imposing that contract on the very first day that she could, in my mind, is a direct affront to this people's House and the 300 million people that are represented by it and shame on her.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Well, surprise, the political appointees at the Bush Federal Aviation Administration and their supporters in Congress want to undermine the safest, most productive air traffic control system in the world by any measure. Why? Because there is one basic flaw. There is an agenda no one is talking about here tonight. It is not privatized. It

does not provide a profit for Halliburton or some other contractor. That is what this is all about. Let's kill off the existing FAA and the air traffic controllers and then the private sector will save us.

Well, in the three countries where the private sector has come in, it has not worked out so well, neither for the safety nor for the taxpayers. They have all had to be bailed out. They are all more expensive. They are all less productive and they are nowhere near as safe.

Now, the gentleman from Florida complains about the salaries. The salary he is talking about with benefits is less than a Member of Congress like himself or me or the gentleman there or any of the rest of us. Now, I could not handle 20 planes on approach with obsolescent equipment and keep people alive day in, day out across America and in our skies. Could he? I think not.

Now, I am not going to complain about that salary. In fact, I don't find anybody at 30,000 feet or 40,000 feet that is complaining about that salary. And if we said, well, let's talk about the productivity. Well, they are handling 20 planes at once on approach, death defying air time here. That is about \$8,000 per plane. That is even less than the Republicans mandated federal minimum wage. Now, is that where they want to drive this or do they maybe want to outsource it to India so we could send the data over there and they could do it for even less?

This is about safety, security, air space, the American public and, yes, it is about fairness. There has been a little bit of talk about fairness. Let's talk about fairness. 265 Members out of 435 have co-sponsored the Costello-Kelly bill; but the chairman of the committee, the operatives at the White House, and the Republican leadership will not allow a bill supported by an overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives, Democrats and Republicans, to come up for an up or down vote. Instead, they give us this option. We will give you a vote and then we will complain about the terms of it because it is retroactive and has all these other problems. We will complain about it here and we will require, guess what America? A two-thirds vote for passage.

This is not a straight deal for the people who keep us alive every week in the skies, who have an unparalleled record of safety and security for the American traveling public. Yeah, you can quibble and complain about the salaries and you can get up and talk about the average salary in my district, but I know the air traffic controllers in my district. There is not a single one of them earning \$173,000. They would be living in the mansions on the hill if they did and they do not live in the mansions on the hill. So they can come up with the mythical air traffic controller somewhere.

And then the gentleman from Los Angeles comes up and feigns concern

about the number of air traffic controllers. Where is someone going to move and relocate and live in the Los Angeles area on the new \$50,000 a year salary?

Vote for this bill. We need a two-thirds vote. And if it does not pass then come down to the well. I invite my Republican colleagues to come down here, sign the discharge position, and bring up the Kelly-Costello bill for a straight up vote, simple majority.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

I do not see Mr. KNOLLENBERG or Mr. SHADEGG and try to wrap up for opposition side, and if they come, I will be glad to yield.

First of all, from Oregon, the average median household income is \$41,794.

I have the greatest respect for Mr. DEFAZIO. He was my ranking member on aviation. He does a great job, but I disagree with him on this issue.

First let me talk about the fairness. I have been here in the minority. I have been here in the majority. I have never seen anything fairer than this. How would you like to be me, chairman of aviation. We had a bill with 250 cosponsors, many Republicans. That bill was not brought out but people cosponsored it. Everyone was open to cosponsor. We had a discharge petition. Mr. COSTELLO, I believe he had 195, not even every Democrat signed it, no Republicans. So that procedure ended last week. And then I get the notice that of course the new contract is going into effect on Monday and there is going to be a vote, it was supposed to be today. It will be tomorrow.

I feel like the guy that is trying to carry the ball down the field. I get to the end of the line, the goal line, and now they moved the goal for me out into the parking lot. So I do not think I would complain.

Again, I think this has been a very fair and open process. And I admire the Speaker and Majority Leader and others who have participated, Mr. LATOURETTE.

We do want, again, the very best system but we want fairness for the taxpayers. I do not think this is all about fairness for the taxpayers. And I have to go back to John Carr, again, a good friend and he represents the air traffic controllers as well. These are his words, March 31, 2006: "There is absolutely no reason for NATCA to end talks. The current contract is better than our last concession-laden contract proposal at the bargaining table and stays in effect until there is a new contract. We could literally talk forever."

That is what this is about. If you reverse the contract that went into effect on Monday and we go back to talking forever, that is the plan because again these huge increases that were allowed under the Clinton administration do continue.

□ 2145

We still have increases, but we have a limit on those increases.

Now, many groups have looked at this. The National Taxpayers Union has strong opposition. Here is a letter I would like to submit for the RECORD. The Citizens Against Government Waste, they oppose it. Americans for Tax Reform, they oppose it. The National Chambers of Commerce, your chambers of commerce have looked at it; they oppose it. The American Conservative Union. If you are on that side of the aisle, the American Association of Airport Executives will be impacted by this. Our airports oppose it.

VOTE NO ON H.R. 5449

As representatives of the aviation industry, we strongly urge you to oppose legislation, H.R. 5449, that would intervene in the negotiation process between the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the air traffic controllers union.

The law governing this process was passed nine years ago and was in place when the air traffic controllers union successfully negotiated its 1998 contract and 2003 extension of that contract.

Current law requires that if Congress wants to intervene, it has 60 days from the Administration's submission to do so. The deadline for Congressional action was June 5, H.R. 5449, unfairly changes the rules of negotiation nine months into the process. To apply a new process retroactively does not comply with the current law. All parties entered into these negotiations knowing the statutory rules and impasse processes well in advance.

The continued health of our industry depends on the Federal Aviation Administration's ability to effectively and safely manage the national airspace, control costs, achieve efficiencies and expand capacity.

H.R. 5449 changes the rules of a process that has been in place for a lengthy period. This would create uncertainty in terms of cost and efficiencies. The impact would be significant at a time that the industry is facing enormous problems.

Please vote "NO" on H.R. 5449.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. MAY,  
*President and CEO,*  
*Air Transport Association.*

CHARLES BARCLAY,  
*President, American*  
*Association of Airport Executives.*

JAMES K. COYNE,  
*President, National*  
*Air Transport Association.*

RONALD N. PRIDY,  
*President, National*  
*Air Carrier Association.*

STEPHEN A. ALTERMAN,  
*President, Cargo Air-*  
*line Association.*

DEBORAH C. MCELROY,  
*President, Regional*  
*Airline Association.*

EDWARD P. FABERMAN,  
*Executive Director, Air*  
*Carrier Association*  
*of America.*

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,  
*Alexandria, VA, June 5, 2006.*

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION VOTE ALERT

NTU strongly opposes any attempt to interfere with the negotiation process be-

tween the Federal Aviation Administration and National Air Traffic Controllers Association and, as such, our annual Rating of Congress will include any roll call votes on H.R. 5449. Negotiations are taking place under existing law and should not be subject to legislative fiat. The controllers' proposal would cost taxpayers \$3.7 billion more than the FAA plan. In lieu of needed reforms to privatize air traffic control (and follow the example of our free market friends in Canada, Germany, and the U.K.), money should be devoted to modernization and safety, not ever-higher air traffic controller salaries. For that reason, we urge you to vote "NO" on H.R. 5449.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF AIRPORT  
EXECUTIVES,

*Alexandria, VA, June 2, 2006.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTER, T,  
*Speaker of the House,*  
*Washington DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On June 6, the House is scheduled to consider under suspension of the rules, H.R. 5449, a bill to modify bargaining requirements for proposed changes to the personnel management system of the FAA. I am writing to inform you that the American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) opposes this legislation. AAAE is comprised of the thousands of men and women who manage our nation's airports.

It is our view that the existing law governing the personnel management system of the FAA should not be modified at this time. Further, we believe it unfair and unwise to change the "rules" governing the current dispute between the FAA and the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA) at this very late point in the process.

Sincerely,

CHARLES BARCLAY,  
*President.*

THE AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE UNION,  
*June 5, 2006.*

AN OPEN LETTER TO ALL REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OPPOSE H.R. 5449

On behalf of the American Conservative Union, the nation's oldest and largest grassroots conservative lobbying organization, I urge you to oppose H.R. 5449, which would interfere in air traffic control labor-management negotiations.

In September of 2005, the existing controller contract expired. Despite recent negotiation efforts by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA), the discussions have reached an impasse.

The FAA took steps to get the negotiations back on track by involving the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS). The process again was brought to a standstill, as negotiations broke down in early April 2006.

The Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996, (P.L. 104-264) allows controllers to bargain over pay. In return for this right, the law required that in the event of an impasse, the FAA could implement its final offer after a 60-day congressional review.

Next year, Congress will reauthorize the FAA. A key component of the legislation will be to modernize the nation's air traffic control system and continue to make airport investments to meet growing aviation demands. All elements of the aviation industry, including the controllers, support the modernization and improvement of the nation's aviation system. Securing the funding for the modernization will be one of the biggest obstacles during the reauthorization process.

The American Conservative Union strongly supports and appreciates the efforts air traffic controllers make every day to safeguard the skies. But the facts are that since the last labor agreement in 1998, controllers have received a 75 percent pay increase. The average controller now earns \$173,000 in pay and benefits. The current FAA proposal would fully protect the salary and benefits of every current controller. It would control costs for new controllers by offering up to \$127,000 in salary and benefits in the first five years.

If the FAA cannot have the ability to follow existing law in negotiating this controller contract, its ability to modernize the air traffic control system is diminished. Additionally, the efforts of FAA Administrator Marion Blakey to manage the agency like a business, with higher productivity and accountability, would be severely compromised. We believe sending this matter to the Federal Services Impasses Panel would do a disservice to both the FAA and NATCA.

The applicable law, ratified less than ten years ago, provides a process by which disputes between the FAA and NATCA are to be reconciled. No compelling reasons have been presented to justify departing from the mandated process and to do so would undermine the basis of the ongoing negotiations. The established legal process should be followed to mediate the contract impasse. Stated simply, the legal process should be followed. The precedent this legislation would create, in terms of involving Congress in collective bargaining negotiations would be extremely troublesome.

The American Conservative Union strongly urges you to vote "No" on H.R. 5449, and will consider using votes on, or in relation to, this issue for inclusion in our annual Ratings of Congress.

Sincerely,

J. WILLIAM LAUDERBACK,  
*Executive Vice President.*

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Washington, DC, May 31, 2006.*

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: On behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing more than three million businesses and organizations of every size, sector, and region, I urge you to oppose a bill sponsored by Congressman Steve LaTourette (R-OH) [H.R. 5449], that would interfere in air traffic control labor-management negotiations.

Since the existing controller contract expired in September 2005, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA) have made efforts to negotiate a new contract. Unfortunately, those discussions reached an impasse. The FAA then invited the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS) to join the discussions to help reach a deal. Even with the involvement of FMCS in the negotiation process, the impasse persisted, and negotiations broke down in early April 2006.

Under the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996, (P.L. 104-264), the controllers were allowed to bargain over pay. In return for this right, the law required that in the event of an impasse, the FAA could implement its final offer after a 60-day congressional review.

Next year, Congress will reauthorize the FAA. A key component of the legislation will be to modernize the nation's air traffic control system and continue to make airport investments to meet growing aviation demands. All stakeholders in the aviation industry, including the controllers, support

the modernization and improvement of the nation's aviation system. Securing the funding for the modernization will be one of the biggest challenges during the reauthorization period.

The U.S. Chamber strongly supports and appreciates the efforts air traffic controllers make every day to ensure that our airways are safe. But the facts are that since the last labor agreement in 1998, controllers have received a 75 percent pay increase. The average controller now earns \$173,000 in pay and benefits. The current FAA proposal would fully protect the salary and benefits of every current controller. It would control costs for new controllers by offering up to \$127,000 in salary and benefits in the first five years.

If the FAA cannot have the ability to follow existing law in negotiating this controller contract, its ability to modernize the air traffic control system is diminished. Also, the efforts of FAA Administrator Marion Blakey to force the agency to operate like a business, with higher productivity and accountability, would be severely compromised. We believe sending this matter to the Federal Services Impasses Panel would do a disservice to both the FAA and NATCA.

The applicable law, enacted less than ten years ago, establishes a process by which disputes between the FAA and NATCA are to be settled. No compelling reasons have been presented to justify departing from the mandated process and to do so would undermine the basis of the ongoing negotiations. Stated simply, the legal process should be adhered to and the precedent this legislation would set, in terms of Congress interfering in collective bargaining negotiations on a politically driven basis outside of the legal process, would be extremely troublesome.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly urges you to vote "No" on H.R. 5449, and will consider using votes on, or in relation to this issue for inclusion in our annual How They Voted ratings.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

AMERICANS FOR TAX REFORM,  
*Washington, DC, June 2, 2006.*

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: Next week, HR 5449 is slated to be on the suspension calendar. This misguided bill would take away the ability to the Federal Aviation Administration to resolve its current labor dispute with the air traffic controllers union in a timely manner. This costly bill, which is little more than a sop to corrupt labor unions, is too controversial and has no place on the suspension calendar.

In 1996, Congress wrong-headedly allowed air traffic controllers to collectively-bargain with the FAA. In the event of a labor impasse, the FAA would be allowed to implement its final offer after a 60-day review. Removing this 60-day protection for taxpayers is tantamount to changing the rules in the middle of the game—and in favor of the National Air Traffic Controllers' Union.

This bill is expensive (costing taxpayers \$1.9 billion over five years), a sop to our opponents, and divisive. At the very least, it should have to proceed via regular order. With the average air traffic controller making \$173,000 in pay and benefits, Congress doesn't need to stack the deck in the union's favor by using special rules and gimmicks.

President Reagan knew back in 1981 that the controllers' union was holding air traffic hostage with labor gimmicks—does our Republican Congressional majority today?

Sincerely,

GROVER NORQUIST.

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS AGAINST  
GOVERNMENT WASTE,  
*June 5, 2006.*

*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, Soon you will have the opportunity to vote on H.R. 5449, which would amend Title 49 of the U.S. Code and modify bargaining requirements for proposed changes to the personnel management system of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). This is an unwise piece of legislation that would turn over contract negotiations to a third party and take away any legislative or executive authority over a \$6 billion annual payroll for air traffic controllers. On behalf of the more than 1.2 million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), I ask that you oppose this bill.

The FAA recently declared a deadlock in contract negotiations with the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA). The union wants a new five-year contract that includes an 18 percent pay increase, which would increase cash earnings from \$128,000 to \$151,000, with total compensation amounting to \$200,000 by the last year of the contract. The FAA is attempting to slow the growth of controller compensation costs, comparable to patterns found in the private and government sectors, a commendable action and one appreciated by taxpayers.

According to a law passed during the Clinton Administration, NATCA was given the ability to bargain for wages and benefits, making it one of the few federal unions that are allowed to do so. However, since this law was supposed to encourage savings and increase productivity, it also included a provision that if the FAA and NATCA could not reach agreement on a contract, the two offers would be reviewed by Congress. If Congress makes no decision on the opposing offers within 60 days, the FAA is allowed to implement its final offer. But if H.R. 5449 is passed, it will force the parties into a long arbitration process that would allow NATCA to operate under its current contract with automatic pay raises and old work rules. Considering air traffic controllers have already received a 75 percent pay increase since 1998 and are among the highest paid federal employees—the average salary is \$173,000 including benefits—it is no wonder NATCA would prefer a long, drawn-out negotiation.

Congress should not allow a third party to settle this matter. At a minimum, Congress should revisit the idea of wage negotiations before it arbitrarily alters the impasse process found in the 1996 law. Passing this legislation would prevent the FAA from saving \$1.9 billion in salaries over the next five years that can be used to modernize the air traffic control system and improve safety. Again, I ask you to oppose H.R. 5449. All votes on H.R. 5449 will be among those considered in CCAGW's 2006 Congressional Ratings.

Sincerely,

THOMAS SCHATZ,  
*President.*

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

A couple of points very quickly. Number one, the average air traffic controller in the United States does not make over \$200,000 a year. Number two, the 75 percent increase that has been referred to by the chairman of the subcommittee, 60 percent of that came through the normal process when every government employee received a raise.

Finally, let me close by asking our colleagues to support this legislation

and I would ask my friend, the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, and the 75 Republicans who cosponsored the Kelly-Costello bill, that if this legislation fails tomorrow, if it does not get two-thirds vote and pass in this House tomorrow, then we want to see just how many Republicans who are supporting this legislation today will go up and sign discharge petition No. 13.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time, and I will close.

Just a couple of observations. One, Mr. MICA, as the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, does a great job, and a lot of the advances in this country are due to his leadership and Mr. COSTELLO's leadership. So I do not want anybody to leave the floor thinking they are having some kind of tiff, but there are some things that need to be straightened out.

What both sides do agree on is that the air traffic control population is aging. Both sides agree that in 2007 between 4,000 and 7,000 of the 15,000 air traffic controllers are going to retire, and we do not have a farm team. We do not have a pipeline that is really working. For instance, through May of this year, the FAA has only hired one controller. Last year, they hired 762, but since they hired that 762, 400 have retired. It is a program and it is a process that is serious. You just do not show up at work one day and say I am going to be an air traffic controller and I am going to guide your family into Cleveland or Chicago or Washington, D.C.

Secondly, I would say that the reason that the Kelly-Costello bill did not come to the floor is because things are scheduled on the floor. For anybody who is not familiar with our process, things have to be scheduled by the majority leader. The majority leader chose not to schedule the Kelly-Costello bill on the floor. That is why I began my remarks by thanking Speaker HASTERT and Mr. Leader BOEHNER for having the courage to put this on the floor tonight so that Republicans and Democrats could talk about it.

Lastly, there has been some discussion that somehow the Federal Services Impasse Panel is not competent to handle this complicated matter. I would say just from their Web page, the panel resolves impasses between Federal agencies and unions representing Federal employees arising from negotiations over conditions of employment under the Federal service labor management relations statute and the Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act.

I do not know what other body is capable of doing it; and I have to tell you, I would have preferred the Kelly-Costello bill. I would have preferred that it be brought up to a vote, but when the administrator of the FAA was flipping through her desk calendar so fast just so she could implement this contract, when she waited 18 months

when given the same tools and the same opportunity, the only time that this has ever happened, I think, and I am a pretty calm guy, but I really think that she just took her finger and stuck it in the eye of 268 Members of this House and 75 of them happen to be Republican, 75 of them happen to be members of this President's party. I am insulted.

And I hope tomorrow when this vote occurs, everybody that cosponsored that bill, everybody that signed our letter has the courage to not only be a cosponsor of legislation but has the courage to defy the President of the United States on this vote because, quite frankly, although I admire him, he is wrong on this issue.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5449, introduced by the Gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, which would ensure fair treatment of air traffic controllers, by allowing their contract dispute with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to be resolved by the procedures that govern collective bargaining for pay at other federal agencies.

While I appreciate that the Gentleman from Ohio has taken these steps to ensure that air traffic controllers are given a fair shake in this contract dispute with the FAA, I am disappointed that the Republican Leadership has forced this vote under Suspension of the Rules, which requires two-thirds of the House to vote for passage—a threshold much higher than the majority vote required under regular order. Members of this Body have cosponsored legislation similar to Mr. LATOURETTE's and this substantial, bipartisan majority should be given a chance to work its will.

On April 6, the FAA declared an impasse in its negotiations with the National Air Traffic Controllers Association and sent the dispute up to Congress under a provision that FAA argues gives it the right to unilaterally impose its contract terms if Congress does not act within 60 days.

FAA's interpretation of the law gives it an inherent, unfair advantage to impose its contract terms on its employees. Such a one-sided process has been an impediment to good faith negotiations that could lead to a voluntary contract. Under H.R. 5449, the parties would return to the bargaining table and, if a settlement could not be reached, the Federal Service Impasses Panel (FSIP) would have jurisdiction to resolve the dispute, including the power to impose binding arbitration on the parties.

Other federal agencies that have collective bargaining for wages must use the FSIP procedures and, as recently as 2002, the NTEU, on behalf of the Security and Exchange Commission employees it represents, went before the FSIP to settle several issues regarding pay.

The FAA has gone to great lengths to try to persuade the general public that the highly-skilled air traffic controller workforce is overpaid. I can recall no other instance in which a federal agency has gone so far in disparaging its workforce. Air traffic controllers deserve better. They are responsible for the 24/7 operation of the most robust and complex air traffic control system in the world. In 2005, for example, they moved more than 700 million airline passengers. Each day, the federal controller

workforce safely and efficiently manages approximately 130,000 take-offs and landings in a system whose passenger volume is expected to grow to one billion by 2015. Our lives, and those of our constituents are in their hands, and I believe that they deserve their current pay.

Under the FAA's proposal, many controllers are being asked to take a reduction in their take home pay. FAA is proposing to limit or eliminate differential pay for controllers at some of the Nation's busiest airports, such as New York's JFK and Chicago's O'Hare airport. The average federal controller at one of these facilities could see a pay reduction of more than \$10,000 per year.

Moreover, the FAA has misrepresented the facts regarding the controllers' compensation package. First, the FAA states that the current average controller pay is \$173,000. This is misleading because approximately 40 percent of the controllers' compensation is in the form of federal health and retirement benefits that all government employees and Members of Congress receive. In addition, the FAA argues that the controllers have received an average 75 percent increase in salaries since 1998. However, this statement blatantly ignores the fact that nearly 60 percent of these increases are attributable to government-wide pay raises. Most of the remainder comes from a reclassification to recognize the responsibility of controlling traffic in busy facilities.

I am also concerned that if the FAA is permitted to unilaterally impose this contract there will be a mass exodus of highly-skilled, senior controllers that are eligible to retire. This exodus could cause severe understaffing at our Nation's towers, negatively impacting the safety as well as the efficiency of our air traffic control system. It is therefore imperative that we send the parties back to the negotiating table to hammer out a voluntary agreement to avoid any disruptions to air traffic control operations.

Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5449, and restore fairness in the bargaining process between the FAA and its labor unions.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 5449, which requires the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Air Traffic Controllers Association to return to the bargaining table and negotiate a contract.

If this legislation is not passed, the FAA can impose unilaterally its contract on the union. By passing this legislation, Congress is not choosing sides, but is simply asking the two sides to come to a mutually agreeable contract solution.

I believe Congress must encourage employers and unions to come to amicable solutions. I recently introduced legislation to improve the negotiating process at the National Labor Relations Board because many union employees feel that employers have an unfair advantage because they can hold out as long as it takes to get favorable terms in the contract.

It seems to me Congress can lead by example by putting the air traffic controller contracting process on a more level playing field. Under current procedures for the FAA and the air traffic controllers, the FAA would have an advantage by holding out because they can eventually unilaterally impose their contract offer. It seems to me this legislation is fair to both sides.

Our Nation's air safety relies on the men and women who work in air traffic control towers. I am hopeful both sides will work diligently towards a solution.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong objection to H.R. 5449, a bill to modify bargaining requirements for proposed changes to the personnel management system of the Federal Aviation Administration.

I currently serve as the Chairman of the Appropriations Sub-Committee on Transportation, Treasury, HUD and other agencies. This legislation today would put an enormous strain on my committee's resources and force all programs under my jurisdiction into greater budgetary peril.

Simply put, a "yes" vote on H.R. 5449 could cost the FAA \$1.9 billion over the next 5 years. The FAA would be forced to divert funds from critical safety initiatives—such as air traffic control modernization—to cover the cost of sky-rocketing controller salaries.

I understand that air-traffic controllers provide a valuable service to the flying public and that they work hard to ensure safety and security. I also understand that due to the unique ability of their union—an ability that is not available to every other federal employee union—they have negotiated some of the highest wages in federal service.

The average air-traffic controller earns \$173,000 per year, and their salaries have gone up 75 percent in the past 8 years. The top 100 NATCA union members earn an average salary of \$197,000.

How does this compare with other federal employees? Well, quite well I would say. These controllers make more than Members of Congress (\$165,200), Cabinet Secretaries (\$180,100), and almost as much as Supreme Court Justices (\$199,200) and the Vice President of the United States (\$208,700).

The comparison is even more striking when we weigh their salary levels against other critical safety, security, and health professions.

In my home area of Detroit, an average NATCA member makes \$118,490. Compare that to the average firefighter (\$42,100), police officer (\$48,770), or registered nurse (\$59,380). And, this kind of pay disparity is not unique to my home area, but is consistent across the Nation.

At a time when our federal workforce is stretched at home and abroad to protect our Nation, there is no justification for air traffic controllers to enjoy unparalleled salary hikes, especially when our military personnel, homeland security officials, first responders, and other government employees do not receive the same treatment.

Some may try to indicate that a "yes" vote on H.R. 5449 would be a "free" vote to give to the unions. However, nothing could be further from the truth.

If H.R. 5449 is enacted, it will effectively render the new FAA/NATCA control null and void, and cause FAA costs and salaries to spiral out of control. The new NATCA/FAA contract would be superseded by the previous contract, reached between the Clinton Administration and NATCA in 1998, and the continuation of the 1998 contract would cost taxpayers \$1.9 billion in the short-term, and \$3.8 billion in the long-term.

It should be obvious that a cost of \$3.8 billion taxpayer dollars is far from "free."

A vote for this bill is not about protecting workers wages and stopping the FAA from

slashing controllers' salaries. To be crystal clear: the FAA has offered to protect the compensation of each and every current controller. A new contract would only apply to new hires, and not affect the salaries of existing controllers.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 5449—a bill that would ban the FAA from reigning in out-of-control controllers' salaries and cost taxpayers and my committee billions of dollars. I strongly urge a "no" vote on this financially reckless legislation that will set a dangerous precedent for years to come.

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5449; legislation that will strengthen the negotiation process between unions and the federal governments. As many of my colleagues know, the Federal Aviation Administration recently declared a deadlock in negotiations with the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA). The issue is simple; on one hand, the air traffic controllers unions want to increase the pay package for their employees and on the other, the FAA wants to cut the pay package. On June 5, 2006, the 60 day period for Congress to take action on the FAA's contract offer to the NATCA officially expired. Under current law the FAA would now be able to unilaterally impose the contract because Congress has not acted.

The legislation being considered tonight would provide air traffic controllers with a fair negotiation process. H.R. 5449 would break the current impasse by sending negotiators to the Federal Service Impasse Panel (FSIP), a neutral third party, for a final resolution instead of keeping them bound to the FAA.

Mr. Speaker, American workers must be provided with the opportunity to participate in a fair bargaining process. Contracts should be the result of a fair deliberate process that ensures that the rights of workers are protected through a full hearing of their grievances in front of a neutral third party. Congressional inaction and the forced acceptance of one sided contracts are not the way to settle employment disputes.

There has been a lot of talk about this bill interfering with the FAA's ability to budget its compensation packages. Opponents say that this legislation will cost the FAA \$1.9 billion over the next 5 years. This bill does none of these things.

H.R. 5449 does nothing to modify or manipulate the compensation scheme of air traffic controllers. It only deals directly with the bargaining process itself by reaffirming the meaning of good faith bargaining by requiring the parties to submit their impasses to the Federal Service Impasses Panel (FSIP) for final resolution—the natural course for employment disagreements and negotiations at the federal level.

I call on my colleagues to cut through the clutter that this issue has created. The ability for American workers to fairly negotiate with the federal government is at stake here and Congress has a chance to stand up for our Air Traffic Controllers. I call on my colleagues to support and pass H.R. 5449.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5449, which would move current and future contract disputes between the FAA and the air traffic controllers to the Federal Services Impasse Panel.

Current law has an extremely unusual disadvantage for our Nation's air traffic control-

lers: if their union negotiators cannot reach a contract agreement with FAA, then the FAA can impose a contract unless Congress says otherwise within 60 days.

The FAA declared an impasse in the negotiations and has stated that they will be imposing their terms unilaterally within a matter of days in the face of majority opposition in Congress.

This is an extreme burden that few other American workers, if any, must meet in their contract negotiations. Current FAA contract law grants too much power to the FAA management and makes a mockery of the collective bargaining process.

H.R. 5449 is a good compromise, because we as Congress are not taking sides and picking the air traffic controllers contract offer or pick the FAA's contract offer.

The bill is good policy because Congress is not the best place to negotiate the details of employment contracts. Instead, this legislation would place the decision in a specialized board that has plenty of experience mediating federal workers' contract disputes.

The Federal Services Impasse Panel is fair—they resolve numerous disputes in favor of different sides, sometimes going with the agencies' positions and sometimes with federal employees.

The air traffic controllers in the Houston Center and the Houston TRACON and throughout Texas deserve the same fair shake in arbitration that other federal workers receive.

Much of the opposition to this legislation and to air traffic controllers in general comes from groups that voice knee-jerk opposition to any and all federal spending. They fail to offer any answers to the simple fact that air traffic controllers have a hard, complicated job with extremely high stakes.

I doubt that many of the opponents to this bill have ever been in an air traffic control tower, or a control center or a TRACON when a large bank of flights comes into a major hub airport.

We want our skies to be safe, and you don't get safety by cutting corners and nickel and dimeing the workforce.

Our air traffic control system is about to experience a wave of retirements. If we want to recruit quality employees to keep us and our children flying safely into the future, we should approve H.R. 5449.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5449.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5449, the matter just considered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

## AMENDING HOUSE RESOLUTION 517, RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF WELLINGTON TIMOTHY MARA

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 517 be amended as follows: in the first Resolved clause, strike "61 years" and insert in lieu thereof "51 years".

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

There was no objection.

## SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE VIGIL FOR LOST PROMISE DAY

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 422) supporting the goals and ideals of the Vigil for Lost Promise day.

The Clerk read as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 422

Whereas over 26,000 citizens die from the effects of drug abuse each year;

Whereas the damage from drugs is not limited to drug abusers; the collateral damage from drugs is enormous, and drug abuse costs society over \$60 billion in social costs and lost productivity;

Whereas drugs rob users, their families, and all Americans of dreams, promise, ambitions, talent, and lives;

Whereas drug abuse affects millions of families in the United States;

Whereas the stigma of drug abuse and the cloak of denial keep many individuals and families from dealing with the impact of drugs;

Whereas many friends and families are ashamed to acknowledge the death of their loved ones caused by drug abuse;

Whereas all Americans can benefit from illuminating the problem of drug abuse and its impact on families, communities, and society;

Whereas the futures of thousands of the Nation's youth have been cut short because of drug abuse; and

Whereas law enforcement, public health and research organizations, community coalitions, drug prevention outreach organizations, individual parents, siblings, friends, and concerned citizens are joining together on June 8, 2006, in a Vigil for Lost Promise, to call public attention to the tremendous promise which has been lost with the deaths of those affected by drugs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress supports the goals and ideals of the Vigil for Lost Promise day.*

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. 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 materials on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 422, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the committee chairman. This resolution would support the goals and ideals of the Vigil for Lost Promise Day.

Mr. Speaker, drug use and abuse is a national crisis that affects the health of many of our citizens and affects all our communities. Drugs affect people from all walks of life, and addiction does not discriminate. Millions of families and friends have experienced the loss of a loved one to drug use. Addiction has many dimensions and disrupts multiple aspects in an individual's life. Drugs rob users, their families and their friends of dreams, promises and their ambition, their talents and their vitality.

This resolution honors those family members and friends who feel the pain and tragedy each day from the loss of life to drugs. The Vigil for Lost Promise is a national event which brings together parents and friends who have lost someone to drugs and for those who are dedicated to the promise and potential of our Nation's youths.

The stigma attached to drug use causes many friends and families to feel ashamed to acknowledge the death of their loved ones. However, this event offers an opportunity for families to remember those and is dedicated to the education of others on the importance of keeping our youth drug free.

I ask that all Members join with me in supporting H. Con. Res. 422 in the hope that we can offer support to the families and friends of those who have lost loved ones to the perils of addiction.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, many people view drug abuse and addiction strictly as a social problem. Parents, teens, older adults and other members of the community tend to characterize people who take drugs as morally weak or as having criminal tendencies. They believe that drug abusers and addicts should be able to stop taking drugs if they simply are willing to change their behavior. These myths have stereotyped those with drug-related problems, their families, their communities and the health care professionals who work with them.

Drug abuse and addiction comprise a public health problem that affects many people and has wide-ranging social consequences.

A Vigil for Lost Promise Day will help replace the myths and long-held mistaken beliefs about drug abuse and addiction with scientific evidence that addiction is a chronic, relapsing, and treatable disease. Addiction does begin when an individual makes a conscious choice to abuse drugs, but addiction is not just using a lot of drugs.

Recent scientific research provides overwhelming evidence that drugs do more than interfere with normal brain functioning by creating powerful feelings of pleasure. They also have long-term effects on brain metabolism and activity. Changes occur in the brain that can turn drug abuse into drug addiction, a chronic and relapsing illness. Those who are addicted to drugs suffer from compulsive drug cravings and usage that they cannot quit alone. Treatment is necessary to end the compulsive behavior.

Drugs crush the hopes, dreams and potential of drug users, and they shatter the lives of the users' families and friends. I support Vigil for Lost Promise Day because it will draw attention to the impact drugs have, not only on users, but to their loved ones and the community at large.

I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to the day when our country will treat this illness the way it should be treated and that we will have available to individuals treatment on demand, that is, individuals when they know that they are ready and are willing to seek treatment ought to have resources and places to go.

So I commend the sponsors of this legislation and urge its support.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, As an original cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 422, I rise in support of this important resolution expressing the support of Congress for the goals and ideals of the Vigil for Lost Promise Day.

More than 26,000 lives may be lost to the effects of drug abuse this year. This tragic impact is felt in communities across this great nation. Sadly many of these deaths occur among our young people.

One thing we know about drugs is that they do not discriminate and they do not engage in favoritism—not on the basis of race, color, gender, class, geographic location, or age. Drugs have the same impact on everyone who succumbs to their influence.

Moreover, the pain felt by the tragic loss of a loved one to drug overdose or to the deadly effects of chronic drug abuse is universal. The sense of loss, bewilderment, and often shame are known to parents, children, spouses, loved ones and friends of the victims of drug abuse and addiction from all walks of life. These emotions can be especially acute when the victim is a young person who will never have the opportunity to express his or her potential, to live out the promise of a full and productive life.

Envisioned by eight families who have personally suffered the loss of a loved one because of drugs, the Vigil for Lost Promise will serve as a remembrance for those who are

gone, and to illuminate the pervasive and dangerous effects of drug use. The ultimate objective of these eight families is to help ensure that other families will not have to endure the same kind of loss.

The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the Partnership for a Drug Free America have joined the families in support of this effort to raise awareness about the terrible toll that drugs take not just on families and friends but on society as a whole.

I join my colleagues in saluting these organizations, each of which plays a vital role in our national control strategy, as well as the courageous families and other participants who will attend this important event, which will occur this Thursday, June 8th, at DEA's headquarters in Arlington, Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, as we have observed over the past few years, the meth epidemic has awakened much of America to the rampant devastation that drugs can cause to entire communities. This kind of devastation has long been known to urban centers like my own city of Baltimore—cities that have suffered through successive epidemics of heroin, cocaine and crack.

As a result of the meth epidemic, I believe there is a heightened awareness around the country and in this House that drugs don't just impair and kill individual drug users; they tear apart families and neighborhoods. I am hopeful that Thursday's Vigil will bring about even broader recognition of the fact that this problem affects all Americans and that it requires a strong national commitment to drug prevention, drug treatment, combined with concerted efforts to keep drugs off of our streets and out of the hands of our nation's young people.

Sadly, over the past six years, we have seen this Administration shift funding away from prevention, treatment, and state and local law enforcement in favor of supply reduction efforts beyond our borders. This strategy has resulted in no discernible impact on the availability of drugs on the street, and the number of lives lost to drugs like cocaine, crack, heroin and meth continues to climb.

Mr. Speaker, Congress faces difficult choices and the national preoccupation with preventing potential terror attacks is justified by the lingering shock and damage of the 9-11 attacks. Still, we cannot afford to ignore a drug problem that claims more than two thousand American lives each month. If we lack the political will or resources to make a truly substantial investment in prevention and, most important of all, to make drug treatment accessible to all who seek it, at least let us take other steps to ensure that drug abuse claims as few American lives as possible.

There are steps the government can take to avoid preventable deaths from drug overdose and abuse, as well as from the spread of deadly communicable diseases, including HIV/AIDS and hepatitis, among intravenous drug users.

If we are serious about the goal of saving lives, then let us work together to:

Provide funding to states to establish overdose prevention programs;

Ensure that first responders and law enforcement (including correctional workers) are trained to respond to drug overdoses and save lives;

Increase the availability of naloxone ("nal-OX-own")—a short-acting drug that can re-

verse the effects of a heroin overdose—to first responders, law enforcement, needle exchange programs, drug treatment centers, and other public health facilities;

And, finally, allow federal funds to be used to support needle and syringe exchange programs, which have been proven in scientific study after scientific study to reduce HIV transmission without increasing drug use.

All of these are steps that, if implemented, would save lives, preserve human potential, and reduce the suffering of families and communities across America.

By decrying the terrible impact of drugs and yet failing to take prudent action to avoid preventable drug-related deaths, Congress and the Administration risk sending a mixed message to parents who have lost a child to drugs or who stand to lose a child to drug abuse if we don't do our part.

So, as we commemorate the lives of those whose promise has been extinguished by drugs, let us be equally mindful of those who are still with us—but whose lives are in danger and hang perilously in the balance. Let us commit to helping them to avoid the terrible fate of having their promise needlessly lost and being mourned by those who love and care for them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by thanking Mr. DAVIS and Mr. SOUDER for bringing this resolution before us and by again saluting everyone who has worked to make the Vigil for Lost Promise come to fruition. I urge all of my colleagues to support the resolution and, more importantly, to support policies and initiatives that will minimize the number of lives lost to drug abuse from this day forward.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the adoption of H. Con. Res. 422, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 422.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF A NATIONAL CHILDREN AND FAMILIES DAY

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 763) supporting the goals and ideals of a National Children and Families Day, in order to encourage adults in the United States to support and listen to children and to help children throughout the Nation achieve their hopes and dreams, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. RES. 763

Whereas research shows that spending time together as a family is critical to raising strong and resilient kids;

Whereas strong healthy families improve the quality of life and the development of children;

Whereas it is essential to celebrate and reflect upon the important role that all families play in the lives of children and their positive effect for the Nation's future; and

Whereas the country's greatest natural resource is its children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives supports the goals and ideals of a National Children and Families Day to—

(1) encourage adults to support, listen to, and encourage children throughout the Nation;

(2) reflect upon the important role that all families play in the lives of children; and

(3) recognize that strong, healthy families improve the quality of life and the development of children.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 763, which will support the goals and ideals of National Children and Families Day. H. Res. 763, which currently has 54 bipartisan cosponsors, passed the full Government Reform Committee with unanimous consent on May 4, 2006.

Too often we overlook the importance of a strong family in our everyday lives and most importantly its impact on our children. Our children are our country's most vital resource, and we should strive to do everything possible to prepare them to lead healthy, productive lives as they mature into adulthood.

There is nothing more important to any of us, whether we are adult or child, than to have a sense of family and tradition, but most important, to have a feeling of belonging. Too often here in this great country, we hear about the breakdown of the family. A nationally proclaimed family and children's day will be a bridge to our future and will help us restore the Nation's greatness.

Mr. Speaker, this day can serve to be a reminder to all of us to encourage children everywhere to achieve their hopes and dreams.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, families teach children the lessons they must learn to be happy and to prosper. They also care for children by giving them love and warmth and providing food, shelter and financial support.

□ 2200

While families may handle problems differently, families can develop the following traits to become strong and to improve the quality of life and the development of children. Families learn how to show love and affection towards each other. And no matter what children say or do, children need to know that their parents love them. Children must know that they are loved even though they have different strengths or weaknesses. And when children make mistakes, parents can let them know they are loved as they help them to discover how to learn from mistakes.

Strong families build trusting relationships by demonstrating commitment to all the members of the family. This includes following through with promises, working as a team, and talking to one another about important decisions and daily plans.

All families experience crisis, but strong families use these experiences to learn and to grow. Family members should spend time together talking, reading, playing games, and taking walks. They should encourage each other and be involved in their neighborhoods and community.

A National Families and Children's Day will encourage families to embrace these traits and will highlight the important role all families play in the lives of children and their positive effect for the Nation's future.

It is so unfortunate that there are millions of children in our country who don't have the ability to experience on a daily basis, on a regular basis, on an ongoing basis the love and care of a stable family relationship; children who are institutionalized or children who move from one foster situation to another. Hopefully, as we continue to learn how to enhance and improve the quality of life, we will better learn how to strengthen and develop family structures and the reality that strong families help make for a strong Nation.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 763.

This resolution passed out of my committee with unanimous consent on May 4th and has support from Members on both sides of the aisle.

This resolution supports the goals and ideals of a national children and families day to encourage adults to support and listen to their children to help them achieve their hopes and dreams.

Being a parent is the toughest job an individual will ever have, but it is important to recognize that strong, healthy families improve the quality of life and the development of children.

In today's fast-paced society, and with so many demands placed on adults and children alike, it is important to take the time out and recognize the basic necessity of encouraging our Nation's youth as they are the future of this great Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I urge passage,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 763.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMENDING AMERICAN CRAFT BREWERS

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 753) commending American craft brewers.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 753

Whereas American craft brewers are a vibrant affirmation and expression of American entrepreneurial traditions, operating as community-based small businesses and providing employment for more than 33,000 workers;

Whereas the United States has craft brewers in every State and more than 1,300 craft brewers nationwide;

Whereas American craft brewers support American agriculture by purchasing barley, malt, and hops grown, processed, and distributed in the United States;

Whereas American craft brewers promote the Nation's spirit of independence through a renaissance in hand-crafted beers like those first brought to colonial shores by European settlers and produced here by the Nation's founding fathers, including George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, for the enjoyment of the citizenry;

Whereas American craft brewers strive to educate legal drinking-age Americans about the differences in beer flavor, aroma, color, alcohol content, body, and other complex variables, as well as historic brewing traditions, beer history, and gastronomic qualities of beer;

Whereas American craft brewers champion the message of responsible enjoyment to their customers and work within their communities to prevent alcohol abuse and underage drinking;

Whereas American craft brewers produce more than 100 distinct styles of flavorful beers, the quality and diversity of which have made the United States the envy of every beer-drinking nation in the world, thereby contributing to balanced trade by reducing American dependence on imported beers, supporting American exports, and promoting United States tourism;

Whereas American craft brewers are vested in the future, health, and welfare of their communities as employers providing a diverse array of quality local jobs, as contributors to the local tax base, and as committed sponsors of a broad range of vital community institutions and philanthropic causes, including parent-teachers' associations, Junior ROTC, children's hospitals, chambers of commerce, humane societies, rescue squads, athletic teams, and disease research; and

Whereas, in 2006, American craft brewers recognize the week of May 15–21 as American Craft Beer Week and mark it as a time to educate Americans about craft beer and celebrate the contributions that American craft brewers have made to the Nation's communities, economy, and history: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the establishment of American Craft Beer Week as a celebration of the contributions that American craft brewers have made to the Nation's communities, economy, and history; and

(2) commends American craft brewers for providing jobs, improving the balance of trade, supporting American agriculture, and educating Americans about the history and culture of beer while promoting the responsible consumption of beer as a beverage of moderation.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. 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 the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I rise today to recognize and congratulate America's craft brewers, one of the most vibrant and fast growing class of small businesses in America.

Craft brewers are entrepreneurs and hobbyists who create distinctive beverages in small independent breweries across the country. They represent the best in American ideals by combining a spirit of industrious entrepreneurship with a commitment to quality and civic responsibility. The result is a unique product that continues an enduring American tradition of home brewing that can be traced back to George Washington and Thomas Jefferson.

Craft brewers have come a long way since then. Today, there are over 1,300 independent breweries throughout the country, and their numbers are continuing to grow. For the second straight year, craft beer is the fastest growing segment of the U.S. alcoholic beverage industry. In 2005, craft beer experienced a 9 percent increase in volume, nearly triple that of the growth experienced in the wine and spirits industry.

This industry occupies an important niche in our economy and its continued growth is beneficial to our communities. Not only do craft brewers provide over 33,000 of our constituents with quality jobs, they also support our agricultural economy by purchasing barley and malt and hops grown, processed, and shipped domestically. Furthermore, with over 100 diverse and flavorful beverages, craft brewers' beverages have attracted an international following that has strengthened and increased U.S. beer exports.

In my district, the F.X. Matt Brewing Company has become an integral part of our community. For 118 years, this regional brewery has continually reinvented itself and today is most famous for its line of Saranac beer. The brewery's capacity to respond to market changes and customer demands have ensured its continued ability to provide over 100 high-quality manufacturing jobs in an area that has experienced a decline in this sector.

Continuing the tradition of attention to the local community, the F.X. Matt Brewing Company fosters local pride and involvement through their association with the Boilermaker 15K Road Race, one of the finest in America, which culminates in an area-wide celebration at the brewery, and by hosting what we call "Saranac Thursdays" throughout the summer, from which all the proceeds benefit the United Way.

Craft brewers live and work in the community where their products are made, which underlies their continued commitment to local charitable and philanthropic institutions. They have supported children's hospitals, humane societies, chambers of commerce, disease research, and parent-teachers association. In short, they are just good citizens. Craft brewers are committed to promoting the safe and moderate consumption of their beverage, and work closely with their communities to prevent underage drinking and alcohol abuse.

American craft brewers are a testament to this country's entrepreneurial and community-based small businesses tradition, and I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the unique contributions they have made to our culture and economy by supporting this resolution.

Just let me make one last observation. Some people might say, watching the proceedings of this House, why are they spending time on resolutions like this when there are so many really pressing issues facing the Nation? And the answer is very simple. This is a small portion of our legislative week set aside for resolutions just like the ones we are discussing, important to America, not of grand importance, not everybody is concerned about them, but important to certain segments of America.

Tomorrow, we go on with the appropriations bills to discuss things like the war on terrorism. We dealt with homeland security today. We deal day in and day out with critically important issues, but I think it is just proper that we pause on occasion and dedicate a few minutes to saluting, as I am saluting the small brewers of America, and you can salute any small business you want to. They add to the very fabric of our Nation, and I am proud to identify with it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from New York in

commending American craft brewers. America's brewing landscape began to change during the late 1970s when the traditions and styles of brewing brought to our country by immigrants from all over the world began to disappear. Highly effective marketing campaigns were changing America's beer preference to light-adjunct lager. Low-calorie beers soon began driving and shaping the growth and nature of the American brewing industry.

The home brewing hobby began to thrive as American beer drinkers began brewing their own beer so that they could experience the beer traditions and styles of other countries. Those home brewing roots gave birth to what we now call the "craft brewing" industry. Today, American craft-brewed beer is an all-malt beer that is higher in calories and has greater flavor and aroma than the light beers of the 1970s.

Made by any one of America's 1,458 small regional microbreweries, our pub breweries, craft brewers produced 6.23 million barrels, or 3 percent, of the beer consumed in the American States in 2001. American craft brewers are small community-based businesses that employ 33,000 workers and exemplify the American entrepreneurial spirit.

Since 1978, the American craft beer industry has never lost market share. Craft brewers have succeeded in expanding the minds of beer consumers and in creating and establishing a niche in the American consumer market. Today's American beer consumers continue to provide support to the craft beer market.

Again, I join with the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from California in commending the home brewers, as many people like to call them, but the people who make their own so they can sip it, and taste it, and know what it is like before it is finished.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I will close in two important ways. One is to, first, urge all of my colleagues here and already at home tonight to vote for this resolution. I think it sets the right balance on an important segment of our craft industry. Much more than an alcohol industry, this is about the right of the small operation to do something that is a time-honored tradition.

Secondly, I would like to reiterate in the best possible terms why this time we spend here in the evening is different. Most of our colleagues have gone home for the evening or gone to their dinners, but, in fact, Members will choose to come here and take time that otherwise these Chambers would be dark to talk about issues that don't affect all of America but affect some part of America or their district, and I believe that this is the right balance.

I continue to support the idea that we should bring resolutions on suspensions to the floor when they are not

controversial but important to segments of our economy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 753.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECOGNIZING 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VICTORY OF UNITED STATES WINEMAKERS AT 1976 PARIS WINE TASTING

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 399) recognizing the 30th anniversary of the victory of United States winemakers at the 1976 Paris Wine Tasting.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 399

Whereas on May 24th, 1976 in Paris, France, the premier wines of California and France were judged in a blind taste test by leading French wine experts;

Whereas the winning red wine was the 1973 Stag's Leap Wine Cellars SLV Napa Valley Cabernet crafted by winemaker Warren Winiarski;

Whereas the winning white wine was the 1973 Chateau Montelena Napa Valley Chardonnay crafted by winemaker Miljenko "Mike" Grgich;

Whereas this event became known as the Tasting Heard 'Round the World, and heralded the beginning of the rise to pre-eminence of California wines;

Whereas the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of American History has placed bottles of the winning wines in its permanent collection;

Whereas wines from all over the United States are now enjoyed all over the world; and

Whereas the domestic wine industry now contributes over \$50 billion a year to the United States economy: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes and honors the 30th Anniversary of the California victory at the 1976 Paris Wine Tasting; and

(2) recognizes the historical significance of this event to the United States wine industry.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. 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 the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I appreciate that this resolution is being taken out of order, but one might say it is being taken in the correct order. One might even say that it is being taken one after its correct order.

As a Member from California, with my colleague from California on the other side of the aisle, it is important to note that California wines are, in fact, the finest in the world; that they enjoy a special place and a personal honor around the world. So although we came after beer tonight, I would certainly say not far after beer this evening.

Mr. Speaker, until 1976, France was generally regarded as having an unchallenged reputation as the foremost producer of the world's best wines. In that year, a wine merchant in Paris, Steven Spurrier, organized a prestigious wine tasting, now known as the Paris Wine Tasting of 1976.

□ 2215

The blind tasting contest was judged by eight of France's top wine tasting experts. In the white wine as well as red wine consumption, California wines took first place, ending the French wine domination of that industry.

Mr. Speaker, I will include the rest of my statement for the RECORD. I respect so much the co-chairman of the Wine Caucus that I do not want to take the thunder that likely belongs to him and all of the good work my colleague from California has done.

Time Magazine's Paris correspondent was on hand for the tasting and broke the news to the world. Less might have been made of the contest had the renowned French tasters been less disdainful toward the California selections as they tasted. The French tasters were stunned when the names of the wines were revealed. The impact of the tasting for California wines was immediate, showing people everywhere that exceptional wines could come from somewhere other than France. The 1976 Paris tasting has been duplicated over the years with many times the same result. Today, California wines continue to demand respect and admiration of wine experts all over the world.

I urge all members to come together to support adoption of this resolution on the 30th anniversary of that historic tasting.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the champion of wine tasting in the House and the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and my colleague from California, and I concur that this is an important resolution. Although the beer measure was taken up first; as someone who has lived in the wine industry my entire life, someone who grows wine grapes and someone who has worked in many different jobs in the wine industry, I can tell you firsthand that there

is truth in the old saying that it takes a lot of beer to make good wine. So it is probably appropriate that both of these measures are taken up tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct honor and pleasure of representing California's 1st Congressional District, home to over 500 wineries, I believe and I think everyone would agree, the heart and soul of the American wine industry. So you might ask why it is that I would have introduced a resolution honoring a French wine tasting.

As my colleague from California said, the fact of the matter is the Paris Wine Tasting of 1976 is the seminal event in the history of the U.S. wine industry. At that event, some of Europe's greatest wine critics, those from within the European wine community, chose U.S. wines as the winners of that tasting in a blind test. That is why that wine tasting is known even today as the tasting heard around the world.

The Paris tasting was proof that American wine makers could compete with the best in the world, that wine makers like Warren Winiarski of Stag's Leap Wine Cellars and Mike Grgich of Chateau Montelena, he now owns his own winery, but at the time he was the wine maker at Chateau Montelena, were in fact making some of the best wines in the world.

Robert Parker, the world-renowned wine critic, put it best when he said, "The Paris tasting destroyed the myth of French supremacy and marked the democratization of the wine world. It was a watershed in the history of wine."

The tasting served as a launching pad for an industry that has grown to become a major contributor to our national economy, now totaling over \$50 billion a year. There are over 4,000 commercial wineries throughout all 50 States. Many of them are small family-owned businesses. The number has grown by 30 percent in the last 4 years, and the wine industry and the tourism that it generates employs over 250,000 tax-paying Americans.

It is, in fact, a great industry, and our wines are in fact the best. It is appropriate that we take this time to commend those who participated in and the industry that has grown out of the Paris Wine Tasting of 1976. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this. I thank you for the courtesy of bringing this measure up tonight, both out of order and on the floor, recognizing the 30th anniversary of this famous wine tasting.

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

Let me just say that Californians, whether Democrat or Republican, take their politics seriously. They do not always agree on all things, but I think they do agree and I think all of us can agree with them that California does in fact have some of the finest wines known to humankind. I am pleased to join with them in passing this resolution, and perhaps one of these days

Representative THOMPSON might even make me an honorary member of that tasting club.

Mr. Speaker, until 1976, France was generally regarded as having an unchallenged reputation as the foremost producer of the world's best wines. In that year, a wine merchant in Paris, Steven Spurrier, organized the prestigious wine tasting competition now known as the Paris Wine Tasting of 1976. Spurrier sold only French wines and later said "I thought I had it rigged for the French wines to win."

The jury of nine testers in the wine competition included eight of France's top wine tasting experts. Blind tasting was performed so that none of the judges knew the identity of the wines that were tasted. First to be tasted were white wines. The comparison included Chardonnays and matched the very best French Chardonnays from Burgundy against California Chardonnays. The winner was a California Chardonnay that was from Chateau Montelena and made by winemaker Mike Grgich. Third and fourth places also went to California Chardonnays. All nine judges awarded their top scores to either Chalone Winery or Chateau Montelena, both of California. The red wines then were tasted. A Cabernet Sauvignon from California's Stag's Leap Wine Cellars and produced by winemaker Warren Winiarski was chosen as the top wine of that type.

The tasting results were surprising to the judges and wine connoisseurs worldwide. The lone reporter who attended the competition was from Time magazine, and that reporter's story promptly revealed the results to the world. Leaders in the French wine industry banned Spurrier from the nation's prestigious wine-tasting tour for a year, apparently as punishment for the damage his tasting had done to France's image of superiority. And as recently as 2005, some of the judges still refused to discuss the tasting, saying that to do so would have been "too painful."

This resolution recognizes and honors the 30th anniversary of the California victory at the 1976 Paris Wine Tasting and recognizes the historical significance of this event to the United States wine industry.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 399.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I might remind the gentleman from Illinois that wine tasting is a full-participation sport available to all over the age of 21.

Mr. Speaker, I would just close by noting that many, many times California's superiority as the grape wine capital of the world has been repeated in Paris. With that, I close by saying I eat French fries and drink California wine.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 399.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### SUPPORTING NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 729) supporting National Tourism Week.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. RES. 729

Whereas travel and tourism has a major impact on the economy of the United States as the 3rd largest retail sales industry in the Nation;

Whereas 1 out of every 7 people employed in the United States civilian labor force is directly or indirectly employed in the travel and tourism industry;

Whereas international travel to the United States is the largest service export, having generated a trade surplus for 16 consecutive years, increasing 144 percent between 2003 to 2004 to over \$4 billion;

Whereas, in 2005, travel and tourism-related expenditures reached \$1 trillion, including \$596 billion in direct sales and \$445 billion in indirect sales, and supported 8 million jobs;

Whereas the Department of Commerce has released the 2004 international year-end arrivals data, revealing that the level of international travel to the United States increased by 12 percent from 2003 to 46 million in 2004, with overseas visitors increasing 13 percent, to 20 million in 2004;

Whereas domestic and international traveler spending in the United States generated \$99.4 billion in taxes for Federal, State and local governments in 2004;

Whereas tourism contributes substantially to personal growth, education, appreciation of cross-cultural differences, and the enhancement of international understanding and good will;

Whereas the abundant natural and man-made attractions of the United States and the hospitality of the American people establish the United States as the preeminent destination for both foreign and domestic travelers;

Whereas National Tourism Week was established by Congress in 1983, and first celebrated in May 1984, when President Ronald Reagan signed a proclamation urging citizens to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities;

Whereas, since 1984, National Tourism Week has been celebrated each May by the travel and tourism community, travel industry associations, as well as many States, cities, and localities throughout the Nation; and

Whereas May 13 through 21, 2006, is the 23rd annual National Tourism Week: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports National Tourism Week; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups to observe National Tourism Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H. Res. 729, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY). I am also a cosponsor of this resolution, and cosponsor of it for a good reason. The \$1.3 trillion industry in travel and tourism is one that both Florida and California enjoy, and people from all over the world also enjoy it. The United States receives nearly 50 million international visitors, spending over \$100 billion a year while touring within our country.

In fact, the United States is the number one tourist destination in the world. The Travel Industry Association says if not for the taxes generated by the travel and tourism, every household in America would pay over \$900 more in taxes each year to make up for the shortfall, much of that coming from foreign visitors.

In addition, travel and tourism generate \$100 billion in tax revenue for local, State and Federal governments. For this reason, it is important that we encourage and recognize the travel industry for its dedication to not only the accommodation of our vacation needs, but also in providing much-needed jobs and revenue for our country each year. I urge all Members to come together to support the vitally important travel and tourism industry by adopting H. Res. 729.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, people across the Nation and around the world have enjoyed traveling across America to visit our magnificent cities, parks, museums, and our many other national historic and cultural sites. America provides countless opportunities to learn about and to enjoy our Nation's immense variety of attractions.

The travel and tourism industry represents a vital part of the American economy. It is a \$1.3 trillion industry in the United States, and \$100 billion is generated each year in tax revenues for local, State and Federal governments. And with the total of 7.3 million American jobs related to travel, the travel and tourism industry is one of the country's biggest employers.

National Tourism Week was established by Congress in 1983 and first celebrated in May of 1984 when President Ronald Reagan signed a proclamation that urged citizens to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. Held each year from May 13 to May 21, National Tourism Week provides the perfect platform upon which to challenge State tourism boards, city

governments and other relevant entities to take a proactive role and to engage in practices that protect and maximize their tourism assets.

As a matter of fact, when I think of tourism, I think of my own congressional district which includes downtown Chicago with many of the skyscrapers, the Sears Tower, the Water Tower Place. King Tut is now on exhibit in our city, and thousands of people are coming each and every day. And so travel and tourism contribute to the cultural and social well-being of the Nation. I support this resolution and urge its passage.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois is quite right. On Monday I left several tourist dollars on the 95th floor of the John Hancock Building at that lovely, beautiful restaurant. Chicago is in fact a major tourist destination, and I have been to more trade shows than I care to, well, I care to remember them all. They were all quite good. Chicago hosts some wonderful McCormick-based facilities, and has some of the finest hotels. I have not stayed in all of the finest hotels, but you have some of the finest hotels.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution to thank the travel and tourism industry for what they contribute to our economy.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, at the start of the summer season we recognize the contributions of the travel and tourism industry by celebrating National Tourism Week.

Over the last 22 years, our Nation has celebrated National Tourism Week, and rightfully so. This industry ranks first, second or third in nearly 60 percent of the country.

Not only is tourism a dominant industry in the U.S. economy, but it is an industry that is present in every Congressional district. From sea to shining sea, to purple mountains majesty, every corner of the U.S. contributes to the travel and tourism industry—Hawaii, Alaska, Maine, Florida, California, and everything in between.

The travel and tourism industry boasts heavy-hitting statistics on expenditures, revenues, and jobs (the 3rd largest retail sales industry in the Nation; has generated a trade surplus for 16 consecutive years; supports 8 million jobs; in 2005, expenditures reached \$1 trillion.). But that's not all. The travel and tourism industry produces something that cannot be quantified. There is no better way to understand and appreciate a culture than to travel to that land and experience it. When people come to the U.S., they experience our culture and hospitality first hand, and almost without exception, their view of America changes for the better. In today's world, this element is priceless.

As co-chairs of the Congressional Travel & Tourism Caucus since 1997, Congressman FOLEY and I have worked hard to educate our colleagues about the significance of this industry and all that it offers to our country. The caucus is over 100 members strong and continues to grow as more of my colleagues truly comprehend the magnitude of tourism.

Travel is an integral part of the human experience, and I am pleased that we are honoring the travel and tourism industry by putting forth this resolution celebrating National Tourism Week.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 729, resolution sponsored by my friend and colleague MARK FOLEY, the Co-Chair of the Travel and Tourism Caucus along with members of the Caucus including myself, in support of National Tourism Week.

It is worth repeating, Mr. Speaker, as the resolution points out, Travel and Tourism as the 3rd largest retail sales industry in the Nation, has a major impact on the economy of the United States. One out of every 7 people employed in the United States civilian labor force is directly or indirectly employed in the travel and tourism industry. International travel to the United States is the largest service export, generating a trade surplus for 16 consecutive years, increasing 144 percent between 2003 and 2004 to over \$4 billion. And, in 2005 alone, travel and tourism-related expenditures reached \$1 trillion, including \$596 billion in direct sales and \$445 billion in indirect sales, and supported 8 million jobs.

As someone who represents an area where tourism is our number one industry, I am proud to report that despite increases in the price of oil, the tourism industry in the Virgin Islands have been doing exceptionally well over the last couple of years.

According to the Virgin Islands Bureau of Economic Research, the industry was one of the strongest performers and main contributor to the economic performance during 2004 with increases in both air and cruise ship passengers. Total visitors in the Territory in fiscal year 2004 reached a record 2.6 million, up 12 percent over 2003.

The BER projects, barring any significant shocks, that visitor arrival will peak at 2.7 million by the end of fiscal year 2005 and 2.8 million in fiscal year 2006.

Mr. Speaker, the Travel and Tourism industry generates trillions of dollars in economic activity in the U.S. and as such it deserves all of our support. I urge my colleagues to support passage of H. Res. 729.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my support for House Resolution 729, a bill that I and Mr. FARR introduced recognizing the 23rd Annual National Tourism Week.

First established by Congress in 1983, this annual event gives us an opportunity to recognize the significant importance the Travel and Tourism Industry has on our economy.

The travel and tourism industry is the lifeblood of many states around the country—including Florida, California, New York and Nevada, to name a few. Every Congressional District is impacted—that is every district with a restaurant, hotel, museum, national park, stadium, theater, campgrounds and beaches.

Domestic travel and tourism-related spending has reached \$1 trillion a year. There are over 8 million people in the food service, hospitality and travel-related industries that rely on America's vibrant and thriving travel industry.

As America's third-largest retail sales industry, nearly \$100 billion dollars was generated in tax revenue for our local, state and federal governments in 2004.

In addition, international travel to the United States is now the largest service export with a generated trade surplus for 16 consecutive years.

For example, in my district there are visitors from all over the world who are drawn to our beautiful beaches, recreational lakes, habitat wildlife preserves and golf courses. In 2005, Florida collected over \$3 billion in tourism and recreational sales, a reflection of \$62 billion that went into the state's economy during the year.

So as some of us begin our summer travel, let us remember the tremendous impact the travel and tourism industry makes on all of our lives.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 729.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MATTHEW LYON POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5245) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Marble Street in Fair Haven, Vermont, as the "Matthew Lyon Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5245

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

#### SECTION 1. MATTHEW LYON POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Marble Street in Fair Haven, Vermont, shall be known and designated as the "Matthew Lyon Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Matthew Lyon Post Office Building".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, born in County Wicklow, Ireland, Matthew Lyon was a printer, farmer, soldier and politician who came to America as an indentured servant at the age of 14 in 1764. During

the Revolution, Matthew Lyon fought with Ethan Allen and the Green Mountain Boys to capture Fort Ticonderoga. He later resigned from the Army in 1778, and became a member of the Vermont House of Representatives from 1779 to 1783.

During this time he built and operated various kinds of mills, including one to manufacture paper. He also established a printing office in 1793 and published the Farmers' Library. In addition, he created the Fair Haven Gazette, a weekly newspaper, and served as publisher and editor while using the paper to express his political opinions in the early years of our Republic.

Lyon was elected as a Republican to the Fifth and Sixth Congresses, but was not a candidate for renomination in 1800. He then went on to relocate to the State of Kentucky in 1801, and settled in Caldwell County, now Lyon County, and became a member of the House of Representatives of Kentucky in 1802.

He was then elected to the Eighth Congress and to three successive Congresses until he was unsuccessful in seeking reelection in 1810. He is certainly one of our Founding Fathers, and it is long overdue for him to be recognized with this post office.

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

□ 2230

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

As a member of the Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 5245, legislation naming the postal facility at 1 Marble Street in Fair Haven, Vermont, after Matthew Lyon. This bill, which was sponsored by Representative BERNARD SANDERS of Vermont, was unanimously reported by our committee on May 4, 2006.

Matthew Lyon was born in County Wicklow, Ireland, and in 1764, at the age of 14, emigrated to the United States as an indentured servant. It was not long before he was a free man and fighting alongside Ethan Allen and others in the famous battle of Ticonderoga. Lyon went on to settle in Vermont, founding the village of Fair Haven and later representing Vermont in Congress for two terms.

Lyon was a fierce Jeffersonian Republican and a staunch opponent of the Sedition Act. Lyon's public opposition to the Sedition Act led him to be the first person arrested under the guise of the act. A dubious honor to some, perhaps, was a badge of honor to this protector of free speech and liberty. Lyon would serve a 4-month prison sentence and become a champion of the movement opposed to the Sedition Act.

After serving two terms as the Representative for Vermont and one term in the Kentucky State legislature, Lyon was elected to Congress again, this time as a Representative for the State of Kentucky, becoming one of

only three people elected to Congress from two States.

Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a great deal of historic as well as patriotic value, and I would urge swift passage of H.R. 5245 which seeks to honor the life of a true American pioneer, Matthew Lyon.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5245, a bill I introduced to rename the Fair Haven, Vermont, post office in honor of Matthew Lyon, an American patriot and staunch defender of First Amendment rights.

I would like to thank Chairman DAVIS and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their help in moving this bill through the Government Reform Committee. I would also like to thank Jeffrey Schulz, the Fair Haven Town Manager, and the Fair Haven Select Board for supporting this legislation.

Matthew Lyon was born in Dublin, Ireland, on July 14, 1749, and immigrated to colonial America in 1765 as an indentured servant. In 1774 he purchased land in the area of the Hampshire Grants now known as Wallingford, Vermont, and soon after joined Ethan Allen's Green Mountain Boys militia where he led his own unit in defending their land from competing claimants as well from British attacks from the north. In Vermont, he was involved in encouraging the formation of citizen committees across the state to discuss national and state issues, meet with their elected officials, and ensure that their government was being operated in the best interest of all citizens.

In 1783, Matthew Lyon founded the town of Fair Haven. He served in the Vermont State Legislature for 14 years before being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives to serve as Vermont's Congressional representative from 1797–1801. Interestingly, he also represented the State of Kentucky in the U.S. House from 1803–1811.

Matthew Lyon, however, is perhaps best known for being the first person to stand trial and be convicted under the 1798 Sedition Act—sweeping legislation passed during a period when America was engaged in hostilities with France. As we're all aware, the purpose of the legislation was to curtail dissent from citizens and members of the press who opposed President John Adams' foreign policy toward France. The legislation was unquestionably a direct attack on rights explicitly protected by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

For violating provisions of the Sedition Act, Matthew Lyon was convicted and sentenced to four months in jail, required to pay the cost of his prosecution and a fine of \$1,000. His only crime was writing a letter to the editor critical of President John Adams' foreign policy toward France and submitting another person's similar writings to a local newspaper that published them. Although he was jailed, he continued to exercise his Constitutional rights by expressing his views and actively opposing the Sedition Act's anti-free speech provisions. He was even re-elected to Congress from prison in December of 1798.

Eventually, the Sedition Act was allowed to sunset according to its terms and President Thomas Jefferson pardoned those still serving in prison under the Act and remitted their fines. Decades later, Congress passed a law that reimbursed Matthew Lyon's heirs and representatives for the fines he was forced to pay under the Sedition Act.

This remarkable story is not only one that makes the citizens of my state proud but also represents an event of national historical significance. Too often today, we forget the struggles that many who came before us undertook to preserve freedom of speech, the press, and the right to assemble. This post office will serve as a reminder to Vermonters, the nation, and all those who visit Fair Haven, of the heroic efforts made in the past to protect the rights of all to speak freely, no matter what political viewpoint or ideas they may have.

At a time when we find ourselves struggling to balance the security of our nation with the liberties we cherish, I can think of no better time to honor one of our nation's champions of the First Amendment's right of free speech. Naming the Fair Haven Post Office in honor of Matthew Lyon would be a fitting tribute to him and his fight for liberty, and would serve as a reminder of Fair Haven's connection to this great American patriot.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill; to honor Matthew Lyon, a patriotic American who through his actions more than 200 years ago, reminds us of the importance of freedom of speech in our country.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption and yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5245.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING ALBERT  
PUJOLS ON BEING NAMED THE  
MOST VALUABLE PLAYER FOR  
THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR  
THE 2005 MAJOR LEAGUE BASE-  
BALL SEASON

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 626) congratulating Albert Pujols on being named the Most Valuable Player for the National League for the 2005 Major League Baseball season.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 626

Whereas Albert Pujols of the St. Louis Cardinals was named the Most Valuable Player for the National League for the 2005 Major League Baseball season;

Whereas in 2005 Albert Pujols led the Cardinals with a batting average of .330, 41 home runs, 117 runs batted in, and 16 stolen bases;

Whereas Albert Pujols is the only player in the history of Major League Baseball to have a batting average higher than .300, hit 30 or more home runs, drive in 100 or more runs, and score 100 or more runs in each of his first five seasons in the major leagues;

Whereas Albert Pujols has already won the 2001 Rookie of the Year Award for the National League, the 2003 National League batting championship, and the Most Valuable Player Award for the 2004 National League Championship Series;

Whereas Albert Pujols exemplifies true sportsmanship and class; and

Whereas Albert Pujols is active in numerous St. Louis area charities and causes, most notably through his establishment of, and involvement in, the Pujols Family Foundation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives congratulates Albert Pujols on being named the Most Valuable Player for the National League for the 2005 Major League Baseball season.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the national pastime, obviously, is baseball and to honor the most valuable player of the 2005 season seems to be only appropriate. Certainly, there can be no more appropriate thing as we go into the heart of baseball season than to consider a resolution recognizing this amazingly great accomplishment and an amazing season in 2005. And so I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, St. Louis Cardinal first baseman Jose Alberto Pujols is widely regarded as one of major league baseball's best offensive players because he hits consistently for average and power. On August 5, 2005, Pujols became the first player in major league history to hit 30 or more home runs in each of his first five seasons. On August 31, 2005, he became the first major league player since Ted Williams to have 100 runs batted in during each of his first five seasons.

Originally from the Dominican Republic, it was in the United States that Pujols developed his love for baseball and demonstrated his ability for the game. He batted over .500 during his first season of high school baseball. At Maple Woods Community College in the Kansas City area, Pujols showed off his talent by hitting a grand slam and recording an unassisted triple play during his first game and by batting .461 during his first season.

The St. Louis Cardinals drafted Pujols in the 13th round of the 1999 draft. He initially turned down a \$10,000 bonus and opted to play in the Jayhawk League in Kansas. By the end of the summer, the Cardinals had increased their bonus offer to \$60,000. Pujols signed with the Cardinals and was assigned to the minor leagues. By

the next year he was playing for Single A team the Peoria Chiefs where he was voted league Most Valuable Player. Pujols progressed quickly through the ranks of the St. Louis farm system and on to the major leagues.

The 2005 season saw Pujols establish career highs in walks and stolen bases while leading the St. Louis Cardinals in almost every offensive category. He finished with a .330 batting average, a .430 on-base percentage, and a .609 slugging percentage, 41 home runs, a grand slam, 117 RBIs, 97 walks and 16 stolen bases. The Cardinals were eliminated during the National League championship series, but only after Pujols hit a memorable home run in game five, a two-out, three-run blast in the top of the ninth inning off Houston Astro closer Brad Lidge. After the season, Pujols received his first National League Most Valuable Player award which underscored his critical role in keeping the injury-plagued Cardinals on track throughout the season.

Pujols should be commended for his work on the baseball field, for the foundation he and his wife, Diedre, have created and dedicated to the love, care and development of people with Downs Syndrome and their families, and for helping the poor in the Dominican Republic. For those and other reasons, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 626, a tremendous athlete, but an even more tremendous humanitarian.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. I have no further speakers on this side, Mr. Speaker, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. It is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to that great St. Louis Cardinal fan and the sponsor of this legislation, Representative CARNAHAN from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 626, congratulating Albert Pujols of the St. Louis Cardinals on being named the Most Valuable Player in the National League for the 2005 Major League Baseball season.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we recently passed a companion resolution, House Resolution 627, congratulating his teammate, Chris Carpenter, for winning the National League Cy Young Award. This marks the first time since 1968 that the Cardinals have won both an MVP and Cy Young Award in the same year.

Albert Pujols came to spring training in 2001 as a 13th round draft choice. Not only did he make the St. Louis Cardinals opening day roster that year, but he won a starting job and went on to win the National League Rookie of the Year Award.

The first 5 years of his career rank among the best in baseball history. He has a career .332 batting average, 201 home runs and 621 runs batted in.

He is the only player in the history of the major leagues to have a batting average higher than .300, hit 30 or more home runs, drive in 100 or more runs,

and score 100 or more runs in each of his first five seasons.

During the 2005 season, Albert Pujols led the Cardinals with a batting average of .330, 41 home runs, 117 runs batted in, and 16 stolen bases. He was a major factor in the Cardinals' 100-win season and run to the National League championship series.

Albert Pujols is truly a champion on and off the field. He and his wife, Diedre, have three children, a son named Albert, Jr., a daughter named Sophia and a daughter Isabella who has Downs Syndrome.

In 2005 they started the Pujols Family Foundations which is dedicated to the love, care and development of people with Downs Syndrome and also reaches out to impoverished families in the Dominican Republic, Albert's native country.

As a lifelong Cardinals fan and St. Louis resident, it is an absolute joy to watch Albert Pujols on and off the field. He embodies the true spirit of Cardinal Nation, and I offer my most sincere congratulations on all that he has accomplished thus far, and wish him the best in the future, including recovering from his recent injuries.

Mr. Speaker, I think the spirit that he brings to baseball and that has captured this country is also reflected in the numerous Members of this Congress, not just from St. Louis, not just from the State of Missouri, but from around the country and both sides of the aisle that joined in sponsoring this resolution of congratulations.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption and yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 626.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL PASSPORT MONTH

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 327) supporting the goals and ideals of National Passport Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 327

Whereas, through international travel, Americans can individually play a major role towards improving foreign relations by building bridges and making connections with citizens of other countries;

Whereas interacting with the global community inspires Americans to reflect on the diverse multi-cultural background that has defined the United States as a great country of cooperation and progress;

Whereas having a passport and traveling abroad creates connections with the global

community, supporting goodwill throughout the world;

Whereas having a passport and traveling abroad promotes understanding and goodwill throughout the world, opening the doors to increased peace, tolerance, and acceptance;

Whereas having a passport and traveling abroad opens up a preponderance of educational opportunities and experiences for Americans of all ages;

Whereas having a passport and traveling abroad enables Americans to see first-hand the effect of the United States on the world, including the tremendous amount of humanitarian aid given by the United States through both public and private sectors;

Whereas having a passport and traveling abroad reminds Americans that they are members of a global family and gives them opportunities to mend rifts around the world;

Whereas fewer than 23 percent of Americans have passports, thereby limiting their ability to travel outside the United States;

Whereas the more Americans travel outside the United States, the more they will experience opportunities to increase their understanding of the world and the place of the United States in it;

Whereas the creation and support of a National Passport Month signals to Americans the important role they can play as ambassadors for the United States by serving as agents of understanding, tolerance, and mutual respect; and

Whereas travel publishers along with travel editors from the most prestigious media outlets in the United States, student travel organizations, and book sellers have designated September as "National Passport Month" to educate the public about the importance of having a passport and the positive impact international travel has on individuals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Passport Month; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today in the United States, fewer than 23 percent of Americans have an issued passport, meaning that millions of our citizens are unable to take advantage of the culturally enriching opportunities presented by international travel. International travel can help promote understanding, tolerance and mutual respect for other

cultures and traditions around the world.

National Passport Month would support the goal of encouraging and inspiring Americans to participate in the educational opportunities that having a passport can provide.

□ 2245

By opening the doors to the rewards of traveling beyond the borders and the equally important potential that we have to build bridges connecting cultures throughout the world, makes it extremely pertinent that we encourage especially the young and old to apply for past ports.

Mr. Speaker, recently it became necessary to have a passport to go into Mexico. Most Americans are not yet aware of that. I would particularly remind people listening tonight throughout the world and those who will read the official record of our proceedings here today that having a passport takes time. I would encourage people to have them before they intend to travel so that they are prepared for the quick trip from San Diego to Tijuana or the trip from here to Abu Dhabi.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the record a statement from Representative BARBARA LEE, who is the sponsor of this resolution. Congresswoman BARBARA LEE could not be with us here today, though she sincerely wanted to be. In her absence, she asked me to give a few remarks on her behalf.

Congresswoman LEE would like to thank ranking member WAXMAN and the chairman of the Government Reform Committee, TOM DAVIS, along with the leadership on both sides of the aisle, for bringing this bill to the floor today. Representative LEE expresses her appreciation to the over 55 cosponsors of this bipartisan resolution for their support and she wants in particular to thank her Republican leader on the resolution, Congressman CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey, for his support.

This resolution is extremely straightforward and noncontroversial. It details and recognizes the value of international travel and requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the Federal Government, State localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses and other entities and the people of the United States to observe National Passport Month with appropriate ceremonies, programs and activities.

As the senior Democratic woman on the House International Relations Committee and a traveler herself, Congresswoman LEE truly understands and appreciates the value and importance of international travel. As Congresswoman LEE notes in her statement for the record, there is no substitute for the experience that you get from vis-

iting other countries. Travel changes the way we see the world. It broadens our horizons and deepens our appreciation for different countries and cultures. It also helps us to be more understanding, tolerant and to have respect for other cultures.

Not only does travel provide enriching opportunities for the individual, it can also have profound benefits to our Nation as a whole by allowing Americans to spread the message of freedom and democracy around the world. In addition, having a passport and traveling abroad enables Americans to see the American influence on the world firsthand, including the tremendous amount of humanitarian aid given by Americans throughout both the public and private sectors.

I agree with the Congresswoman, who states that Americans of all ages are our best ambassadors and we should promote policies that encourage them to travel, to forge connections with people from other countries, to foster mutual understanding and tolerance and to help open new doors to peace.

The timing of this resolution could not be more critical, because America needs a boost in foreign public opinion. When Lonely Planet, which is located in Representative LEE's district in Oakland, California, raised the idea of a National Passport Month, she immediately embraced it. In Representative LEE's statement for the record she notes how proud she was to introduce H. Res. 327 and to be part of the campaign to recognize the importance of international travel and how overwhelmed she was by the support she has received for the effort.

In April of this year, Lonely Planet presented her with over 5,000 petition signatures from people all over the country who support these efforts. This resolution has the support of a broad coalition of over 70 supporting travel organizations and associations. This includes corporations such as American Express and Yahoo and the State Department. In fact, Congresswoman LEE is submitting the letter of support from the State Department along with her statement today.

Representative LEE would like to thank all the supporters of the resolution, and notes that she looks forward to working with them to ensure that the White House issues the proclamation in ample time for the inaugural National Passport Month celebrations this September.

I, too, Mr. Speaker, would urge support for this resolution. And since we have had so many items on the agenda this evening coming out of Government Reform, I also want to simply state that it has indeed been a pleasure to work with the gentleman from California. I am not looking forward to another long session like this coming from Government Reform, but if it has to be, then I look forward to working with him.

I urge passage of this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, urge passage and thank the gentleman from Illinois. It is a pleasure working on the Committee on Government Reform. It is also a privilege serving on the International Relations Committee, in which public diplomacy has been a major initiative that Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS have been reaching out and trying to have done.

There is no better public diplomacy than for Americans to reach out to people, perhaps from their ancestry or simply from an area of interest, by visiting. So I too encourage all the Members to vote for this, to travel themselves and to be the diplomats in public diplomacy that we need so badly in this time of strife throughout the world.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 327, legislation I sponsored to support the goals, ideals and creation of National Passport month.

I want to thank my colleague Congressman DANNY DAVIS for managing the bill today and for his leadership on the Government Reform committee. I also want to thank the Ranking Member of the Committee, Congressman WAXMAN and the Chairman of the Committee, TOM DAVIS along with leadership on both sides of the aisle for bringing this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to express my appreciation to the over 55 co-sponsors of this bipartisan resolution for their support, and want to especially thank my colleague and the Republican lead on this effort, Congressman CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey for his support.

This resolution is extremely straightforward and noncontroversial. It details and recognizes the value of international travel and requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe National Passport month with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

The purpose of National Passport Month is to create a time to educate the public about the incredible opportunities available to those who obtain passports as well as the positive impact international travel has on individuals and the global community.

Today, less than 23 percent of Americans have a passport, thereby limiting their ability to travel outside the United States. As a result, millions of Americans are unable to take advantage of the enriching opportunities presented by international travel.

As the Senior Democratic woman on the House International Relations Committee, and a traveler myself, I understand and appreciate the value and importance of international travel.

There really is no substitute for the experience that you get from visiting other countries, from meeting the people, tasting the food and interacting with the culture. It changes the way we see the world. It broadens our horizons and deepens our appreciation for different countries and cultures and our shared humanity. It also helps us learn understanding, tolerance and mutual respect for other cultures.

Not only does travel provide enriching opportunities for the individual, it can also have

profound benefits to our Nation as a whole by allowing Americans to spread the message of freedom and democracy around the world. In addition, having a passport and traveling abroad enables Americans to see the American influence on the world first-hand, including the tremendous amount of humanitarian aid given by Americans through both the public and private sectors.

Americans of all ages are our best ambassadors and we should promote policies that encourage them to travel, to forge connections with people from other countries, to foster mutual understanding and tolerance and to help open new doors to peace.

The timing of our efforts could not be more critical. I think we can all recognize that America needs a boost in foreign public opinion and I am confident that connections made with American travelers can and will make a huge difference improving our image abroad.

So, for all of these reasons, when Lonely Planet, which I am pleased to say is located in Oakland in my district, first raised the idea of a national passport month, I immediately embraced it.

I am proud to have introduced H. Res. 327 and to be part of this campaign to recognize the importance of international travel, and I am overwhelmed by the support we have received. In April of this year, Lonely Planet presented me with over 5,000 petition signatures from people all over the country who support these efforts. And this campaign has the support of a broad coalition of over 70 supporting travel organizations and associations to corporations like American Express and Yahoo.

Moreover, the U.S. Department of State is on record in supporting September as National Passport month. I want to read a quote from its letter: "Since September is a time of the year when schools are re-opening and many students are considering travel or study abroad, it is a highly appropriate month to promote public awareness of the value of the U.S. passport. The Department shares your appreciation of the U.S. passport and supports your resolution."

So, today I'm pleased the House will go on record in support of proclaiming September National Passport Month.

Again, I want to thank all the supporters of this resolution and I look forward to working with you all to ensure the White House issues this proclamation in ample time for the inaugural National Passport month celebrations this September.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BUREAU OF  
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,  
Washington, DC, August 29, 2005.

DEAR Ms. LEE: Thank you for your letter addressed to Secretary Rice regarding H. Res. 327, a resolution to encourage President Bush to proclaim September National Passport Month. It is a pleasure to acknowledge your comments on the positive impact international travel has on individuals and the global community. We, too, recognize the value of travel as a means of enhancing international understanding.

Even though the State Department will issue more than 10 million passports this fiscal year, still less than 23 percent of Americans have a passport. The Department strives to make the process of issuing passports to U.S. citizens as efficient and as courteous as possible. Since September is a time of the year when schools are re-opening and many students are considering travel or study abroad, it is a highly appropriate

month to promote public awareness of the value of the U.S. passport. The Department shares your appreciation of the U.S. passport and supports your resolution.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW A. REYNOLDS,  
Acting Assistant Secretary.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 327.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOUSE REPUBLICANS ARE FIGHTING FOR BORDER SECURITY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans understand that in this post-9/11 world we cannot separate national security from border security. On that fateful day back in 2001, we learned that the "business as usual" mentality simply does not work anymore. What our Nation needs is a clear immigration enforcement strategy that reduces the threat posed by those who are breaking our laws.

It is estimated that roughly 12 million illegal aliens now reside in the United States. Each year the number grows by another 700,000. Yet we are arresting the same number of illegal aliens as we did back in 1977, despite the fact we have many more illegals coming in than we used to.

Obviously, something has to be done. That is why House Republicans voted to pass a major border security bill this past December. This bill strengthens our borders, implements employment eligibility verification systems, cracks down on those who knowingly hire illegals, empowers local law enforcement to enforce our immigration laws and expedites the swift deportation of illegal aliens.

This is something that has to be done and we cannot compromise on this. Our Nation's security is at risk, and nothing else is more important.

#### D-DAY AND THE YOUNG AMERICANS

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the silent ocean roar now covers the battlefields on the shores of France.

They fought for a people they did not know in a place they had never been and consecrated the soil of freedom by the self-sacrifice of their own blood.

There are 9,386 Americans buried on the cliffs of Normandy, France. 1,557

are still missing 62 years later. They gave their youth so Europe could have a tomorrow. They came not to conquer, but to set a people free. That D-Day invasion of France was the beginning of the liberation of Europe.

Those that served that day jumped from the sky in the darkness, or went ashore in the face of massive gunfire. They were the young Americans that went to land in Normandy on June 6, 1944. They defeated the evil forces of the Axis and they did not come back until it was over over there.

History refers to those that died and those that lived as the Greatest Generation. They are our fathers and our grandfathers. They defended the honor of liberty and proved there is something worth fighting for, and there is something worth dying for. And that's just the way it is.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS IN NAGORNO-KARABAKH

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to bring attention to the problem of internally displaced persons, or IDPs in Nagorno-Karabakh in the Caucasus. The situation is disheartening because aid is needed and, unfortunately, the United Nations refuses to allow its organizations like UNHCR and UNICEF to operate in the country largely due to Azerbaijan's opposition.

Because internally displaced persons remain within the borders of their home country, primary responsibility for protecting and assisting them rests with their national authorities. However, I strongly believe there is also a responsibility that lies with the United States and the international community to bring rightful attention to this issue and consider ways to ease and eventually end the plight of these displaced individuals.

Mr. Speaker, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, as the Soviet Union was collapsing the people of Nagorno-Karabakh made a peaceful request to reunite with Armenia, from which they were arbitrarily separated by Joseph Stalin in 1921.

□ 2300

Azerbaijan responded with a campaign of ethnic cleansing and full-scale military attack on Nagorno-Karabakh.

As a result of Azerbaijan's aggression, 30,000 people died, and hundreds of thousands fled the region. About 36,000 Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan and some 71,000 displaced ethnic Armenians now reside in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Though the fighting has ended, ceasefire violations continue, and the victims are still suffering.

IDPs still face hardships, including lack of economic opportunity and inadequate shelter. Refugees and displaced individuals and families deserve humanitarian support independent of their location. However those in Nagorno-Karabakh have not received adequate international assistance.

The International Committee of the Red Cross and Doctors Without Borders are the only major international organizations operating in Nagorno-Karabakh. Besides Armenia, the United States is the only other government providing them assistance.

Now recognizing the ongoing need for humanitarian assistance, the U.S. Congress has provided funds to Nagorno-Karabakh since 1998. Through various organizations, USAID has implemented critical projects, including the construction of homes, improved access to water supplies and school reconstruction.

Although these programs have helped improve living conditions, much more is still needed. So, Mr. Speaker, the UN unfortunately refuses to operate in Karabakh and does not send aid or organizations like UNHCR and UNICEF there for assistance.

The reason given by the UN is that they do not work in "politically unrecognized territories". Yet it is my understanding that there are several other disputed territories where the UN currently operates. For example, the UN has been providing assistance to refugees in the West Bank and Gaza since 1950. In fact, the UN created a specific organization, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the Near East to help Palestinian refugees.

They have also undertaken work in other unrecognized or disputed areas, including Kosovo, Somaliland, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Transnistria. The Karabakh authorities have made repeated requests for help to the UN for assistance but have been unsuccessful.

The UN's refusal to work in Karabakh is unfair and hard to comprehend since the UN has been providing substantial assistance to refugees and IDPs residing in Armenia and Azerbaijan, while overlooking the needs of similar groups residing in Karabakh.

It is encouraging that the United States is committed to finding a peaceful solution of the Nagorno-Karabakh crisis. But as Members of Congress, we must provide the leadership necessary for the UN and other relevant organizations to find ways to support these refugees and IDPs.

I plan to send a letter urging the UN to reconsider its misguided policies that are depriving suffering people in Karabakh of urgently needed humanitarian assistance. I hope that my colleagues will join me in this effort when I send the letter, and that we can get the UN to turn around its position.

#### LAWLESSNESS BREEDS MORE LAWLESSNESS

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, she was buried alive in a landfill underneath massive concrete chunks. Human garbage is what Milagro Cunningham thought of this 8-year-old girl who he raped, choked and left to die in a dump.

Police do not know how she was able to find the strength to wiggle her fingers while trapped underneath these slabs of concrete. She was still barely alive, and wiggling her fingers was her silent cry for help.

Milagro Cunningham was an illegal from the Bahamas. He was arrested three times by police before he tried to kill this tiny girl. Not once did the police detain him for trespassing on American soil. They let him go each time. Then he ruined the life of a child. Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be.

Failure to enforce the laws of the border brings those bad people to America to break more laws. There are others. The Railroad Killer, Angel Resendez or Resendez Resendez as he is sometimes referred to, raped, bludgeoned, hammered, and even sledgehammered nine people to death. All lived within yards of railroad tracks throughout the plains of America.

Small town shops sold out of pistols. People who never locked their doors sealed their windows afraid of this killer on the loose. The killer? An illegal from Mexico. He hopped trains never knowing where he was going, but always knowing what would happen when he got there. To him every border, Mexican, U.S. or Canadian meant bloodshed and murder.

He was arrested and released numerous times. He was even arrested and deported. He was sent home after carrying guns, defrauding Social Security, committing burglary, trespassing, even pretending to be an American citizen.

But the border of Texas and Mexico is no border at all for this killer. He was only arrested for murder after he claimed the lives of nine American citizens. His first known murder victim was beaten to death just 2 years after his last deportation. The victim's girlfriend was raped and beaten, but she survived and was found near railroad tracks.

These deadly illegal invaders knew what they were doing, but they are not the only ones to track northward leaving a trail of trouble. Their bold and brazen border crossings and thousands of others like them mean 12 legal citizens will be murdered today, tomorrow, and every day.

Lawlessness on the border breeds lawlessness in the heart of America. And 13 legal citizens will die because a drunk illegal got behind the wheel of a car. That occurs today, and tomorrow, and every day. That is 28,000 homicides by illegals since 2003, 10 times the number of U.S. soldiers killed in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. And there is more. Eight children will be sexually abused by illegal perverts who will cross the line, cross over our open borders. That is today, that is tomorrow, and it is every day. Lawless on the border breeds lawlessness in the heart of America.

Not all illegal immigrants are criminals. But some are. And when all cross the border, they break the law with their first step on American soil. And their first crime may not be their last.

Mr. Speaker, they are not just trespassing on our soil, they are laughing at our laws. They are violating our values. They are shattering our safety. Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. It must be stopped with a sealed border, and a common sense immigration process that puts America first.

And to the pandering politicians who prefer a plan of patronizing the illegals to the detriment of citizens and illegal immigrants, shame on you for your un-American policy. That's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### RECOGNIZING BILLY CASPER

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise today to talk about an American hero, a hero from San Diego, California, Billy Casper, one of the great athletes to ever stride the greens and fairways of America's golf courses and compete in national and international tournaments with a great successful record, but also one of the greatest family men and greatest husbands, greatest father, greatest grandfathers who ever had a family in San Diego or helped a community or did all of the great things that Billy Casper has done.

I have got my friend, Mr. ISSA, to talk with me a little bit about Billy Casper. But Billy Casper was a great golfer. And he is celebrating, we are celebrating here, his first victory which was the LaBatt Open in Canada. I think he was 22 years old at the time.

I think he had at that time had married Shirley, who was his high school sweetheart from Chula Vista, and he followed that victory, the LaBatt Open, with some 50 more PGA professional victories, including two U.S. Opens and a Masters.

You know, people once said, Mr. Speaker, I know you coming from Long Beach, and then ultimately the entire State of California as our former Attorney General, you knew about Billy Casper, because he was a guy who was

called by Johnny Miller, as the guy who had the greatest set of hands in golf, meaning one of the greatest touches.

He had what I think is the most memorable come-from-behind victory in the history of major golf in 1966, when he demonstrated those great hands when he was 7 shots behind the great Arnold Palmer in the closing 9 holes of the U.S. Open, 1966, playing at Olympic Country Club in San Francisco, and Billy Casper closed out with a 32 on the back 9 at Olympic, which is nearly miraculous.

He tied Arnold Palmer and he beat him the next day in a playoff with a 69. Now, they had The Big Three of Golf, Mr. Speaker. It was called Player, Palmer and Nicklaus. They needed the Big Three because between 1964 and 1970, they needed all three of their tournament victories added together to have more than Billy Casper because he had 4 more victories during that period than the great Jack Nicklaus, and he had more victories than Arnie and Gary Player together.

It is neat to be here with Mr. ISSA from San Diego and talk about this American hero, this San Diego sports hero, Billy Casper.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I know you join with Mr. HUNTER and myself in recognizing the importance of California, and particularly San Diego as the golf club production and design capital of America. But a club is just what it sounds like unless you put it in the hands of somebody like Billy Casper, somebody who can do what Duncan Hunter cannot do, and I guarantee I cannot do with a club and that is make it send a ball straight and true or hook it if you need to hook it to make that special shot. Billy Casper had that talent, used that talent and was a great ambassador for our country here and around the world. I think it is very appropriate that we honor him here on the floor of the House tonight.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank Mr. ISSA for his contribution here, because Billy Casper has not only touched the hearts or touch the minds and memories of lots of sports writers and people who read those sports pages when he was amassing those 51 professional victories, but he touched the hearts of so many young people. And he and Shirley, his wonderful wife, have hearts as big as the 18th green at San Diego Country Club, and they have touched the lives of literally thousands and thousands of young people through the scholarship funds that they put together, through all the help they put together through Billy's annual tournament.

If you walk up to Billy Casper on the golf course, here is a guy who won a couple U.S. Opens and the Masters and a guy who lives in this era where sports idols charge money for their autographs. Billy Casper will stop what he is doing, he will look you in the eye,

and if you are a young person he will really pay a lot of attention to you. He and Shirley are absolutely the greatest examples of what families should be like in this country. So it is neat to be here with my great colleague Darryl Issa and talk a little bit about this American hero, Billy Casper.

□ 2310

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

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

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

(Mr. MCHENRY 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 Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL 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 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 NORTH CAROLINA'S BEEKEEPERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the many of the hard working beekeepers in North Carolina's fifth congressional district. Beekeepers play an extremely important role in our society and often do not get the recognition they deserve.

Back in 1905, an obscure Swiss patent clerk named Albert Einstein published three papers that would later result in his receiving the Nobel Prize. During that same year, he gave a speech on a subject that fascinated him greatly, the marvelous honey bee. He said, "If the bee disappeared off the surface of the globe, then man would only have four years left to live."

Back then, much like it is today, the survival of the honey bee was threatened by pests and climate. The honey bee survived the challenges of Dr. Einstein's time but new obstacles have also emerged. Despite these challenges I am sure that Dr. Einstein would be happy to know that the honey bee is alive and well in North Carolina.

Next year the North Carolina State Bee Keeping Association celebrates its 90th year of helping local beekeepers succeed. I am happy to report that the association has seen a 58 percent increase in membership in just the past 2 years and now has more than 1,900 dues paying members. The organization is run entirely by volunteers without a single full time paid staff member. It is the largest bee keeping association of its kind in the Nation and some folks tell me the best.

According to Dr. David Tarpy, North Carolina State Agriculturist and head of the agricultural program at North Carolina State University, there are some 10,000 hobbyist beekeepers in North Carolina. I am proud of our North Carolina beekeepers and I want to tell you why. But first perhaps we should answer a basic question. Why do so many grown men and women fawn over this tiny insect and weighs less than an ounce and is so small it can rest on your fingernail? The answer reveals the secret of why so many are so passionate about their apiary hobby.

If you call the office in the North Carolina Department of Agriculture that works with beekeepers, you will be greeted by the words, "beneficial insects." After all, the honey bee is one of God's most beneficial creatures. She makes sweet honey that mankind has enjoyed for most of his time on the planet. The 100,000 colonies of bees managed by North Carolina beekeepers produce some \$10 million worth of honey, almost all of which is consumed within the State. Some say our honey, especially the wonderful sourwood honey produced in the mountains, is just too good to send away.

The honey bee also pollinates 90 or more important food crops, a third of all the food we eat. Without proper pollination, many of these crops would not produce fruit. The value of honey bee pollination to North Carolina agriculture exceeds \$100 million and is growing. Cucumbers are ninety percent dependent on honey bee pollination, blueberries 80 percent. Apples, melons and many vegetables are also dependent on the honey bee.

There is much more to this little bee than the delicious honey they make and even crops they pollinate. Modern medicine is returning to the old ways and rediscovering the practical use of many products from the hive in preventing and curing disease. Honey was used to treat burns and minor wounds by the ancient Greek, Chinese, Roman and Egyptian civilizations. The jelly that worker bees use to grow their new baby queens is a highly valued and expensive cosmetic. Pure beeswax makes wonderful candles and is a reliable industrial grade lubricant. There is much anecdotal evidence that bee venom is an effective remedy for arthritis and multiple sclerosis. And most recently, sticky, resinous propolis from the hive, once considered a nuisance is now the subject of a major cancer treatment research project at Wake Forest University.

Speaker after speaker at the annual beekeeping conferences tell us that North Carolina has the best State wide organization of beekeepers in the entire Nation. Many people in many organizations deserve credit for this success.

In 1975 Dr. John Ambrose came to work for North Carolina State University as an extension bee keeping specialist. Dr. Ambrose led an important era of growth for beekeeping in North Carolina, expanding the position to a major teaching and research position that is now held by Dr. Tarp. This position is one of the best of its kind in the entire Nation.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture bee labs also play an important role in finding and developing new ways to protect of the honey bee.

J.D. Foust has been president of the North Carolina association of Beekeepers for the past 3 years and has led the organization through its fastest growth ever. Brady Mullinax of Forsyth County, has been a stalwart in the organization for more than half a century. Steve and Sandy Forrest, proprietor of Brushy Mountain Bee Farm in Wilkesboro, have build a thriving business out of supplying beekeepers with equipment and supplies and are now the third largest beekeeping supplier in the entire Nation.

The typical beekeeper in North Carolina not unlike the solitary yeoman farmer who, with an ax and hoe, carved North Carolina's vast agri-business economy from the wilderness that once swept from the Atlantic and Mississippi River. He takes his chances and usually at the end of another season, there is sufficient honey for him to sell at his roadside stand and leave enough for the bees to survive another winter.

For many beekeepers in my district the honey they produce is their Christmas money and an important part of their annual disposable income. I am proud of our beekeepers, for they are the residual spirit of the early pioneers who built this country on little more than strong backs and a desire to be free.

If Albert Einstein was correct in his fear that the survival of mankind depends in large part on the survival of the honey bee, I am confident that the honey bee is in safe hands among so many North Carolina passionate beekeepers.

□ 2320

HONORING JUDGE WILLIAM M. STEGER

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this week, America, Texas and East Texas mourn the loss of Federal District Court Judge William Merritt Steger.

As former law clerk and good friend Andy Tindel said, "Judge Steger was

one of the finest, fairest, most honest man I have ever had the privilege of practicing law before."

While Bill Steger was studying prelaw, the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. And within 24 hours the 21-year-old had withdrawn from Baylor University and volunteered for service. The Dallas native has always wanted the opportunity to become a pilot, and with the Nation entering World War II, he took a chance.

On November 9, 1942, he got his wings. Then after training he was sent to Casablanca and flew 56 combat missions for which he received an air medal and four oak leaf clusters.

While later training other pilots, Captain Steger also tested the first U.S. jet airplanes.

Once his Nation was secure, Bill Steger went back to school and received his law degree from Southern Methodist University, that is, their law school.

He married his wife, Ann Hollandsworth Steger, on Valentine's Day in 1948. They had one child, the late Merritt Reed Steger, who was one of my younger brother David's closest friends.

Judge Steger entered and engaged in private practice in Longview and Tyler and headed up numerous east Texas campaign clubs for Dwight D. Eisenhower for President. After the election, President Eisenhower appointed Judge Steger in 1953 to the position of U.S. attorney for East Texas at the young age of 32.

In 1960, he and a good friend debated which one should run for governor and which one should run for senator. Their goal was to bring the Republican party into popularity in the State of Texas. Because Texas was conservative, it seemed to Judge Steger that it would be a good fit, but he was blazing a trail. He ended up being the one to run for governor against a very popular John Connally, and Judge Steger's good friend John Tower ran for senator. The Republican party had never before then received enough votes to hold a primary, and though Judge Steger knew he would not win the race, he hoped he would get the requisite 200,000 votes so the Republican party could hold a primary in the next election. Judge Steger actually received more than 600,000 votes.

In 1962, Judge Steger was persuaded to run for Congress and received 49 percent of the vote, lacking only 1,300 votes to beat his Democratic opponent who was the incumbent.

Bill Steger became a Federal district judge for the Eastern District of Texas in December of 1970 after President Richard Nixon nominated him. He truly loved being a jurist, and he was a hardworking, dedicated, cerebral, no-nonsense, constitutional constructionist judge whose discerning intellect could always cut straight to the heart of any issue.

In 1987, Judge Steger assumed senior active status duty, but since then still

continued to handle a full docket. December 1, 2005, marked 35 years on the Federal bench for Judge Steger, and since his appointment in 1970, he had handled more than 15,000 cases.

Judge Steger received the Justinian Award May 7, 2004, at the annual Tyler Law Day luncheon for his community service, legal ethics and professionalism.

He was a Baptist, a charter member and a deacon of Green Acres Baptist Church, helping to nurse it through its early days of going from nonexistent to its current 12,000 members. He was a confidant for me, a friend and a wise sounding board.

He and Ann endured the worst heart-ache a couple can face in the loss of their only child, Reed, in a tragic scuba diving accident, but the manner in which Judge Steger dealt with such devastation and allowed his faith, God's help, and Ann's companionship to help overcome the horrendous blow will help inspire me the rest of my life.

Judge Steger was a heroic patriot; a caring father; a loving husband; an even-handed, clear-thinking, constitutionally reverent judge; a personal mentor; and a cherished friend whom I came to know through my brother 25 to 30 years ago.

Always having had the courage of his convictions despite the odds against him, Judge Steger was and is a profile in courage whose memory will continue to inspire me the rest of my life.

God bless the Stegers and God bless America.

REMEMBERING NORMANDY

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleague from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to recognize that it is now the 61st year to remember Normandy, to remember that special time when the world waited and hoped that the allies, led by the United States, dominated by the United States, would free Europe, the European mainland, from the effects of fascism, the effects of allowing a petty dictator to build an Army and begin expanding his borders.

Mr. Speaker, I find it particularly appropriate that just a week ago at the Memorial Day commemoration at Mt. Soledad in San Diego where Congressman HUNTER and I both live, we were faced with the exact same situation that we see in Normandy: crosses. We were faced looking at a memorial that remembers all of our fallen heroes from previous wars that was put there because of our fallen heroes of the Korean War and now is in jeopardy of being taken away because somebody says that if it is in the shape of a cross, it must by definition be a religious statement.

My colleague and I, I believe, are here tonight to remember Normandy and remember those many crosses that we have seen across the land and above the cliffs of Normandy and remember that those crosses do not stand for Jesus Christ or for religion. Those crosses stand for the men and women buried below.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my colleague, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I think it is appropriate to recall the days of Normandy.

The gentleman said those days when the world waited to find out whether or not that very difficult mission would be successful, and you know, the theme I think that we should take from Normandy or the message from Normandy was that our soldiers came not to conquer but to liberate. That is consistent with the American theme throughout the last century, and it is consistent with the theme that is being carried out by about 130,000 men and women in the sands of the Iraqi desert right now.

And that is, that all the wars that we fought in the last century, wars in which we lost 619,000 Americans killed in action on the battlegrounds and the oceans and the airways of the various wars, we did not conquer, we did not covet land. When we won the Spanish American War, we gave back Cuba and the Philippines, gave them their freedom. When we went to save Europe the first time, we gave back all that ground that had been hard won by the Marines at Bellawood and by the U.S. Army and so many difficult battles. In World War II, having liberated Europe a second time in that century, we gave back all that land that had been so dearly won.

And today, in Iraq, we are not engaged in military operations so that we can somehow derive material benefits from that country or somehow enslave the inhabitants of that country and turn them toward our political benefit and our economic benefit.

We do it because we think that it is in the interests of the United States to spread freedom, to change the world, and I think lots of Americans understand that if we do not change the world, the world is going to change us.

Those heroes who have won now some 45,000 Bronze Stars for meritorious service and for valor in the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan I think are every bit as courageous and, in many cases, are related to and the descendants of those incredible people who climbed the cliffs at Normandy and went up those beaches.

Some of those landing craft opened up and the Americans were machine gunned before they could get out of the craft, and there were men bobbing in those waves, some of them dead before they hit the water. Others got to the beach and went down, and you can see the dramatic newsreels that show

Americans falling as they are taking that beach, and then still others got to the base of the cliffs, and then some scaled those cliffs.

Of course, we had others that came in, paratroopers, some of whom landed in dug-in positions that the enemy had established and were killed before their chutes could reach the ground. Others that went in in gliders, not an avocation that is conducive to longevity, and others simply went in the old-fashioned way, but they went in for freedom. They went in for America, and they liberated, and that is the theme of Normandy.

I thank my colleague for yielding this time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and I thank the Speaker for the opportunity to remind the world that the only land we ever covet are the small plots around the world in which we bury our dead.

□ 2330

#### THE DEBT, THE DEFICIT, AND THE FUTURE OF THE COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for half the time remaining before midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I rise on behalf of the 37-member strong fiscally conservative democratic Blue Dog coalition. We are 37 fiscally conservative Democrats that are united in the name of fiscal discipline and common sense. We are very concerned about the debt, the deficit, and the future of this country that we are leaving for our children and grandchildren.

As you can see right here, today, the United States national debt is \$3,369,917,837,082 and some change. And if we divide that number by every man, woman, and child, including those being born today, everyone in America's share, including the children, amounts to about \$28,000. It is what we call the debt tax, D-E-B-T, and that is one tax that cannot go away until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Because, Mr. Speaker, you see, our Nation is spending about \$5 billion a day not paying principal but simply paying interest on the national debt. One half billion dollars a day. Give me 3 days' interest on the national debt and I can build Interstate 69 through Arkansas. Give me another 3 days' interest on the national debt and I can complete Interstate 49 in Arkansas. Give me less than a day's interest on the national debt, and I can complete the Hot Springs Expressway. Give me less than a day's interest on the national debt, and I can complete I-530 through Arkansas. Give me a couple days' interest on the national debt and I can make the Red River navigable all

the way up to Fulton, Arkansas, at Interstate 30.

It is these type of priorities that can create economic opportunities and jobs for our people that will continue to go unmet until our Nation, until this Republican Congress gets its fiscal house in order.

You will find these posters, Mr. Speaker, that change daily. Unfortunately, the number continues to increase daily. But you will find these posters by the door to every one of the 37 members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog coalition. You will find this by our doors in the halls of Congress because we want America to know. We want America to know that this reckless spending, this reckless spending that has been provided to us under the leadership of this Republican Congress must stop.

You know, this is the first time in well over 50 years that the Republicans have controlled the White House, the House, and the Senate. And what have they given us? They have given us failure after failure. They failed in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. They failed with their energy policy. They have failed with their war policy in Iraq. They have failed with their Medicare prescription drug plan implementation. And they have failed by giving us the largest deficit ever in our Nation's history for a fifth year in a row.

The projected deficit for fiscal year 2007? You will hear a lot of people say it is \$350 billion. Not so. The real deficit for fiscal year 2007 is \$545 billion. Because, you see, when the Republican leadership tells you the deficit is \$350 billion, and that is bad enough, it is one of the largest deficits ever in our Nation's history, but the reality is when they say it is \$350 billion, they are counting the money that they are borrowing from the Social Security Trust Fund. Without the Social Security Trust Fund, the real deficit projected for fiscal year 2007 is \$545 billion.

The first bill I filed when I got to Congress was a bill to tell the politicians in Washington to keep their hands off the Social Security Trust Fund. Now I am beginning to understand why the Republican leadership refused to give me a hearing or a vote on this bill, because today they are using the Social Security Trust Fund to help pay for this reckless spending, this deficit spending.

But this is not new. In fiscal year 2006, the deficit was \$372 billion. In 2005, it was \$318 billion. In 2004, it was \$412 billion. In fact, this Republican administration, this Republican Congress has given us a deficit every year since 2002. It is hard now to believe that we had a balanced budget in this country from 1998 through 2001, but we did.

And why is this important? Why is this important? The total national debt from 1789 until 2000 was \$5.67 trillion. But by 2010, the total national debt will have increased to a whopping \$10.88 trillion. Mr. Speaker, this is a doubling, a doubling of the 211-year

debt in just 10 years. Interest payments on this debt are one of the fastest growing parts of the Federal budget, and the debt tax, D-E-B-T, is one tax that cannot be repealed.

The current national debt: \$8,369,917,837,082 and some change. Each individual's share of the national debt, including every man, woman, and child alive tonight, is somewhere around \$28,000. Well, the average household income in my district is not much more than that, Mr. Speaker. Yet it would take that amount of money from every living man, woman, and child in this country to wipe out this national debt.

It is time for this Republican Congress to stop this reckless spending. It is time for this Republican Congress to address our Nation and its spending habits with a good dose of common sense.

Now, why do deficits matter? Deficits reduce economic growth. They burden our children and grandchildren with liabilities. We spend today, and it is our children and grandchildren that get stuck with the bills. They increase our reliance on foreign lenders, who now own about 40 percent of our debt. That is right, this President and this Republican Congress has borrowed more money from foreign central banks and foreign investors in the past 5½ years than the previous 42 presidents combined.

The U.S. is becoming increasingly dependent on foreign lenders. Foreign lenders currently hold a total of about \$2 trillion of our Nation's public debt. Compare this to only \$23 billion in foreign holdings back in 1993.

So who do we owe all this money to? The top ten current lenders are: Japan. We have borrowed, our Nation has borrowed, this Republican Congress and this Republican administration has borrowed \$640.1 billion from Japan. China, \$321.4 billion.

As my friend John Tanner has pointed out, if China decides to invade Taiwan, we will have to borrow more money from China to defend Taiwan. This is a dangerous path that we are going down as a Nation, owing all this money to foreign central banks and foreign investors.

The United Kingdom. We have borrowed, our Nation has borrowed \$179.5 billion from the United Kingdom. OPEC. And we wonder why gasoline is approaching three bucks a gallon. Our Nation has borrowed \$98 billion from OPEC. Korea, \$72.4 billion. Taiwan, \$68.9 billion. The Caribbean banking centers, \$61.7 billion. Hong Kong, \$46.6 billion. Germany, \$46.5 billion.

And Mexico. Imagine that, our Nation has borrowed \$40.1 billion from Mexico. To do what? To finance the war in Iraq, to finance tax cuts for those earning over \$400,000 a year. And the list goes on and on.

□ 2340

Again, our national debt is \$8,369,917,837,082 and some change, and this is just a small sampling of where

\$2 trillion of that debt has come from. It has come from foreign central banks and foreign investors.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any questions or comments or concerns about what I am talking about tonight as it relates to the debt and the deficit and trying to restore some common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government, I invite you to e-mail us at BlueDog@mail.house.gov. Again, there are 37 members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. Our mission is to restore some common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government.

Again, Mr. Speaker, if you have any comments, questions or concerns to raise with us, I would encourage you to e-mail us at BlueDog@mail.house.gov.

I do not raise these issues to simply beat up the Republicans. They are doing a pretty good job of that on their own these days. Public opinion polls indicate that. There is an all-time low approval rating with their leadership in this House and the Senate, with the White House and the Supreme Court.

But I raise these issues to set the stage for the Blue Dog 12-point reform plan. We have a 12-point plan for curing our Nation's addiction to deficit spending.

Number one, require a balanced budget. Forty-nine States require a balanced budget. I know at the Ross home in Prescott, Arkansas, my wife requires us to have a balanced budget. I do not believe it is asking too much of our Nation to have a balanced budget.

Number two, do not let Congress buy on credit. Every time a Member of Congress comes down here and wants to introduce legislation to fund a new program, they should have to show us which program they are going to cut to fund that new program.

Put a lid on spending. This Republican Congress just from 2001 to 2003, their government spending soared by 16 percent. We want to put strict spending caps to slow the growth of runaway government programs.

Number four, require agencies to put their fiscal houses in order. According to the Government Accounting Office, 16 of 23 major Federal agencies cannot issue a simple audit of their books. Worse, the Federal Government cannot account for \$24.5 billion it spent back in 2003. This is the kind of leadership this Republican Congress has given America. Government auditors should be doing a better job of tracking taxpayer dollars. We want to restore accountability to our government.

Number five, make Congress tell taxpayers how much they are spending. Many spending bills slide through Congress on a voice vote with no debate, and many Members vote on bills without knowing their true cost. The Blue Dog Coalition proposes that any bills calling for more than \$50 million in new spending must be put to a roll call vote.

Set aside a rainy day fund. That is common sense. We all know we are

going to be faced with unexpected happenings and disasters.

Do not hide votes to raise the debt limit. We should have a separate stand-alone vote when this Republican Congress proposes raising the debt limit instead of hiding it in another bill.

Justify spending for pet projects.

And ensure that Congress reads the bills it is voting on. Now we cannot do that, but think about this, over the past few years, some of the largest spending bills in American history have been voted on after only a few hours of consideration. For example, the Medicare prescription drug bill, remember that one, now estimated to cost \$720 billion or more over the next 10 years, went to a vote barely a day after the final version of the 500-plus-page bill was made available to Members of Congress.

As members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we propose that Members of Congress should be given a minimum of 3 days to have the final text of legislation made available to them before there is a vote.

Require honest cost estimates for every bill that Congress votes on.

Make sure new bills fit the budget. That is why we have a budget.

Finally, make Congress do a better job of keeping tabs on government programs. Again, getting back to the word "accountability."

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not here tonight to simply lay blame on this Republican leadership for the largest deficit ever in our Nation's history. I am here to offer up a plan, the Blue Dog Coalition's 12-point reform plan, for curing our Nation's addiction to deficit spending.

#### OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for the remaining time before midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to take these few short moments and bring a little more positive perspective, a brighter outlook, and hopefully a little more unifying message than we have just heard and, frankly, than we often hear in the United States House Chamber, especially by some of my good friends from the other side of the aisle.

We call this the Official Truth Squad. I thank the leadership and the conference for allowing me to come and share a few words tonight.

The Official Truth Squad grew out of a frustration on the part of the freshmen class of the Republican Conference. We all were elected in 2004, 24 strong, now 26 of us here in the United States House of Representatives. After a relatively few number of months, we grew frustrated with the fact that there was a lot of misinformation and a lot of distortion and a lot of frankly

deception that was going on here. And so what we wanted to do was to put together a group of folks that would come to the House floor and try as best we could to provide some truth, some facts to the situations that we address here in the United States House of Representatives.

We have just gotten back, Mr. Speaker, from a week at home, a district work period, over the Memorial Day week. I heard from constituent after constituent about two big issues. One was illegal immigration, obviously the largest issue we have to deal with as a Nation right now. But the second one in meeting after meeting after meeting with constituent after constituent all across my district on the north side of Atlanta was people asking why on earth is Congress so divided. Why is it so partisan? Why do you have the kind of sniping that goes on? And I am loathe to answer that question because it is so difficult to understand why there are many in this Chamber who are not interested in working positively or productively together. It just boggles my mind.

These are not Democrat problems or Republican problems, Mr. Speaker; these are American problems. And American problems deserve a united Congress working together.

So what you have just heard in the last 15 minutes is an individual who will tell you that, quote, "this is a Republican Congress problem." Well, Mr. Speaker, we do better if we work together. The fact is that it is extremely difficult to get anything moving forward positively in Congress without the support of many different folks. And so we work better when we work together.

What you hear so often is what I call the politics of division. The politics of division is so destructive, they do a disservice to every single one of us in this Nation.

I tried to put some words to the consequences of the politics of division, and I think I have found a quote. I have shared it with you before, Mr. Speaker, and it comes from the Reverend William Boetcker, who was a philosopher and leader around the time of the late 19th century and early 20th century. He described what he said was a social philosophy and he attributed it to Abraham Lincoln. Nobody can actually determine whether President Lincoln actually said these words, but Reverend Boetcker talked about them, and I think they crystallize and capture my concern, my suspicion about what the consequences are of this politics of division that is so destructive.

□ 2350

He said, "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You can't help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer, you cannot encourage the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred, and you cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of crystallizes, I think, what is a unifying American philosophy. It is a philosophy that would serve us extremely well here in the United States House of Representatives.

How often do you hear people just castigate out individuals who are more wealthy than others, destroying the rich in an effort to build up the poor. It doesn't work that way, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't work that way. Our system never has. Our system never has done that.

And so the Official Truth Squad tries to bring some credibility and truth to these discussions. We have adopted a motto which is a quote from a wonderful United States Senator, Daniel Patrick Moynihan from the State of New York. And this quote, I think, makes it so that everybody has to be held accountable. And what Senator Moynihan said is that everyone is entitled to their opinion. And they are, and opinions are here in the countless number. Everyone's entitled to their opinion, but they're not entitled to their own facts. Everyone's entitled to their opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts, which is why it is so, frankly, troubling, Mr. Speaker, that the Blue Dog group gets up here night after night, week after week and talks about how they want to be fiscally responsible.

You know, we used to say that folks who were politicians that said one thing at home and did something different in Washington weren't being responsive to their constituents. Well, the Blue Dogs have perfected the art of saying one thing in Washington and doing another thing in Washington. And we will use some facts, Mr. Speaker. Here are some facts. You want to talk about facts? During the fiscal year 2006 budget, this was the plan of the Blue Dogs and the Democrats. Instead of being responsible about spending, they offered programs that would have spent 21.5 more billion dollars. You didn't hear that from folks on the other side of the aisle. That is the truth, Mr. Speaker. That is the truth.

How many in new taxes? \$54 billion in new taxes. Talk to me now about what the truth is and what is being proposed and what is being said in Washington and what is being voted on in Washington and what is being said back home.

How many mandatory savings? The Republican conference, all on their own, in a very difficult way, because we got no cooperation from folks who will tell you one thing at home, in fact, they will tell you one thing, that same thing in Washington, but they will do exactly the opposite. We gained \$40 billion this savings with the Deficit Reduction Act.

Earlier this year, how much mandatory savings on the part of the other side? Zero. Zero, Mr. Speaker. That is the truth. That is a fact. That is not opinion. That is a fact.

The bills that they brought forward, the Blue Dogs, my good colleague just

before me, talked about wanting a balanced budget. We have given them an opportunity to vote on a balanced budget. In fact, we did so just 3 or 4 weeks ago here on the floor of the House of Representatives. Not a single one of those 37 Blue Dogs voted in favor of that balanced budget. Not one.

They talk about making certain that you pay as you go, that you only pay for programs that you have the money for. We have offered that on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker. We do not get the support of the Blue Dogs.

They talk about having a rainy day fund. Doesn't it make wonderful sense to have a rainy day fund because we know year after year after year we will have emergencies like Katrina or other emergencies. There is an average of \$20 billion annually where there are emergencies that need Federal money during the course of any given year on average. \$20 billion.

So what does the Republican Congress propose that we are being accused of doing? In fact, what we do propose is a rainy day fund in the budget that we just adopted for fiscal year 2007. How many Members of the Blue Dog, how many of those 37 Blue Dogs voted in favor of that rainy day fund? Mr. Speaker, not one. Not one. Same number that we got when we talk about the mandatory savings. Zero. Not one of them support it.

I want to talk about a little positive information about this economy because you won't, you may not hear about it on the nightly news. You may not read about it in your newspapers. You certainly won't hear about it from some folks who want to make certain that they practice this politics of division and this politics of deception.

Did you see the new job figures, Mr. Speaker, last month, the month of May? 75,000 new jobs created. And this economy, over the past 12 months has created 1.9 million new jobs. 1.9 million new jobs. More than 5.3 million new jobs since August of 2003.

The unemployment rate has fallen to 4.6 percent, lower than the average of the 60s, 70s, 80s and 90s.

Mr. Speaker, a picture oftentimes says it so much better than any of us can, so let me see if I can show you the picture of that kind of job growth that we have seen over the past 3 years. Here it is on a graph. Here we are in January 2002 with unemployment up at about 5.7 to 8 percent. Here is the job growth at that time. And then on the bottom, we have the number of months going by. We haven't even gotten to this month. But earlier this year, what has happened to the unemployment rate? It has gone down, Mr. Speaker. What's happened to the job growth? It has gone up significantly. Again, 5.3 million new jobs since August of 2003.

So the curious individual, the individual who wanted to solve problems and work positively and productively on behalf of the American people would say well, what happened when this seemed to change, when unemployment

rates began to go down, when the job growth began to go up? What happened? What occurred there?

Well, lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, you know what happened. We had tax decreases, appropriate tax decreases, responsible tax decreases. By making certain that Americans got to keep more of their own money, and when you allow Americans to keep more of their own money, what happens? They spend it and they save it in wise ways and then the economy flourishes. So because of the tax policies of this Congress, of this Congress, and this administration, we have seen increasing job growth and decreasing unemployment.

What else about the economy is going on? Revised reports show the fastest real gross domestic product growth in over 2½ years in the first quarter. Real GDP growth grew at an annual rate of 5.3 percent in the first quarter. Productivity increased at an annual rate of 3.7 percent in the first quarter. Hourly compensation, real hourly compensation rose at a 3.2 annual percentage rate in the first quarter. Personal income increased at an annual rate of 6.7 percent in April. Since January of 2001, real after tax income has risen by 12.9 percent. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because of tax policies, appropriate responsible tax policies put in place by this Congress, this administration, this leadership. And oftentimes, in spite of what you hear at home, and in spite of what you hear by my friends on the other side of the aisle, oftentimes, more often than not, frankly, without a single individual helping on that side of the aisle.

In fact, they come down and they say these tax decreases, the tax reductions will destroy the economy, will throw people out on the streets. But, Mr. Speaker, you know what happens. What happens is that unemployment goes down, job growth goes up, and in fact, sometimes they will even say that at 1 minute and then they will vote for the same thing that they just said was awful, just said was awful just a moment before that.

Mr. Speaker, truth is so doggone important in the public discourse. Remember, you can have your own opinions, but you are not welcome to your own facts. You have got to talk about facts. And that is why the Official Truth Squad takes the opportunity as often as possible to come down here and talk about facts, talk about facts with the American people because the politics of division again, does a disservice to every single American.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a glorious Nation, a wonderful Nation, a Nation that is still seen by men and women around the world as a beacon of liberty and a repository of hope. I am proud to serve in the United States House of Representatives and to have the opportunity to share a positive, productive perspective and vision with my colleagues, and I hope that we can be joined by more and more colleagues on both sides of the aisle as we work to

solve the incredible challenges that we have before us as a Nation. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of primary elections.

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a family illness.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. WOOLSEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mrs. BONO (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for the week of June 6 on account of her son's graduation from high school.

Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending his son's high school graduation.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROSS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. FOXX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, June 7.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today and June 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and June 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. BLUNT, for 5 minutes, June 13.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today and June 7 and 8.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, June 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 12 and 13.

Mr. SODREL, for 5 minutes, June 7.

Mr. ISSA, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2784. An act to award a congressional gold medal to Tenzin Gyatso, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, in recognition of his many enduring and outstanding contributions to peace, non-violence, human rights, and religious understanding; to the Committee on Financial Services.

S. 3322. An act to build operational readiness in civilian agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1953. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Old Mint at San Francisco, otherwise known as the "Granite Lady", and for other purposes.

H.R. 3829. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Muskogee, Oklahoma, as the Jack C. Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

H.R. 5401. An act to amend section 308 of the Lewis and Clark Expedition Bicentennial Commemorative Coin Act to make certain clarifying and technical amendments.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1235. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and extend housing, insurance, outreach, and benefits programs provided under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to improve and extend employment programs for veterans under laws administered by the Secretary of Labor, and for other purposes.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on May 25, 2006, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 5037. To amend titles 38 and 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain demonstrations at cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration and at Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 7, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7767. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on U.S. military personnel and U.S. individual civilians retained as contractors involved in supporting Plan Colombia, pursuant to Public Law 106-246, section 3204 (f) (114 Stat. 577); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7768. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2005 through March 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7769. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7770. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7771. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7772. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7773. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7774. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7775. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7776. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7777. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7778. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received

April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7779. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7780. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7781. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7782. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7783. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7784. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 06-32, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on International Relations.

7785. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-386, "My Sister's Place, Inc. Grant Authority Temporary Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7786. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-387, "Disclosure of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Fatality Review Committee and Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Incident Management and Investigations Unit Information and Records Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7787. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-385, "National Guard Operations Coordination Temporary Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7788. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-383, "Tobacco Settlement Trust Fund and Tobacco Settlement Financing Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7789. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-382, "Closing of a Portion of S Street, S.E., a Portion of 13th Street, S.E., and Public Alleys in Squares 5600 and 5601, S.O. 04-11912, Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7790. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-381, "Organ and Tissue

Donor Registry Establishment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7791. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-384, "Closing of Public Streets and Alleys in Squares 702, 703, 704, 705, and 706 and in U.S. Reservation 247, S.O. 05-6318, Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7792. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7793. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7794. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7795. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7796. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7797. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7798. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7799. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7800. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7801. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7802. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7803. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7804. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7805. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7806. A letter from the Deputy CHCO/Director, OHCM, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7807. A letter from the Deputy CHCO/Director, HCM, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7808. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Secretary, White House Liaison, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7809. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Secretary, White House Liaison, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7810. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7811. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7812. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7813. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7814. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7815. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7816. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7817. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7818. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7819. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7820. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7821. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7822. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7823. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7824. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7825. A letter from the Associate Legal Counsel, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7826. A letter from the Executive Secretary/Chief of Staff, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7827. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Office of Executive Secretariat, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility of Arriving Aliens in Removal Proceedings to Apply for Adjustment of Status and Jurisdiction to Adjudicate Applications for Adjustment of Status [CIS No. 2387-06] [DHS Docket No. USCIS-2006-0010] (RIN: 1615-AB50) received May 18, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7828. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Wishkah River, WA [CGD13-05-040] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7829. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Maryland Swim for Life, Chester River, Chestertown, MD [CGD05-06-006] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7830. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, between Sandy Point and Kent Island, MD [CGD05-06-003] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7831. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Delaware River, Delaware City, DE [CGD05-06-035] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7832. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Chesapeake Bay; Correction [CGD05-05-130] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7833. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Martin Lagoon, Middle River, MD [CGD05-06-031] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7834. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Upper Mississippi River, Iowa and Illinois [CGD08-06-018] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7835. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Upper Mississippi River, Iowa and Illinois [CGD08-06-007] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7836. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Lake Washington Ship Canal, WA [CGD13-06-014] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7837. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Back Bay of Biloxi, Biloxi, MS [CGD08-06-015] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7838. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River, Chesapeake, VA [CGD05-06-041] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7839. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Potomac River, between Maryland and Virginia [CGD05-06-040] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7840. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Townsend Gut, Booth Bay and Southport, ME [CGD01-06-019] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7841. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Single Entry for Unassembled or Disassembled Entities Imported on Multiple Conveyances [CBP Dec. 06-11] (RIN: 1505-AB34) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## 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:

*[The following action occurred on May 26, 2006]*

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4411. A bill to prevent the use of certain payment instruments, credit cards, and fund transfers for unlawful Internet gambling; and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-412 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4127. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect computerized data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach; with an amendment (Rept. 109-453 Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

*[Pursuant to the order of the House on May 25, 2006 the following report was filed on June 1, 2006]*

Mr. LEWIS of California: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5521. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

*[The following reports were filed on June 2, 2006]*

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4127. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect computerized data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach; with amendments (Rept. 109-453 Pt. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARTON of Texas: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3997. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide for secure financial data, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 109-454, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

*[Pursuant to the order of the House on May 25, 2006 the following report was filed on June 5, 2006]*

Mr. KOLBE: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5522. A bill making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

*[Filed on June 6, 2006]*

Mr. BARTON of Texas: Committee on Energy and Commerce. Supplemental report on H.R. 5252. A bill to promote the deployment of broadband networks and services (Rept. 109-470 Pt. 2).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 849. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5521) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-487). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS of California: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Sub-allocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2007 (Rept. 109-488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARTON of Texas: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5126. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit manipulation of caller identifica-

tion information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

*[The following action occurred on May 26, 2006]*

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration H.R. 1071. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

*[The following action occurred on May 26, 2006]*

H.R. 921. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than June 30, 2006.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LINDER (for himself and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 5523. A bill to align the immigration laws of the United States with the Mexican General Population Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. REYES, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. SALAZAR):

H.R. 5524. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve health care for veterans in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 5525. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure that a Federal employee who takes leave without pay in order to perform service as a member of the uniformed services or member of the National Guard continues to receive pay in an amount which, when taken together with the pay and allowances such individual is receiving for such service, will be no less than the basic pay such individual would receive as a Federal employee if no interruption in employment had occurred; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland (for himself and Mr. GINGREY):

H.R. 5526. A bill to derive human pluripotent stem cell lines using techniques that do not knowingly harm embryos; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEY (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5527. A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to restructure mortgages and rental assistance for certain assisted multifamily housing; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 5528. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit Federal court jurisdic-

tion over State laws restricting pornography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself and Ms. HART):

H.R. 5529. A bill to amend United States trade laws to address more effectively import crises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5530. A bill to lengthen Daylight Savings Time; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5531. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to require the Federal Government to acquire not fewer than 50,000 plug-in hybrid electric vehicles; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. AKIN):

H.R. 5532. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for reassignment of certain Federal cases upon request of a party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 5533. A bill to prepare and strengthen the biodefenses of the United States against deliberate, accidental, and natural outbreaks of illness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself and Mr. FOSSELLA):

H.R. 5534. A bill to establish a grant program whereby moneys collected from violations of the corporate average fuel economy program are used to expand infrastructure necessary to increase the availability of alternative fuels; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5535. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to exclude foreign governmental entities from suing under the treble damages portion of its civil RICO provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 5536. A bill to implement the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative and other registered traveler programs of the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE (for herself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FORBES, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr.

GINGREY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HALL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKEON, Miss MCMORRIS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SODRELL, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.J. Res. 88. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MICA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. NEY, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. CARTER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 422. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Vigil for Lost Promise day; to the Committee on Government Reform. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Con. Res. 423. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of "A History, Committee on the Judiciary, United States House of Representatives, 1813-2006"; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. PETRI introduced a bill (H.R. 5537) to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to James Megellas, of Colleyville, Texas, for acts of valor on January 28, 1945, during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II; 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. 303: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 311: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 378: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 503: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 517: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 521: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 550: Mr. RUSH and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 558: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 615: Mr. OWENS and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 752: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 763: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 791: Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 857: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 874: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 886: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 899: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 997: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 998: Mr. JINDAL, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 1227: Mr. JINDAL.

H.R. 1248: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1298: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1376: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1384: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. EVERETT, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1424: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1425: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1447: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1494: Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 1507: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1517: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1554: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1574: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1634: Mr. RENZI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 1671: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. REYES, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1687: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1902: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2034: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2037: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2048: Mr. WAMP and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2052: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2053: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2072: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2131: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 2178: Ms. WATSON and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2237: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2429: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2617: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 2730: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 2793: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3198: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 3427: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3476: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3584: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3601: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 3762: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3861: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3883: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 3928: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 3957: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio and Ms. HART.

H.R. 3968: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 4025: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 4033: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SABO, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. NEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 4042: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 4059: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 4098: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 4188: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 4197: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 4222: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4259: Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 4315: Mr. MELANCON and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 4341: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 4347: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 4357: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 4384: Mr. EHLERS and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 4424: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 4434: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 4435: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 4479: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4517: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 4547: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CANTOR, and Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 4596: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 4597: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4695: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4747: Mr. RAHALL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. McCOTTER, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 4755: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4859: Mr. ISSA and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4873: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 4894: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4901: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 4903: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 4949: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 4974: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 4980: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 5005: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 5013: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 5022: Mr. BARROW, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 5023: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 5050: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 5056: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5106: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 5121: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 5126: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 5136: Mr. SALAZAR and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 5150: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BACA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 5159: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr.

BOUSTANY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 5185: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 5188: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 5189: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 5201: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 5216: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 5219: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 5225: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5230: Mr. MICA, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 5238: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 5247: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 5249: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 5254: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 5262: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 5273: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 5278: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 5310: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 5319: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 5321: Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 5330: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 5348: Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 5356: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 5357: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 5358: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 5365: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FORD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 5367: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 5371: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 5388: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 5396: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 5400: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 5425: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 5432: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 5444: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 5449: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. POMBO, Mr. CASE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 5452: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 5455: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 5463: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 5464: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. FEENEY.

H.R. 5465: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 5466: Mr. WYNN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 5499: Mr. BASS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 5509: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 5520: Mr. PEARCE and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 39: Mr. CANNON, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. PELOSI.

H. Con. Res. 137: Mrs. KELLY.

H. Con. Res. 154: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. FATTAH.

H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GOODE.

H. Con. Res. 348: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Con. Res. 368: Mr. PAYNE.

H. Con. Res. 380: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H. Con. Res. 409: Mr. EMANUEL and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Con. Res. 419: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 20: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H. Res. 222: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Res. 316: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H. Res. 318: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. HAYES.

H. Res. 526: Mr. MURPHY.

H. Res. 566: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. REICHERT.

H. Res. 603: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H. Res. 760: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Res. 773: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H. Res. 776: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. OTTER, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. PEARCE.

H. Res. 800: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. CANNON.

H. Res. 825: Mrs. CAPPAS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Res. 828: Mr. REHBERG.

H. Res. 838: Mr. BONNER and Mr. KILDEE.

H. Res. 844: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 846: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PAYNE.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4341. Mr. BOUCHER.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5521

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 44, insert after line 18 the following:

SEC. 211. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1 percent.