



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 2007

No. 1

House of Representatives

This being the day fixed by the 20th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and Public Law 109-447 for the meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members-elect of the 110th Congress met in their Hall, and at noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. Karen L. Haas.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Today is built upon all the yesterdays and contains the promise of all the tomorrows.

Lord God, You are the eternal author of all creation and every age. You are the same yesterday, today and forever. Be present to us now. Be gracious and bless all those duly elected by their districts who gather today to form the House of the people as the 110th Congress of the United States of America for the governance of our beloved Nation.

Together, may they know forthright debate and civil discourse, enact quality legislation and persevere in representing the diversity and the will of the people in addressing the priority issues facing the Nation today.

Bless the families of these Representatives, granting them forbearance and understanding of the public service implied by this undertaking.

Lord, may the 110th Congress of the United States read the signs of the times and seize this moment to create a history that will reflect the values of Your kingdom here on Earth and thereby unite this Nation and reveal to peoples around the world the dignity and the glory of being the free children of God. For to You be the honor, the glory and the power, now and forever. Amen.

At the request of the Honorable Nancy Pelosi, I am pleased to introduce the Reverend Stephen A. Privett, President of the University of San Francisco, for an additional prayer.

The Reverend Stephen A. Privett, President, University of San Francisco,

San Francisco, California, offered the following prayer:

I recall this morning the story of a poor mother of five children. When she was asked which of her children she loved the most, she did not answer the expected, "I love them all the same." Rather, she bent down and scooped up into her arms a young child with obviously crippling disabilities. "This one," she said, "because he needs me the most."

Let us pray:

God of compassion and mercy, we pray that the new leadership of this Congress and all of its Members will write into law the story of a country that measures its success by God's standard; by how well it cares for the weakest and most vulnerable among us.

We pray for the legislators of this 110th Congress, that they may challenge, inspire and lead us to put aside self-interest and pursue the common good of all the people of this great Nation of ours, especially of those "who need us the most." Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The CLERK. The Members-elect and their guests will please remain standing and join in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

The Clerk 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.

The CLERK. Members-elect, this is the day fixed by the 20th amendment to the Constitution and Public Law 109-447 for the meeting of the 110th Congress and, as the law directs, the Clerk of the House has prepared the official roll of the Representatives-elect.

Certificates of election covering 435 seats in the 110th Congress have been received by the Clerk of the House, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly

elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States or of the United States will be called.

The Representatives-elect will record their presence by electronic device and their names will be reported in alphabetical order by States, beginning with the State of Alabama, to determine whether a quorum is present.

Representatives-elect who have not obtained their voting ID cards may do so now in the Speaker's lobby.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Representatives-elect responded to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—435

ALABAMA

Aderholt	Cramer	Rogers
Bachus	Davis	
Bonner	Everett	

ALASKA

Young

ARIZONA

Flake	Grijalva	Renzi
Franks	Mitchell	Shadegg
Giffords	Pastor	

ARKANSAS

Berry	Ross
Boozman	Snyder

CALIFORNIA

Baca	Harman	Miller, Gary
Becerra	Herger	Miller, George
Berman	Honda	Napolitano
Bilbray	Hunter	Nunes
Bono	Issa	Pelosi
Calvert	Lantos	Radanovich
Campbell	Lee	Rohrabacher
Capps	Lewis	Roybal-Allard
Cardoza	Loftgren, Zoe	Royce
Costa	Lungren, Daniel	Sánchez, Linda
Davis	E.	T.
Doolittle	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Dreier	McCarthy	Schiff
Eshoo	McKeon	Sherman
Farr	McNerney	Solis
Filner	Millender-	Stark
Gallegly	McDonald	

□ 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.

H1

Tauscher Thompson	Waters Watson	Waxman Woolsey		MISSISSIPPI	Culberson Doggett Edwards Gohmert Gonzalez Granger Green, Al Green, Gene Hall	Hensarling Hinojosa Jackson-Lee Johnson, E.B. Johnson, Sam Lampson Marchant McCaul Neugebauer	Ortiz Paul Poe Reyes Rodriguez Sessions Smith Thornberry	
DeGette Lamborn Musgrave	COLORADO		Pickering Taylor	Thompson Wicker				
	Perlmutter Salazar Tancredo	Udall		MISSOURI	Clay Cleaver Emerson	Graves Hulshof Skelton		
Courtney DeLauro	CONNECTICUT		Akin Blunt Carnahan		MONTANA			
	Larson Murphy	Shays		Rehberg			UTAH	
	DELAWARE				NEBRASKA			
	Castle		Fortenberry	Smith	Terry		VERMONT	
	FLORIDA				NEVADA		VIRGINIA	
Bilirakis Boyd Brown, Corrine Brown-Waite, Ginny Buchanan Castor Crenshaw Diaz-Balart, L.	Diaz-Balart, M. Feeney Hastings Keller Klein Mack Mahoney Meek Mica	Miller Putnam Ros-Lehtinen Stearns Wasserman Schultz Weldon Wexler Young	Berkley	Heller	Porter	Boucher Cantor Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Tom	Drake Forbes Goode Goodlatte	Moran Scott Wolf
	GEORGIA		Hodes	Shea-Porter				WASHINGTON
Barrow Bishop Deal Gingrey Johnson	Kingston Lewis Linder Marshall Norwood	Price Scott Westmoreland		Andrews Ferguson Frelinghuysen Garrett Holt	LoBiondo Pallone Pascrell Payne Rothman	Saxton Sires Smith	Baird Dicks Hastings Inslee	Larsen McDermott McMorris Rodgers
	HAWAII				NEW HAMPSHIRE			WEST VIRGINIA
Abercrombie	Hirono		Pearce	Udall	Wilson		Capito	Mollohan Rahall
	IDAHO				NEW JERSEY			WISCONSIN
Sali	Simpson		Ackerman Arcuri Bishop Clarke Crowley Engel Fossella Gillibrand Hall Higgins	Hinchey Israel King Kuhl Lowey Maloney McCarthy McHugh McNulty Meeks	Nadler Rangel Reynolds Serrano Slaughter Townes Velázquez Walsh Weiner		Baldwin Kagen Kind	Moore Obey Petri
Bean Biggert Costello Davis Emanuel Gutierrez Hare	Hastert Jackson Johnson Kirk LaHood Lipinski Manzullo	Roskam Rush Schakowsky Shimkus Weller	Butterfield Coble Etheridge Foxy Hayes	Jones McHenry McIntyre Miller Myrick	Price Shuler Watt			RYAN Sensenbrenner
	ILLINOIS				NEW MEXICO			WYOMING
Burton Buyer Carson	Donnelly Ellsworth Hill	Pence Souder Visclosky			NEW YORK			Cubin
	IOWA				NORTH CAROLINA			□ 1232
Boswell Braley	King Latham	Loebsack	Boehner Chabot Gillmor Hobson Jones Jordan	Boren Cole	Fallin Lucas	Sullivan		
Boyda Moore	Moran Tiahrt				OHIO			
	KANSAS				NORTH DAKOTA			
Chandler Davis	Lewis Rogers	Whitfield Yarmuth	Blumenauer DeFazio	Hooley Walden				
Alexander Baker Boustany	Jefferson Jindal McCrary	Melancon			OKLAHOMA			
	KENTUCKY				OREGON			
Allen	Michaud		Altmire Brady Carney Dent Doyle English Fattah	Gerlach Holden Kanjorski Murphy, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murtha Peterson	Pitts Platts Schwartz Sestak Shuster			
Bartlett Cummins Gilchrest	Hoyer Ruppersberger Sarbanes	Van Hollen Wynn			PENNSYLVANIA			
	LOUISIANA				RHODE ISLAND			
Capuano Delahunt Frank Lynch	Markey McGovern Meehan Neal		Kennedy	Langevin				
	MAINE				SOUTH CAROLINA			
	Maryland		Barrett Brown	Clyburn Inglis	Spratt Wilson			
	MARYLAND				SOUTH DAKOTA			
					TENNESSEE			
	MASSACHUSETTS				TEXAS			
Camp Conyers Dingell Ehlers Hoekstra	Kildee Kilpatrick Knollenberg Levin McCotter	Miller Rogers Stupak Upton Walberg	Blackburn Cohen Cooper	Burgess Carter	Davis, David Davis, Lincoln Duncan	Gordon Tanner Wamp		
Bachmann Ellison Kline	McCollum Oberstar Peterson	Ramstad Walz	Barton Brady			Conaway Cuellar		

The CLERK. The quorum call discloses that 435 Representatives-elect have responded to their name. A quorum is present.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CLERK

The CLERK. Credentials, regular in form, have been received showing the election of the Honorable LUIS FORTUÑO as Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for a term of 4 years beginning January 3, 2005; the Honorable ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON as Delegate from the District of Columbia; the Honorable DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN as Delegate from the Virgin Islands; the Honorable ENI F.H. FALDOMAVEGA as Delegate from American Samoa; and the Honorable MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO as Delegate from Guam.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. Pursuant to law and precedent, the next order of business is the election of the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress.

Nominations are now in order.

The Clerk recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Clerk, as a father of three young children, I am particularly thrilled to be a part of this moment, thrilled that a generation of young girls and boys across America are about to witness another historic step in our Nation's march toward equality of opportunity. NANCY PELOSI's goal is a Congress known for its ideas, not its insults; its patriotism, not its partisanship.

Madam Clerk, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I am directed by

the unanimous vote of that caucus to present for election to the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress the name of the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, a Member-elect from the State of California.

The CLERK. The Clerk now recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Clerk, I am pleased to put forward the name of a man who represents the best of honesty, integrity, decency, uncanny wisdom and understanding.

As chairman of the Republican Conference, I am directed by the unanimous vote of that conference to present for election to the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress the name of the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER from the State of Ohio.

The CLERK. The Honorable NANCY PELOSI, a Member-elect from the State of California, and the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, a Member-elect from the State of Ohio, have been placed in nomination.

Are there further nominations?

There being no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint tellers.

The Clerk appoints the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN).

The tellers will come forward and take their seats at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The roll will now be called, and those responding to their names will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice.

The Reading Clerk will now call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for the Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]
Pelosi—233

Abercrombie	Capuano	DeLauro
Ackerman	Cardoza	Dicks
Allen	Carnahan	Dingell
Altmire	Carney	Doggett
Andrews	Carson	Donnelly
Arcuri	Castor	Doyle
Baca	Chandler	Edwards
Baird	Clarke	Ellison
Baldwin	Clay	Ellsworth
Barrow	Cleaver	Emanuel
Bean	Clyburn	Engel
Becerra	Cohen	Eshoo
Berkley	Conyers	Etheridge
Berman	Cooper	Farr
Berry	Costa	Fattah
Bishop (GA)	Costello	Filner
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Frank (MA)
Blumenauer	Cramer	Giffords
Boren	Crowley	Gillibrand
Boswell	Cuellar	Gonzalez
Boucher	Cummings	Gordon
Boyd (FL)	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Boya (KS)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Braley (IA)	Davis, Lincoln	Gutierrez
Brown, Corrine	DeFazio	Hall (NY)
Butterfield	DeGette	Hare
Capps	Delahunt	Harman

Hastings (FL)	McDermott
Herseth	McGovern
Higgins	McIntyre
Hill	McNerney
Hinchey	McNulty
Hinojosa	Meehan
Hirono	Meek (FL)
Hodes	Meeks (NY)
Holden	Melancon
Holt	Michaud
Honda	Millender-
Hooley	McDonald
Hoyer	Miller (NC)
Inslee	Miller, George
Israel	Mitchell
Jackson (IL)	Mollohan
Jackson-Lee	Moore (KS)
(TX)	Moore (WI)
Jefferson	Moran (VA)
Johnson (GA)	Murphy (CT)
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy, Patrick
Jones (OH)	Murtha
Kagen	Nadler
Kanjorski	Napolitano
Kaptur	Neal (MA)
Kennedy	Oberstar
Kildee	Obey
Kilpatrick	Oliver
Kind	Ortiz
Klein (FL)	Pallone
Kucinich	Pascrell
Lampson	Pastor
Langevin	Payne
Lantos	Pelosi
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter
Larson (CT)	Peterson (MN)
Lee	Pomeroy
Levin	Price (NC)
Lewis (GA)	Rahall
Lipinski	Rangel
Loeb sack	Reyes
Lofgren, Zoe	Rodriguez
Lowe y	Ross
Lynch	Rothman
Mahoney (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Maloney (NY)	Ruppersberger
Markey	Rush
Marshall	Ryan (OH)
Matheson	Salazar
Matsui	Sanchez, Linda
McCarthy (NY)	T.
McCollum (MN)	Sanchez, Loretta

Boehner—202

Aderholt	Davis, Jo Ann	Hunter
Akin	Davis, Tom	Inglis (SC)
Alexander	Deal (GA)	Issa
Bachmann	Dent	Jindal
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (IL)
Baker	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson, Sam
Barrett (SC)	Doolittle	Jones (NC)
Bartlett (MD)	Drake	Jordan
Barton (TX)	Dreier	Keller
Biggett	Duncan	King (IA)
Bilbray	Ehlers	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Emerson	Kingston
Bishop (UT)	English (PA)	Kirk
Blackburn	Everett	Kline (MN)
Blunt	Fallin	Knollenberg
Boehner	Feeney	Kuhl (NY)
Bonner	Ferguson	LaHood
Bono	Flake	Lamborn
Boozman	Forbes	Latham
Boustany	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Brady (TX)	Fossella	Lewis (CA)
Brown (SC)	Fox	Lewis (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Franks (AZ)	Linder
Ginny	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Buchanan	Gallely	Lucas
Burgess	Garrett (NJ)	Lungren, Daniel
Burton (IN)	Gerlach	E.
Buyer	Gilchrest	Mack
Calvert	Gillmor	Manzullo
Camp (MI)	Gingrey	Marchant
Campbell (CA)	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)
Cannon	Goode	McCaul (TX)
Cantor	Goodlatte	McCotter
Capito	Granger	McCrery
Carter	Graves	McHenry
Castle	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Chabot	Hastert	McKeon
Coble	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Cole (OK)	Hayes	Rodgers
Conaway	Heller	Mica
Crenshaw	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Cubin	Herger	Miller (MI)
Culberson	Hobson	Miller, Gary
Davis (KY)	Hoekstra	Moran (KS)
Davis, David	Hulshof	Murphy, Tim

Musgrave	Reynolds	Sullivan
Myrick	Rogers (AL)	Tancredo
Neugebauer	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Norwood	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Nunes	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Paul	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi
Pearce	Roskam	Turner
Pence	Royce	Upton
Peterson (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
Petri	Sali	Walden (OR)
Pickering	Saxton	Walsh (NY)
Pitts	Schmidt	Wamp
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Poe	Sessions	Weller
Porter	Shadegg	Westmoreland
Price (GA)	Shays	Whitfield
Pryce (OH)	Shimkus	Wicker
Putnam	Shuster	Wilson (NM)
Radanovich	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Ramstad	Smith (NE)	Wolf
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Rehberg	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Reichert	Souder	
Renzi	Stearns	

□ 1344

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tallies that the total number of votes cast is 435, of which the Honorable NANCY PELOSI of the State of California has received 233 and the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER of the State of Ohio has received 202.

Therefore, the Honorable NANCY PELOSI of the State of California is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress, having received a majority of the votes cast.

The Clerk appoints the following committee to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair:

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER), and the members of the California delegation: Mr. STARK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FARR, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. BONO, Ms. LEE, Mr. GARY G. MILLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BACA, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. DAVIS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. NUNES, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

The committee will retire from the Chamber to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair.

The Sergeant at Arms announced the Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives of the 110th Congress, who was escorted to the chair by the committee of escort.

□ 1400

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, Leader HOYER, my distinguished colleagues, welcome to you all. I would particularly like to welcome our new colleagues. It is an honor and a privilege to serve in this great institution, and I would like to thank you in advance for the sacrifices and contributions you will make to this body during your time here.

As colleagues, we owe a huge debt to those who have served before us. I would be remiss if I did not mention the enormous contributions of one of my predecessors, Gerald Ford. Former President Ford served in the House over 25 years, including 8 of those years as Republican leader from 1965 to 1973. He served his Michigan constituents and the American people with great distinction not just here in Congress, but as Vice President and as President of the United States. The thoughts and prayers of this House and those of a grateful Nation are with Betty and the Ford family.

This is an historic day. In a few moments, I will have the high privilege of handing the gavel of the House of Representatives to a woman for the first time in American history.

For more than 200 years, the leaders of our government have been democratically elected, and from their ranks our leaders have always selected a man for the responsibility and honor as serving as Speaker of the House. Always, that is, until today.

It is sometimes said the Founding Fathers would not recognize the government that exists here in Washington today. It has grown in size and scope far beyond anything they could ever have imagined, much less endorsed or advocated for our future. But today marks an occasion that I think the Founding Fathers would view approvingly. And my fellow Americans, whether you are a Republican, a Democrat, or an Independent, today is a cause for celebration.

Today also, of course, marks a change in the House majority. Twelve years ago, some of us stood proudly in this Chamber as our former colleague, Dick Gephardt from Missouri, handed the gavel to the Republican Speaker, Newt Gingrich from Georgia. There were some great achievements during those 12 years that followed, and we are fortunate that the man who was the driving force behind many of those achievements will continue to serve with us: The gentleman from Illinois, DENNY HASTERT.

There were some great achievements during those 12 years that followed; there were also some profound disappointments. If there is one lesson that stands out from our party's time in the majority, it is this: A congressional majority is simply a means to an end. The value of the majority lies not in the chance to wield great power but in the chance to use limited power to achieve great things.

We refer to the gavel that I am holding as the Speaker's gavel; but like ev-

erything else in this Chamber, it really belongs to the American people. It is on loan from the real owners. This is the people's House; this is the people's Congress. Most people in America don't care who controls it. What they want is a government that is limited, honest, accountable, and responsive to their needs; and the moment a majority forgets this lesson, it begins writing itself a ticket to minority status.

The 110th Congress will write the next chapter in American history, but the American people will dictate it.

Today, the Democrat Party assumes the challenge and opportunity of majority power in the people's House. Republicans will hold the incoming majority accountable for its promises and its actions, but we also want to work with the incoming majority for the good of our Nation that we were all elected to serve.

Fundamentally, democracy is a battle of ideas. The battle of ideas, I believe, is healthy and is important for our Nation. But it is also a battle that can take place respectfully. Republicans and Democrats can disagree without being disagreeable to each other. Sometimes what people call partisanship is really a deep disagreement over a means to a shared goal, and we should welcome that conversation, encourage it, enjoy it, and be nice about it.

It is now my privilege to present the gavel of the United States House of Representatives to the first woman Speaker in our history, the gentlewoman from California, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you, Leader BOEHNER. Thank you, my colleagues. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speakers.

I accept this gavel in the spirit of partnership, not partisanship, and I look forward to working with you, Mr. BOEHNER, and the Republicans in the Congress for the good of the American people.

After giving this gavel away in the last two Congresses, I am glad someone else has the honor today.

In this House, we may be different parties, but we serve one country, and our pride and our prayers are united behind our men and women in uniform. They are working together to protect the American people; and in this Congress, we must work together to build a future worthy of their sacrifice.

In this hour, we need and pray for the character, courage, and civility of a former Member of this House, President Ford. He healed the country when it needed healing. This is another time, another war, and another trial of American will, imagination, and spirit. Let us honor his memory not just in eulogy, but in dialogue and trust across the aisle.

I want to join Leader BOEHNER in expressing our condolences and our appreciation to Mrs. Ford and to the entire Ford family for their decades of leadership and service to our country.

With today's convening of the 110th Congress, we begin anew. I congratu-

late all Members of Congress on your election. I especially want to congratulate our new Members of Congress. Let's hear it for our new Members.

The genius of our Founders was that every 2 years, new Members would bring to this House their spirit of renewal and hope for the American people. This Congress is reinvigorated, new Members, by your optimism and your idealism and your commitment to our country. Let us acknowledge your families whose support have made your leadership possible today.

Each of us brings to this Congress our shared values, our commitment to the Constitution, and our personal experience. My path to Congress and to the speakership began in Baltimore where my father was the mayor. I was raised in a large family that was devoutly Catholic, deeply patriotic, very proud of our Italian-American heritage, and staunchly Democratic. My parents taught us that public service was a noble calling, and that we had a responsibility to help those in need.

□ 1415

My parents worked on the side of the angels, and now they are with them.

But I am so happy that my brother, Tommy D'Alesandro, who was also a mayor of Baltimore, is here leading the D'Alesandro family from Baltimore today. He is sitting right up there with Tony Bennett.

Forty-three years ago, Paul Pelosi and I were married. We raised our five children in San Francisco where Paul was born and raised. I want to thank Paul and our five children, Nancy Corrine, Christine, Jacqueline, Paul, Jr., and Alexandra, and our magnificent grandchildren, for their love, for their support, and the confidence they gave me to go from the kitchen to the Congress.

And I thank my constituents in San Francisco and to the State of California for the privilege of representing them in Congress. St. Francis of Assisi is our city's patron saint, and his prayer of St. Francis is our city's anthem: Lord, make me a channel of thy peace; where there is darkness may we bring light, where there is hatred may we bring love, and where there is despair, may we bring hope.

Hope, that is what America is about. And it is in that spirit that I serve in the Congress of the United States.

And today, I thank my colleagues. By electing me Speaker, you have brought us closer to the ideal of equality that is America's heritage and America's hope.

This is a historic moment, and I thank the leader for acknowledging it. Thank you, Mr. BOEHNER. It is a historic moment for the Congress, and it is a historic moment for the women of America.

It is a moment for which we have waited for over 200 years. Never losing faith, we waited through the many years of struggle to achieve our rights. But women were not just waiting;

women were working. Never losing faith, we worked to redeem the promise of America that all men and women are created equal. For our daughters and our granddaughters, today we have broken the marble ceiling. For our daughters and our granddaughters, the sky is the limit. Anything is possible for them.

The election of 2006 was a call to change, not merely to change the control of Congress, but for a new direction for our country. Nowhere were the American people more clear about the need for a new direction than in the war in Iraq.

The American people rejected an open-ended obligation to a war without end. Shortly, President Bush will address the Nation on the subject of Iraq. It is the responsibility of the President to articulate a new plan for Iraq that makes it clear to the Iraqis that they must defend their own streets and their own security, a plan that promotes stability in the region and a plan that allows us to responsibly redeploy our troops.

Let us work together to be the Congress that rebuilds our military to meet the national security challenges of the 21st century.

Let us be the Congress that strongly honors our responsibility to protect the American people from terrorism.

Let us be the Congress that never forgets our commitment to our veterans and our first responders, always honoring them as the heroes that they are.

The American people also spoke clearly for a new direction here at home. They desire a new vision, a new America built on the values that have made our country great.

Our Founders envisioned a new America driven by optimism, opportunity, and courage. So confident were they in the America that they were advancing that they put on the seal, the great seal of the United States: "Novus ordo seclorum," a new order for the centuries. Centuries; they spoke of the centuries. They envisioned America as a just and good place, as a fair and efficient society, as a source of hope and opportunity for all.

This vision has sustained us for over 200 years, and it accounts for what is best in our great Nation: liberty, opportunity, and justice.

Now it is our responsibility to carry forth that vision of a new America into the 21st century. A new America that seizes the future and forges 21st-century solutions through discovery, creativity, and innovation, sustaining our economic leadership and ensuring our national security. A new America with a vibrant and strengthened middle class for whom college is affordable, health care is accessible, and retirement reliable. A new America that declares our energy independence, promotes domestic sources of renewable energy, and combats climate change. A new America that is strong, secure, and a respected leader among the community of nations.

And the American people told us they expected us to work together for fiscal responsibility, with the highest ethical standards and with civility and bipartisanship.

After years of historic deficits, this 110th Congress will commit itself to a higher standard: pay-as-you-go, no new deficit spending. Our new America will provide unlimited opportunity for future generations, not burden them with mountains of debt.

In order to achieve our new America for the 21st century, we must return this House to the American people. So our first order of business is passing the toughest congressional ethics reform in history. This new Congress doesn't have 2 years or 200 days. Let us join together in the first 100 hours to make this Congress the most honest and open Congress in history. 100 hours.

This openness requires respect for every voice in the Congress. As Thomas Jefferson said, "Every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle." My colleagues elected me to be Speaker of the House, the entire House. Respectful of the vision of our Founders, the expectation of our people, and the great challenges that we face, we have an obligation to reach beyond partisanship to work for all Americans.

Let us stand together to move our country forward, seeking common ground for the common good. We have made history; now let us make progress for the American people.

May God bless our work, and may God bless America.

□ 1430

Before we move forward, because there are so many children here and so many of them asked me if they could touch the gavel, I wanted to invite as many of them who wanted to come forward to come join me up here. I know my own grandchildren will.

Let's hear it for the children. We're here for the children. For these children, our children, and for all of America's children, the House will come to order.

I am now ready to take the oath of office from the Dean of the Congress of the United States, Mr. DINGELL. In acknowledging him, I also want to acknowledge Speaker Foley who has been with us as well.

Mr. DINGELL then administered the oath of office to Ms. PELOSI of California, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Mr. DINGELL. Congratulations, Madam Speaker.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. According to precedent, the Chair will swear in the Members-elect en masse.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOLT. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. HOLT. In light of the fact that there are nonpartisan and partisan lawsuits under way with regard to Florida's 13th Congressional District and that the votes of 18,000 voters were not recorded on the paperless electronic voting machines in an election decided by only 369 votes, may I ask for the record whether a notice of contest has been filed with the Clerk on behalf of CHRISTINE JENNINGS pursuant to law and what effect, if any, today's proceedings have on the pending contests?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised by the Clerk that a notice of contest pursuant to statute, section 382 of title 2, United States Code, has been filed with the Clerk. Under section 5 of article I of the Constitution and the statute, the House remains the judge of the elections of its Members. The seating of this Member-elect is entirely without prejudice to the contest over the final right to that seat that is pending under the statute and will be reviewed in the ordinary course in the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PUTNAM. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PUTNAM. Am I correct, Madam Speaker, that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) has been certified by the Secretary of State as duly elected from the 13th District of Florida?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. If the Members-elect will rise, the Chair will now administer the oath of office.

The Members-elect and Delegates-elect and the Resident Commissioner-elect rose, and the Speaker administered the oath of office to them as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now Members of the 110th Congress.

MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I

have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as majority leader the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable STENY H. HOYER.

MINORITY LEADER

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, as chairman of the Republican Conference, I am directed by that conference to notify the House officially that the Republican Members have selected as minority leader the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER.

MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as majority whip the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable JAMES E. CLYBURN.

MINORITY WHIP

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to notify the House officially that the Republican Members have selected as minority whip the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable ROY BLUNT.

ELECTION OF CLERK OF THE HOUSE, SERGEANT AT ARMS, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND CHAPLAIN

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1

Resolved, That Karen L. Haas of the State of Maryland, be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Wilson S. Livingood of the Commonwealth of Virginia be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That James M. Eagen, III, of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; and

That Father Daniel P. Coughlin of the State of Illinois, be, and is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment to the resolution, but before offering the amendment, I request that there be a division of the question on the resolution so that we may have a separate vote on the Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The question will be divided.

The question is on agreeing to that portion of the resolution providing for the election of the Chaplain.

That portion of the resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PUTNAM

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment to the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PUTNAM:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That Paula Nowakowski of the State of Michigan be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Seth O. Webb of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives; and

That Brian Gaston of the State of Ohio be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remainder of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

The remainder of the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now swear in the officers of the House.

The officers presented themselves in the well of the House and took the oath of office as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations.

□ 1445

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Senate be informed that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that Nancy Pelosi, a Representative from the State of California, has been elected Speaker; and Karen L. Haas, a citizen of the State of Maryland, has been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 3

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to consider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 3

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make:

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 4) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 4

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected Nancy Pelosi, a Representative from the State of California, Speaker; and Karen L. Haas, a citizen of the State of Maryland, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 5) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 5

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 6) adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Tenth Congress. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except as specified in sections 2 through 4 of this resolution.

SEC. 2. The question of adopting the resolution shall be divided among five parts, to wit: each of its five titles. The portion of the divided question comprising title I shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. The portion of the divided question comprising title II shall be debatable for 60 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. The portion of the divided question comprising title III shall be debatable for 60 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. The portion of the divided question comprising title IV shall be debatable for 60 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. The portion of the divided question comprising title V shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. Each portion of the divided question shall be disposed of in the order stated.

SEC. 3. Pending the question of adopting the final portion of the divided question, it shall be in order to move that the House commit the resolution to a select committee with or without instructions. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to commit to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 4. During consideration of House Resolution 6 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority leader or his designee, 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.

The resolution that I am calling up on this historic day, H. Res. 5, provides for the consideration of a rules package, H. Res. 6, that we hope will begin to return this Chamber to its rightful place as the home of democracy and deliberation in our great Nation.

The resolution we are now debating will allow the House to consider and vote on the Democratic rules package in five separate parts. The first title contains the rules package our Republican colleagues adopted in the 109th Congress, while the second through fifth titles contain amendments that will begin a reformation of this body that is long overdue.

I also include for the RECORD at this time a detailed summary of the changes H. Res. 6 will make to the standing House rules of the 109th Congress.

SUMMARY OF HOUSE RULES PACKAGE, OPENING DAY OF THE 110TH CONGRESS, PREPARED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER, CHAIRWOMAN-DESIGNATE

TITLE I—ADOPTION OF 109TH RULES PACKAGE

This title adopts the standing rules that were in effect in the 109th Congress. The sub-

sequent adoption of the amendments contained in Titles II-V will then make certain changes to these rules.

TITLE II—ETHICS REFORMS

ENDING THE K STREET PROJECT

(Rule XXIII—Code of Official Conduct) Prohibits Members from threatening official retaliation against private firms that hire employees who do not share the Member's partisan political affiliation.

LOBBYIST GIFT BAN

(Rule XXV, cl. 5(a)) Prohibits Members and employees from accepting gifts from a registered lobbyist, from an agent of a foreign principal, or an entity that employs or retains these lobbyists and agents. Under the current gift rule, Members and employees may accept gifts valued less than \$50 (and a total of \$100 per calendar year) from these lobbyists and agents. The current gift ban exemptions in cl. 5(a)(3) still apply.

(Rule XXV, cl. 5(a)) Adds language clarifying that for the purposes of the gift rule, a ticket to a sporting event is valued either at the face value of a ticket, or at the cost of the ticket to the general public when (1) the ticket does not have a face value or (2) when the face value of the ticket does not reflect its economic value.

LOBBYIST TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS/ONE-DAY TRIPS

(Rule XXV, cl. 5(b)) Prohibits Members and employees from accepting travel reimbursements from a registered lobbyist, from an agent of a foreign country, or from an entity that employs or retains these lobbyists and agents. (Current rules already prohibit lobbyists and agents of foreign principals from reimbursing travel).

A new subsection to this rule clarifies that colleges and universities are not subject to this prohibition. Another subsection allows entities that employ lobbyists to reimburse Member and employee travel to one-day events (e.g. conventions, meetings). In general, travel to a one-day event includes an overnight stay, although the Ethics Committee may allow two-night stays in certain cases. These new restrictions take effect on March 1, 2007.

(Rule XXV, new cl. 5(c)) Adds new language stating that except in the case of trips sponsored by colleges and universities, lobbyists may only play a de minimis role in Member travel to one-day events that can be reimbursed by entities that employ lobbyists.

NEW TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

(Rule XXV, new cl. 5(d)) Adds language stating that prior to accepting reimbursed travel, Members and employees will be required to obtain a certification from the entity paying for the trip declaring that, except as permitted for universities and one-day travel, lobbyists did not plan, organize, request, arrange, or finance the travel. Members and employees will be required to submit this certification to the Ethics Committee and receive approval from the Ethics Committee before taking the trip. These new requirements take effect on March 1, 2007.

In connection with this new prior authorization requirement, this new rule requires Members and employees to submit their certifications, advance authorizations, and other travel disclosure materials to the Clerk of the House within 15 days after the travel is completed. The Clerk of the House must make this information available to the public as soon as possible. (Current rules allow 30 days for the submission of travel disclosures).

(Rule XXV, new cl. 5(i)) Requires the Ethics Committee to develop new standards for what constitutes a reasonable expense by a private group for Member travel. The Ethics

Committee must also develop a new standard for determining that the travel has a valid connection to Members' official duties. In addition, it requires the Ethics Committee to develop a process for the submission and approval of the prior authorization requirements created in new cl. 5(d).

CORPORATE JET BAN

(Rule XXIII—Code of Official Conduct) Prohibits Members from using official, personal, or campaign funds to pay for the use of privately owned airplanes. (Members will still be able to charter commercially available airplanes.)

ETHICS TRAINING

(Rule XI, cl. 3) Requires the Ethics Committee to offer annual ethics training to Members and appropriate employees. New employees must receive this training within 60 days of beginning work in the House and other employees must certify they take the course each year.

COMMITTEE NAME CHANGES

(Rule X, cl. 1) Changes the names of the following House committees: 1) the Committee on Education and the Workforce becomes the "Committee on Education and Labor," 2) the Committee on International Relations becomes the "Committee on Foreign Affairs," 3) the Committee on Resources becomes the "Committee on Natural Resources," 4) the Committee on Government Reform becomes the "Committee on Oversight and Government Reform," and 5) the Committee on Science becomes the "Committee on Science and Technology."

TITLE III—CIVILITY

HOLDING VOTES OPEN

(Rule XX, cl. 2) Prohibits the Speaker from holding votes open for longer than the scheduled time for the sole purpose of changing the outcome of the vote.

CONFERENCE PROCEDURE

(Rule XXII, new cl. 12) Requires House conferees to insist that conference committees operate in an open and fair manner and that House conferees sign the final conference papers at one time and in one place.

(Rule XXII, new cl. 13) Prohibits the consideration of a conference report that has been altered after the time it was signed by conferees.

TITLE IV—FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

(Rule XXI, new cl. 7) Prohibits the House from considering budget resolutions or amendments to budget resolutions that contain reconciliation instructions increasing the budget deficit.

(Rule XXI, new cl. 8) Applies Budget Act rules against bills that have not been reported by committees.

(Rule XXI, new cl. 10) Prohibits the consideration of any legislation proposing direct spending or revenue changes that would increase the budget deficit within a five-year or a ten-year time frame ("Pay-as-You-Go" point of order).

EARMARK REFORM

(Rule XXI, new cl. 9) Requires committees of jurisdiction and conference committees to publish lists of the earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits contained in all reported bills, unreported bills, manager's amendments, and conference reports that come to the House floor. These lists will be electronically available to the public either through committee prints or printing in the Congressional Record. In the case of a reported bill, the single list contemplated by the rule may cross-reference other parts of the report. If a measure does not contain any earmarks, committees must publish a statement to this effect. A Member

may make a point of order (similar to the unfunded mandates point of order) against the consideration of any special rule that waives this requirement.

This new clause defines an earmark as any Member-requested project that is targeted to a specific place and falls outside a formula-driven or competitive award process. Limited tax and tariff benefits are revenue provisions that would benefit 10 or fewer persons.

(Rule XXIII—Code of Official Conduct) Prohibits trading earmarks for votes and requires Members to disclose their earmark requests and certify that they and their spouses have no personal financial interest in the request.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

(Rule X, cl. 4) Gives the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform authority to adopt a rule allowing Committee Members and staff to conduct depositions in the course of Committee investigations.

(Rule XIII, cl. 3) Shields Rules Committee reports from a point of order if they are filed without a complete list of record votes taken during the consideration of a special rule. This provision allows the Rules Committee to publish recorded votes taken during Committee hearings in committee reports and/or through other means such as the Internet.

Makes a number of technical changes to the standing House rules.

Allows for the consideration of several pieces of legislation that are part of the "First 100 Hours" agenda if special rules for those provisions are not separately reported.

Continues the budget "deeming" resolution from the 2nd Session of the 109th Congress until such time as a conference report establishing a budget for the fiscal year 2008 is adopted.

Renews the standing order approved during the 109th Congress that prohibits registered lobbyists from using the Members' exercise facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be a great honor to have a chance to address our House on the first day of the 110th Congress. That is what serving as a Representative in this body is, an honor.

There are only 435 Members of Congress chosen from a population of over 300 million. Our neighbors send us here to represent their interests and defend their needs in Washington. What they give us is their trust and the precious opportunity to improve the lives of millions here in America, and in many cases around the world. I can't think why anyone would want to squander that opportunity, Mr. Speaker; and yet this body's previous leadership seemed too often to do just that.

It should come as no surprise that just a few short weeks ago a national poll found that only 11 percent of American voters gave the outgoing Congress either a good or an excellent review. What was worse, fully 74 percent thought that most of us here are more focused on advancing our careers than we are on helping our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the last several years has borne these opinions out. On the first day of the 109th Congress, we debated a new rules package, just as we are doing today. My fellow Democrats and I spoke out against that package from the beginning because we saw what it represented, a retreat from ethical conduct and an abandonment of our real responsibil-

ities. It rendered the Ethics Committee totally powerless to meaningfully enforce the ethical standards of the House. While its most egregious elements were abandoned, it did its job, helping to pave the way to a Congress where unethical conduct would soon find a new home.

By the time Democratic leaders from both the House and Senate joined me to unveil our Honest Leadership and Open Government Act 1 year ago, a great deal of damage had already been done. We had already seen a Medicare bill that sold out America's seniors to the bottom lines of the drug companies. We had seen an energy bill that did nothing to make our Nation's energy supply more stable, but that made the balance books of billion-dollar corporations solid as a rock, even though the CEOs of some of those companies have admitted they did not want those tax cuts.

We had seen our homeland defenses imperiled and a war effort undermined by huge contracts given not to the best and the brightest, but to the most well-connected. Real, meaningful oversight of those contracts never seemed to make it to the agenda. In one of the most embarrassing series of revelations in our Nation's history, we had seen top legislators bought and sold for their allegiance, traded for gifts, trips, and parties, all worth so much less than the faith the American people had freely given to them and which they had, by the end, lost.

But as I said at the time, the lobbyists who gave those gifts and paid for those trips and hosted those parties, those lobbyists could only knock on the doors of Congress. Members of Congress, the ones inside, were the ones who let them in.

The culture of the last Congress came to be defined by a phrase now common to America throughout the country: it was a "culture of corruption." Two months ago, the American people decided they had paid nearly enough for that kind of leadership. They had sacrificed enough peace of mind, lost enough hope, had their well-being imperiled far too many times. They stated loud and clear that they were ready for a new culture to take hold in Washington, a culture of commitment.

That is what my fellow Democrats and I are pledging to bring to this body today, a commitment to the citizens who elected us, a commitment to their needs, a commitment to their security, and a commitment to their future. It may seem like a tall order, but we are already well on the way. We have a new set of leaders here, Democrats who understand the value of trust that has been placed in them.

Together we are going to usher in nothing less than a new way of doing business in the House. While the necessary cultural shift is already under way, a new legislative framework is needed as well. We need rules in the House that will keep the body focused on the well-being of the American peo-

ple, in other words, keep us focused on our job; and that is the framework that we begin to lay out today.

The political process by which bills are written and voted on often seems arcane. It certainly receives little of the focus given to so much else that goes on in Washington. Yet it is at the very heart of what we do here. A broken political process undermines the Democratic principles the House was built on, and it serves as a gateway to a corrupted Congress.

By contrast, a responsible process acts as a powerful check against the abuses and misuses of power so common in recent years. In so many ways our Founding Fathers were visionaries. The rules that Thomas Jefferson first wrote down two centuries ago provide for order and discipline in the House. They provide for transparency and accountability. If they are followed, corruption will be exposed before it has a chance to take root.

Democrats are going to follow the long-established rules of the House, instead of treating them as impediments to be avoided. We are going to allow Members to read bills before voting on them and prevent them from being altered at the last minute.

We are not going to hold open votes for hours on end while arms are twisted and favors are traded. We are going to conduct business whenever possible during normal hours, instead of in the dead of night. We are going to be open about the schedule we keep. In short, we are going to restore basic civility to this body, and never again will any Member of the Congress have to fight to find out where the conference to which he or she has been appointed is meeting.

But we are going to do more. While the rules package of the 109th Congress effectively embraced corrupt practices, this package stamps them out. Today and tomorrow we are introducing a series of critical new rules, legislation that will help guarantee that the unethical practices of the past will have no place in our future.

Gifts and lobbyist-sponsored travel are banned by this rules package. They have been used to grant select groups of people unfettered access to Members of Congress. They have no place in this new Congress. The rules package will finally shed light on an earmarking process that has greased the wheels of corrupt House machinery. It requires the full disclosure of earmarks on all bills and conference reports before Members are asked to vote on them.

If a Member is convinced that a project is worth a Federal earmark, they should have no problem attaching their name to that funding if the project is sound and they have nothing to hide. This package will make real fiscal responsibility a fundamental principle of the House, not a rhetorical one. It will prohibit the consideration of any legislation that would increase budget deficits without offsets.

Democrats are joined by so many Republicans in believing that it is immoral to pass on the question of debt to our children and grandchildren.

□ 1500

Enough is enough. No more deficit spending.

Mr. Speaker, and my friends on both sides of the aisle, I know I am joined by my fellow Democrats as well as many Republicans when I say that I want a Congress that America can be proud of again.

I am tired of having to tell my grandchildren and school children in my district that what they have learned in school about the ideals and practices of a democracy isn't true anymore, and what they have learned about how a bill is passed no longer stands here.

It is long past time that this House started living up to those ideas and practices; that they started putting honesty, and integrity, transparency and accountability ahead of everything else.

We must rededicate the People's House to the needs of its citizens. We must return the keys of the government and this democracy to the citizens whom they belong.

This body was created to serve as the battleground of ideas, not of checkbooks or back-room deals or deceptions. It was created to serve the people of the United States.

Today, the men and women of America have given us a very special gift. We have the ability to leave our mark on the future of our Nation. It is the only gift Members of Congress should ask for, and one we must cherish for the good of all. Let us begin.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to reaffirm the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business as contained in House Rule X, clause 1(p). The Committee's jurisdiction includes the Small Business Administration and its programs, as well as small business matters related to the Regulatory Flexibility Act and the Paperwork Reduction Act. Its jurisdiction under House Rule X, clause 1(p) also includes other programs and initiatives that address small businesses outside of the confines of those Acts.

This reaffirmation of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business will enable the House to ensure that it is properly considering the consequences of its actions related to small business.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the designee of the Republican leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we have spent a great deal of time this afternoon focusing on the fact that we have the first female Speaker of the United States House of Representatives in our Nation's history. And I think it is also very important for us to note today

that we have the first female Chair of the House Rules Committee in my good friend, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and I would like everyone to join in extending congratulations to Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Now, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I look forward to working in a bipartisan way in the spirit that was outlined by Speaker PELOSI, and I, of course, will treat the new Chair of the Rules Committee with the dignity that she deserves.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I do rise with mixed emotions today. I was very proud to join with you as we came down the center aisle escorting the new Speaker of the House, my fellow Californian. And I am very pleased that we have the first woman, the first Californian, and the first Italian American as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I have mixed emotions because, while I am very, very proud of Speaker PELOSI, and the new Rules Chair, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and others who are assuming leadership positions, I also am very disappointed.

I am disappointed as I look at this package that we are about to consider, because I do join with you, Mr. Speaker pro tempore, the distinguished majority leader, and Speaker PELOSI, as we have discussed privately and publicly, in our quest, and I think Speaker PELOSI put it extraordinarily well, focusing on the priorities that we have. We are, first and foremost, Americans. We are here to do the people's business and they sent a very strong message last November, and I believe we have an opportunity to do just that.

I will say that I remember very well the opening days of the 104th Congress, 12 years ago. I remember the very heady feeling that came from knowing that, for the first time, at that juncture, in almost half a century, we Republicans were in the majority of the House of Representatives, and we were going to do all that we had promised the American people.

We were that optimistic, quite frankly, because we didn't know any better. None of us had ever served in the majority and we were blissfully unaware of the pressures and problems associated with trying to govern this institution.

During the 109th Congress, the Democratic Caucus, many of whom actually served in the majority before 1995, made a lot of promises about how they would run this place if they ever achieved the majority again. Of course, they, unlike Republicans in 1994, had the experience of having run this place, having served in the majority. And I have a great deal of admiration for my colleagues, because they know exactly what they are facing. Knowing that, knowing exactly what they would face in the majority, they made a commitment to minority rights, should they regain the majority.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is why I said I am disappointed. The resolutions before us bear very little resemblance to

the rhetoric on this floor and on the campaign trail. The much ballyhooed commitment to minority rights is virtually nonexistent in the measures before us today. They undermine minority rights that were constantly guaranteed when we were in the majority. The rights of the minority are undermined. Their promises are for a delivery date at some later point, if we agree to be cooperative, according to one Member on the other side of the aisle. And we have, as an IOU now, a wink and a nod and a gentle "trust us."

Mr. Speaker, trust is something that is in short supply in this House, and the actions of the incoming majority are, based on the package that has been brought before us early last evening, certainly less than 24 hours before we are considering it here on the House floor, are not doing a lot to bolster our reserves when it comes to the issue of trust. Despite an oft repeated commitment to provide Members with, as I said, at least 24 hours to review legislation before voting on the floor, we received this package at 6:15 last night, 6:15 only after that package was delivered to our friends up in the press gallery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, despite Speaker PELOSI's principle that we need to return to regular order for legislation, including a full committee process of hearings and markups and, I quote Ms. PELOSI here when she said we need an "open, full and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute."

Now, we, in spite of that great directive that came forward, we have a rules package that actually self-executes closed rules for bills that haven't even been introduced, and won't even be going through the committee process. The section of the package that includes those closed rules is debatable for just 10 minutes. This is the polar opposite, the polar opposite of how the Republicans opened the 104th Congress, when our priorities were considered in regular order and under an open amendment process.

Mr. Speaker, also providing a stark contrast is the fact that we put in place, from day one, a guaranteed bite at the apple for the minority in the form of a motion to recommit. We felt so strongly about the fact that when we were in the minority we were denied that chance. So that is why at the beginning of the 104th Congress we put into place that guarantee for the minority.

But I must remind my Democratic colleagues on the Rules Committee that, time and time again, they have made clear their view that the motion to recommit is an insufficient opportunity to articulate their alternative. That argument was propounded constantly as we were dealing with public policy questions. So you can imagine how surprised I was when the Speaker recently replied to a reporter's question about Republican alternatives to

the Democratic priorities by saying, "They'll have a motion to recommit."

Even worse than five closed rules, Mr. Speaker, is the rollback of one of the most essential elements of transparency that Republicans put into place back at the beginning of the 104th Congress; that is, the right to know how a member of a committee votes on legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this rules package exempts the Committee on Rules from the requirement to publish the votes of its members on its committee reports, something required of every other committee except the Ethics Committee.

Now, in my 12 years as a member of the Rules Committee majority, we took more than 1,300 votes in committee, every single one of which was accurately reported in the committee's report.

Mr. Speaker, at best, this is a solution in search of a problem. At worst, it is an attempt to shield the Rules Committee from the public scrutiny of its actions.

We were told by the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee that ethics reform and rules reform were not just election year issues for Democrats. Now, Mr. Speaker, sadly, this document says something quite different than that. Promises were made, and they are not being kept. That is the thing that I find to be most troubling. We intend to explain the many inconsistencies for the record and as the debate moves forward.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we want to work with our democratic colleagues. Even with this treatment of minority rights, we stand here determined to work in a bipartisan way to confront the challenges that we all know face this country. Unfortunately, this rules package shuts us out from the start. It is my hope that the promises made will, indeed, be kept. But, Mr. Speaker, this package does not inspire a great deal of hope in that they in any way will.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great deal of disappointment and a great deal of concern about the first actions that we are taking here.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield myself about 30 seconds, 45 perhaps, just to respond for a moment, to remind my friend that what we are voting on is the Republican package of the last term. If it was so bad, we thought it was pretty bad then as well, but we will have time to debate all these things. We will have open debate. And what we have said about fairness is what we are dedicated to do.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the next speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 5 and H. Res. 6.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, for the purpose of debate only, to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on this historic day, the sun is shining brightly in Washington outside and today, finally it is shining inside this great Capitol building.

Normally, a New Year's resolution is a list you write for yourself. But the ethics package that we Democrats are now adopting was written by the American people at the ballot box in November. This January resolution is possible only because of the November revolution by voters who were, quite frankly, revolted by what they saw going on here in Washington.

Under Democratic leadership, "Spring Cleaning" is getting an early start here in January. We ban lobbyists-sponsored junkets and gifts and the use of corporate jets from jet-setting lobbyists like the tobacco company that even took one Member of Congress on a special flight to his criminal arraignment.

In Congress, an earmark too often is a secret means for a Member to funnel Federal dollars to special projects. Some are worthwhile, some are dubious.

When I talk about earmarks to my rancher friends down in Texas, they have a different earmark in mind. It is the mark you put on an ear of your cattle to identify them. By their very nature, earmarks are public, designed to identify ownership. I think we need some of that Texas thinking here in Washington. If earmarks can identify a steer, we are now able, through this new package, to know who is "steering" earmarks of federal tax dollars to some unworthy cause.

Ethics reform, of course, is not an end in and of itself. The goal of reform is to improve the substance of the work that we do here. It is to ensure that the priorities in Washington are genuinely the priorities of hard working families in San Marcos, Bastrop, Kyle, and many other communities across our country.

Because fiscal security is national security, we are also working to cut the ballooning federal deficit with pay-as-you-go budgeting; barring new spending provisions or tax changes that would increase our soaring national debt.

Our reforms seek to curb the cost of corruption. It is a cost that has been borne in the pocketbooks of our seniors who pay too much for drugs because of a drug bill that was designed by the pharmaceutical manufacturers, instead of designed to help those who needed help most.

It is the cost of corruption that is reflected in no-bid contracts in Iraq and in the aftermath of the Hurricane Katrina debacle. And it is reflected in

the price that the jobless, the homeless, and the hopeless are paying for the corruption within this administration.

Mr. Speaker, accountability, so long lacking from this administration and the House leadership begins today.

□ 1515

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART from Florida.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my dear friend, and, Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased that my friend and dear chairman of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, pointed out as she spoke, I heard her speak that most of the ethics package was precisely the one that we had proposed last year. What is very disturbing, however, and really disappointing, Mr. Speaker, are a number of the items that have been included that Mr. DREIER referred to previously.

It is extremely disappointing to see that one of the great advancements of this Congress over the last two centuries, which has been to bring a transparency to our votes, because you know, Mr. Speaker, it used to be even on the floor of the House votes would take place that were not roll call votes, they were not noted for the record and, thus, for the people; yet we moved forward and we changed that. And also in committee, votes had to be recorded. That has been one of the great advancements in the last two centuries in this Congress.

And to see in the Committee on Rules, that I love so much, where we now in this rules package are faced with such a reversal of that progress and that great advancement of openness and transparency on the record, the requirement that the people will be able to see how the members of that committee vote, that has been eliminated, is being eliminated in this package, that is extremely disturbing. And everyone, Mr. Speaker, who loves this Congress should be saddened by what our friends on the other side of the aisle have included, specifically what I have just mentioned, that great reversal of progress in the rules package that has been brought forward today.

So in the hope that that will be remedied and that our friends on the other side of the aisle will realize how sad that is, I rise today with great disappointment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), one of our brilliant freshmen and a new member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer, along with my distinguished fellow Floridian, and the new rules chairwoman, Ms. SLAUGHTER, an ethics champion in her own right, this legislation extending the rules of the 109th Congress, with ethics reforms to

follow in the 110th Congress. These rules will serve as a baseline for the rules of the 110th Congress, and then we shall add the needed ethics reforms, fiscal responsibility reforms, and rules on civility.

After recent tumultuous events, we can all agree that our neighbors back home expect the highest ethical standards from the Members of Congress, the people's House. This rules package includes some of the very good rules changes made in the 109th Congress, including the end of proxy voting in committees and the emergency power granted to the Speaker to recess the House and convene in another location in the case of a terrorist incident. But our Democratic package goes further, instituting ethics reforms that prohibit Members from accepting gifts from registered lobbyists, restricting Members' travel on corporate airplanes, and offering ethics training to Members and staff.

I come to the House from local government; and like many of my reform-minded freshmen colleagues, I championed ethics reform on the local level, particularly in the Tampa Bay area, where it was needed in the inner workings of county government. Well, it is needed here in the Halls of Congress now more than ever.

The new rules will include a fair and open process for the Congress: no holding open votes to change the outcome and clear guidelines for the operation of conference committees and final conference committee reports. Provisions for more stringent fiscal responsibility and pay-as-you-go budgeting requirements ultimately will aid our neighbors back home in reducing their own debt load while the Federal Government begins to do its part to ease the financial crunch so many of us feel across the country.

The proposed transparency in the earmark process and the additional requirement that Members certify that neither their spouses nor their relatives will have any personal financial interest in an earmark request will show and assure our neighbors back home that Congress is indeed operating in a way that best serves the needs and interests of every American.

I am humble and proud to be part of this new historic Congress and am glad to stand in support of the ethics reform package led by Ms. PELOSI for high ethical standards in government.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to first congratulate Ms. CASTOR and certainly welcome her to the Rules Committee and look forward to serving with her.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DREIER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

My parliamentary inquiry is, may I ask of the Chair exactly what it is we are debating and considering at this point. The Chair of the Rules Committee stood up and said, after I gave my opening remarks, that we were in the midst of a debate on the last year's

rules package. I was wondering if the Chair might enlighten us as to exactly what it is that we are considering.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLYBURN). Pending is House Resolution 5, proposing a special order of business for consideration of House Resolution 6, adopting the Rules of the House for the One Hundred Tenth Congress.

Mr. DREIER. For the consideration of the rules package for the 110th Congress, am I correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DREIER. Thank you very much for that clarification, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I want to commend the ranking member of the Rules Committee and the former chairman for his comments because I think they bring some truth and veracity to this discussion.

I am truly pleased to join my colleagues here who are interested in good government, responsive government, but accountable government. And as a matter of principle, as a matter of principle we believe it is imperative that elected officials be held accountable for what they say and what they do.

Now, while on the campaign trail, Democrats made the promise over and over again that they wanted to have the most open and fair government in history. In fact, the new Speaker said herself, "More than 2 years ago, I first sent Speaker HASTERT proposals to restore civility in Congress. I reiterate my support for these proposals today. We must restore bipartisanship to the administration of the House, reestablish regular order for considering legislation, and ensure the rights of the minority, whichever party is in the minority. The voice of every American has the right to be heard."

And she is right. But far from regular order is what we are dealing with here. There are a couple of items I want to present. We have heard that these issues to be dealt with over the next 100 hours of debate have already been vetted, already been through committee. In fact, the freshmen, who are at least 39-strong Democrats, have not had any opportunity. So there is no regular order there.

We also note that in the rules package under Democrat control, the Rules Committee would become anything but transparent, being that the votes that are required or will take place in the Rules Committee will not be available to the public. I do not think that is what the American people voted on when they voted in November.

A minority bill of rights is what we will propose in our previous question amendment motion, and it is that kind of common sense and that kind of accountability and fairness that Americans expect and that we are asking for.

Hearings, amendments to bills, 24 hours' notice, it is that kind of thing we need because it is that process that ensures that the House will work for all Americans to decrease taxes and to make certain our security is maintained in solving the health care challenges that we have.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that promises made on the campaign trail are going to be promises broken in the majority.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that we are acting quickly in this Congress on the unfinished business from the last Congress. In short order we will be dealing with things like implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations, we will have a clean, up-or-down vote on the minimum wage unchanged after 10 years, and we will be able to deal with promoting stem cell research and cutting interest rates on student loans. Again, this is getting past the unfinished business left over from the last Congress.

I am pleased that today, unlike how we started the last Congress, we are not beginning by watering down the ethics rules or making it more difficult for the minority.

I believe very strongly in the commitment that our caucus has made. Our leadership has articulated that we are not going to treat the Republican minority the way that we were treated. I think it is going to be very important, Mr. Speaker, that we deal with the spirit with which these rules are enforced. And I am absolutely certain that you will find that the people on the Democratic side of the aisle are going to make sure that the spirit is enforced to make sure that voting machines are not kept open for hours in the middle of the night; making sure that our commitment to have functioning conference committees, where Republicans will be invited to attend conference committees, know when they are there, be able to sign off on them, and not have things parachuted in in the middle of the night in back rooms that nobody had seen; There will be no effort to have the notorious K Street Project turn the business lobby into a partisan tool.

Most important, I am interested in our progress to maintain and enhance civil discourse on this floor. I look forward to a bipartisan effort on an ethics panel that would be independent enforcement and that issue will be reported back to Congress by March 15. I am interested in working on a bipartisan basis to establish this independent mechanism for ethics oversight.

The rules we are adopting today and that we will be refining are an important first step to realize the promise of

the new Congress. Most important will be the spirit. And I, for one, pledge myself to work with Rules Committee members on both sides of the aisle to make sure that that spirit is maintained.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Cherryville, North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California for that warm introduction.

Today was a historic day for the House of Representatives: A new Speaker, a new majority, and, in their words, a new time in Washington. To use the new Speaker's words, this is about respect for every voice, to work for every American, to seek common ground for the common good.

Those are high words and high values that we should seek here in the House of Representatives that all Americans desire in their government. And as a key part of what the Democrats campaigned on in the 2006 election, one of the key tenets was open and honest bipartisan governance. But their first act on this House floor is to push down the throats of this institution a closed rule that closes off debate, that disallows dissenting voices, that simply waves off that open, fair, and honest process.

To that end, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. And if we defeat the previous question, I will be able to offer this minority bill of rights, the Pelosi minority bill of rights. To use the words of the new Speaker, the minority bill of rights includes guidelines for bipartisan administration of the House and for the regular Democratic order for legislation. The principles are fair and will provide for the full and open debate that the American people expect and deserve. Now, those are not my words. Those are the words of the new Speaker. Then-Minority Leader PELOSI wrote those words in June of 2004.

Now, while the new Speaker and I may not agree on much in terms of policy, tax policy, or the policy on national defense, I think we have the same values when it comes to fair and open and honest legislative debate. And to that end I sought to outline her principles and put them into the minority bill of rights. So let us defeat the previous question so that we can vote on this minority bill of rights, the Pelosi bill of rights.

□ 1530

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 5, to provide for the rules package of the 110th Congress. I am proud that the first act of this new Congress is to pass long-overdue ethics and lobbying reform.

Today, we end the era of Jack Abramoff and Tom DeLay, when the levers of government were used less to help American families and more to reward monied special interests. Today, we take a major step to restoring Americans' trust in the legislative branch of government.

We will ban gifts from lobbyists, trips funded by lobbyists, and the use of company planes. We will shut down the K Street Project. We will force Members of Congress to take responsibility for their earmarks. And we will ban arm-twisting for votes.

The need for reform is obvious. The alliance between the previous leadership and K Street lobbyists came at a disastrous cost for democracy, decency, and the public interest. The best example is the industry-written Medicare D prescription drug bill passed in the middle of the night. The majority leadership held the vote open for 3 hours as they twisted arms and levied threats. Thousands of Maine seniors can see today that the program was designed to serve the insurance and pharmaceutical interests more than the people on Medicare.

I am pleased that the ethics package includes reforms that Congressmen DAVID OBEY, BARNEY FRANK, DAVID PRICE, and I introduced 1 year ago. I thank Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and Speaker PELOSI for incorporating our ideas, simple ideas, like ensuring that we all have time to read bills before they are voted on.

H. Res. 6 will restore the people's voice to the people's House. Every American family will benefit by legislation that is advanced in an open and transparent manner, rather than written by lobbyists behind closed doors.

I urge the adoption of this resolution and the entire Democratic rules and ethics reform package.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ESHOO). The gentleman from California has 14½ minutes remaining and the gentlelady from New York has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this juncture I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a very, very hardworking Member of the House, the Chair of the Republican Study Committee, the gentleman from Dallas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today, and, unfortunately, I have to oppose this particular rules package.

I listened very carefully to our new Speaker when she spoke of fairness, and yet I see that the minority is not being given the opportunity to offer amendments to this particular package when it comes to the floor. We are being asked to vote on things we don't even know what they are about, something that, Madam Speaker, your party complained of when you were in the minority.

But I specifically am disturbed by what I see in supposedly the fiscal responsibility portion that this rule package would allow. I heard our new Speaker talk about how important it was to bring PAYGO to the floor of the House; and I agree, it is a great concept.

Unfortunately, what is being offered, where the minority doesn't have an opportunity to amend, is really false advertising, because what we have, Madam Speaker, is, number one, this concept called baseline budgeting, where these programs are going to grow automatically in what we call discretionary spending, and yet this PAYGO doesn't apply to this. Anything that the majority writes into the budget resolution again is exempted from PAYGO. All of the entitlement spending, a majority of the spending, which could bankrupt our children and our grandchildren, once again is exempt.

What is covered, Madam Speaker? It is hard to find. But anything that is, then the majority has 5 to 10 years apparently to put off the costs, and somehow we are supposed to be convinced in 5 to 10 years they are actually going to pay for it.

Again, this is false advertising. This isn't PAYGO; this is TAXGO. All this is is a subterfuge to make sure that hardworking American families are denied the tax relief that the Republicans and President Bush brought, the tax relief that created 6 million new jobs, that created the highest rate of homeownership in the history of our country, that helped deficits fall, that ensured that real wages came up. That is why we need to oppose this rule, Madam Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, this is a historic day in this House: the first woman ever elected Speaker; the first woman, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, to be chairman of the powerful Rules Committee. In addition to that, Ms. SLAUGHTER and Speaker PELOSI have put together a package that is indeed a historic, comprehensive ethics package that deserves the support of each and every Member of this body.

In the last Congress, we saw egregious abuses of power by Members of Congress and lobbyists. These abuses tarnished the image of this great institution and caused Americans to lose faith with their government. In the face of these scandals, America had its midterm election and the American people decided decisively to put a new party in charge here in the House of Representatives. They sent a message loud and clear that it was time to clean up the Congress, and in fact exit polls showed that nearly 92 percent of the voters were concerned with the ethical cloud hanging over Washington.

What did they ask for? They asked for honest leadership and open government, and this package presented today by Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. PELOSI and the leadership is the most significant, comprehensive ethics reform that has ever been presented on the first day of an opening of this Congress.

This is a rules package that cuts the ties to the old culture of corruption and in its place creates a new culture of disclosure, of accountability, and of oversight. Starting today, there will be no more lobbyist-funded junkets or vacations; starting today, no more corporate jets, where Members of Congress can be flown to their indictment arraignment; starting today, no more lobbyist-paid gifts; beginning today, no more K Street Projects. All of this is over with the passage of this package.

I have heard the other side say they had no idea what this party was going to come up with for a rules package. We have been talking for quite some time about the efforts to reform this institution, to get transparency in earmarks, to have an institution where lobbyists can't fund vacations. Now if a Member wants to take a trip, it has to be approved in advance by the Ethics Committee.

As a matter of fact, nearly every public interest group in America that has been fighting for reform over the last decade has stepped up to the plate to say this package is the most significant reform of ethics rules that we have had in a generation.

So the time has come for Democrats and Republicans to join together to pass this comprehensive ethics reform package, because the American people demanded it in the last election, and Speaker PELOSI and the new leadership in this House are delivering on that request.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Marietta, Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), a hardworking former member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the former chairman of the Rules Committee, my colleague from California, and also congratulate the new chairman of the Rules Committee, our friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

I just want to point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman that just spoke, this ethics reform package, which we are not opposed to in the totality of it, but many, if not most of these provisions, Madam Speaker, were a part of H.R. 4975, the Republican ethics reform package which we passed in this House in May of this past year with only eight, count them, Madam Speaker, eight votes from the other side. There was total opposition to everything that we wanted to do in regard to ethics reform.

I will remind my colleagues in regard to the so-called K Street Project, that very provision, that is, Members not being able to put pressure on compa-

nies in regard to hiring practices, in regard to granting of any legislative favors, was part of that package. But yet our colleagues in the majority party now want to come forward and say "the K Street Project."

Now, where is the sense of fairness and fair play and bipartisanship in sticking it in the eye of the new minority, when we tried to change that very thing that they voted against?

I would say furthermore in regard to this overall package of rules, what is this business about not holding a vote open for the sole purpose of changing a vote? If that is in fact a good policy, not being able to do that, and I tend to agree with the new majority that we shouldn't be able to break people's arms with favors for earmarks or special committee assignments which may not be appropriate, then why use the word "sole?" Putting in "sole purpose" would allow them or anybody to lock a Member in the bathroom and say we are holding the vote open because they are stuck in traffic. So I would suggest let's eliminate "sole" and say for the purpose of pressuring a Member to change their vote against their will.

Last and not least, and maybe the chairman of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, can address this point of this unbelievable idea that members of the Rules Committee, the new members, maybe to protect the freshman members, are not allowed to have a roll call vote in the light of day.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), and we welcome you home.

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding time.

I am awfully proud to be standing here again in the midst of this distinguished body representing the people of the 22nd Congressional District of Texas.

A wave of change rushed across America since I left office, a wave that carried me back here to Washington, D.C., and I couldn't be prouder to vote today on the very first day of the 110th Congress to reform the rules and code of ethics by which this body operates; rules that were abused and tore Texas and this country apart, and a code of ethics that was disregarded and caused the American people to lose confidence in us, their representatives. We can't afford to wait another day to restore the trust and hope to those who sent us here to represent them.

It is not about moving to the left or to the right, but about moving this country forward. And now is the time to start working together by reaching across the aisle that we allow to divide us. It is time to conduct the people's business openly and honestly in the light of day.

I urge all of you, my distinguished colleagues, to join together in supporting these vital reforms. This is the first step toward restoring pride in our democracy, and that means restoring

fiscal responsibility. Passing our massive debt on to our kids and grandkids is not a legacy we want to leave. Those who elect us are our employers, and we must be diligent in spending their hard-earned money which they entrust to us.

The number of earmarks alone increased nearly 400 percent and spending doubled over the last decade. We must all make an effort, Republicans and Democrats alike, to trim the fat from the budget. We can once again have a balanced budget, fund important initiatives and be diligent in our oversight of agencies of government, all without raising taxes.

I am proud to cast one of my first votes in the 110th Congress in favor of pay-as-you-go rules and aggressive reform of the earmark process so that we can return to a government truly of, by, and for the people.

I am honored to be back in this Chamber. I am proud that this Congress is starting off on the right foot with the best interests of every American on our minds, and I am proud to ask all of my colleagues to support this significant package of rules, H. Res. 5 and 6.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to our very distinguished chief deputy whip, my good friend from Richmond (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the gentlelady from California on her election as Speaker and look forward to serving with her.

I just ran into a reporter on the outside of the Chamber who asked me about the tone of debate and what I thought the tone would be going forward. I agree with Leader BOEHNER when he spoke in this Chamber just a little bit earlier about the fact that we can debate, we can differ in a nice way, and I think that is what the American people expect.

□ 1545

But they also expect rigorous debate here on the floor of the House. I am asking my colleagues to reject the previous question. Because if we look at the message from this election, the American people spoke out: They want change. They want us to change the way that Washington does business. And in fact, a little less than 2 years ago, then Minority Leader PELOSI saw fit to send a letter to the former Speaker HASTERT spelling out the way that she thought this House should run, how we should change, a prescription to correct the so-called ills that my friend from Massachusetts mentioned earlier of the 109th Congress. So if we defeat the previous question, we in the House will be allowed to bring up what has been called the minority bill of rights, and this again was the recipe for change that then minority Leader PELOSI saw fit that was the

right prescription for the ills that affected this institution or allegedly affected this institution.

So it just doesn't make sense for us to be here today and somehow in spirit of bipartisanship, transparency, civility, to be going back on that pledge to honor the rights of all Americans so that we can have an open debate in this House. It doesn't make sense to follow the adage, "Do as I say, not as I do."

So I would urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, allow there to be light, allow there to be transparency, not just after we pass the first 100 hours of this Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

I understand your pain, I understand the hurt, and I understand that you are not really sure that we are going to be fair and honest. But if you look back on the 40 years here before, and I remember on the Rules Committee, that when a bill was coming up to rules, always the chairman and the ranking member came together. They worked together on everything. If it was an oversight committee, I recall that both the chair and the ranking member signed the subpoenas. There was such a series of cooperation we have never, as far as I know, dealt with retribution or underhandedness or hatefulness.

We know we have an awful lot of work to do. We have got a country to save; we have got a reputation to try to get back in the world; we have got the worst deficit we have ever seen; and, we have got to do something about a war. Let me pledge to you, we have no time for vindication or revenge, and it would be so nice if all the Members in this vote for a change would roll in the same direction.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond that I never used the words "pain," I never said "hurt." I said "disappointment." I said disappointment, Madam Speaker, because I am very disappointed.

I will tell you this: I am prepared at this moment to take my three Republican colleagues and go right upstairs to the Rules Committee and go to work at this moment so that we don't have closed rules in the opening day rules package for consideration of measures that have not gone through the committee process and have not had any opportunity to even have our amendments denied in the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I simply want to say there is no point going up to Rules. The Rules Committee has not been constituted yet. This is being brought under privileged communication.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just say, we are prepared at this moment, Madam Speaker, we will send a resolution right now so the Rules Committee can begin meeting upstairs.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I too am deeply disappointed today. I think part of the message from the electorate was that they want us to work together, that they want us to cooperate for the greater good. And, yes, that people were, at least in Nebraska, very upset with the examples of those who violated the public's trust.

We need to work together on an ethics plan. I am pleased that in this rule there are ethics measures that, by the way, the Republicans helped put together many months ago in reaction to the ethics violations we have seen from some of our colleagues.

So, as the people want us to work together in a partnership and not in partisanship, what we received was a partisan slap across the face. It is the mismatch between words and actions of which we are speaking today.

I have had a bill that was incorporated into the ethics package that we passed last May that the Democrats almost en banc opposed because it wasn't tough enough. The reality is that the package in today's rule, which we had no participation in, is, in many ways, weaker. And one of the examples is the fact that, as I worked on with our Speaker, that if you have violated the rules of this House and the public trust and you took money, you found \$90,000 of cold hard cash or you took limousines or whatever the violations were, that you shouldn't be able to leave in the public disgust with the benefits of public service, i.e., a pension. That was in the ethics package passed months ago but isn't in this one. So this is a weaker package.

Now, I too wish I would have had the opportunity to take the bill that I have introduced today and did last year and work with our friends on the other side, but, in the partisan slap, have been denied the ability to do so.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I will yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY), one of the freshmen of which we are so proud.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I am very honored to be part of the historic 110th Congress.

It is entirely appropriate that the incoming Congress is making ethics reform one of its first acts. This issue is personally important to me and to all of Californians.

We need to provide Congress with a fresh start and improve the strained relations that exist between voters and elected officials. Members of Congress should be held in the highest regard by the people they represent, and the ethics changes will help repair years of damage. We must reestablish positive relationships with everyone we serve, and end this period of mistrust in our government.

Traveling throughout our State of California, I heard from many people who simply want to believe and trust in their elected officials, and today we

are sending the message that we feel the same way.

I am confident also that this will be the first of very many steps that will take back trust and civility in Congress, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the ethics package.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ESHOO). The gentleman from California has 6 minutes; the gentlewoman from New York, 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I will yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Cherryville, North Carolina who would like to be recognized.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding, again, to restate what is very important about this coming vote on the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, we can then have an honest vote on the Pelosi minority bill of rights package. It is a very important thing for us to have an open, bipartisanship debate on opening day of this new Congress, for the new majority to be able to say clearly to the American people that their rhetoric is becoming reality on the opening day of this Congress. For if they do not do that and they do ram down the throats of all Members here on this floor this previous question, then all people will be locked out from offering debates on this House floor; and, from the Republican side, 140 million Americans who voted for our side of the aisle, their voices will be stifled in this process.

So, Madam Speaker, I encourage all Members, both Republicans and Democrats to come together, defeat this previous vote, and then we can move on to an open, fair debate on the minority bill of rights, the Pelosi minority bill of rights. That is a fair thing to do.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, the package before us will be modified tomorrow to include provisions that reinstate a practice that was followed throughout the 1990s in the budget process called pay-as-you-go.

Pay-as-you-go was first instituted in 1991 as part of the Budget Enforcement Act when President Bush, the first President Bush, was the President of this country. Pay-as-you-go simply provides that if you want to cut taxes when you have a deficit, you can't make the deficit worse; you have got to offset those tax cuts either with entitlement cuts in an equivalent amount or with tax increases elsewhere in the Tax Code. And, if you want to enhance an entitlement, you have to pay for it with an identified revenue stream.

Our friends across the aisle are trying to imply that this PAYGO rule is a sham. I will simply say to you that our

PAYGO rule is the art of the possible; it is what we can do at the present moment, and that is we can amend the rules of the House today and tomorrow to include two new PAYGO rules which we have provided for and which have been published.

There is some dispute as to whether or not the baseline against which to measure increases and decreases is going to be something that we can manipulate in the Budget Committee. I would simply invite everybody to read the language of the rule, and they will see that in this particular case, the Committee on the Budget is bound to turn to the Congressional Budget Office, which is traditional practice, and to use the recent baseline estimates supplied by the CBO consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1985. That is what the rule provides. We go to CBO for the baseline, we determine whether or not the extent to which there will be an increase in spending or decrease in revenues. It is a CBO function based upon the latest baseline. And any other construction of this is a false construction.

Now, some may say this is just a rule of the House, it can be waived by the Rules Committee because, as the other side well knows, points of order of this kind traditionally have been mowed down by the Rules Committee. But this is the best we can do with a rule of the House. We can later come back and make a statutory change, but it will be good to know if our opponents on the other side who support such a change.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee now, are there any further speakers on the majority side?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. There are not. And I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am actually very enthused and excited about the great new opportunity that lies ahead for every single one of us. We have heard speeches today from our distinguished Republican leader, and we are all very proud that my fellow Californian has become the first woman to preside over the greatest deliberative body known to man. And, as I said earlier, I am particularly proud of the fact that I am being succeeded by the distinguished chairwoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), as the first woman to chair the Rules Committee.

□ 1600

I am enthused about the challenges that lie ahead, and I am very encouraged by the words that we heard from our new Speaker about the need for civility, about the need for us to make sure that we recognize that we are first and foremost Americans, and that the message from last November's election was a very clear one. It was a message that we should come together, work together, Democrats and Republicans

alike, to solve the challenges that we face so that we can in fact do the people's business.

We are very proud of the accomplishments that we have had over the past 12 years, and I believe we can work with the new majority to build on those successes, the successes of ensuring that we have an economy that is second to none, an unemployment rate that is at near-record lows at 4.5 percent, strong domestic product growth, more Americans working than ever before in our Nation's history, more Americans owning their own homes, and more minority Americans owning their own homes.

I also am particularly proud of the fact that working together, Madam Speaker, we have been able to ensure that since that tragic day of September 11, 2001, we have not faced another attack on our soil.

The fact that we have not faced another attack is not an accident. It is because of good public policy and the leadership that we have had. Now we do have a change in leadership here in this institution, and there have been a wide range of promises that were made by Members who formerly served in the majority and now are coming back to majority status. As members of the minority, they talked about the need for enhanced minority rights. And I believe many of those things are very, very important. I believed them before, and I believe them now.

One of the things that I think is very important is for us to have an opportunity for consideration of measures here on the House floor that allow for a greater opportunity for Member participation. The thing that troubles me most is if we don't defeat this previous question and then defeat this rule that allows us to move forward, we will be proceeding with a package that will bring forward five closed rules, preventing the Rules Committee from having an opportunity to in any way consider the chance to bring forward amendments.

Never before, never before in our Nation's history have we seen an opening day Rules Committee that would allow for the consideration of five closed rules in the opening-day package. And one of the things, of course, that was discussed widely by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle which we have strongly supported is the notion of transparency, accountability, and disclosure.

One of the most troubling aspects of this measure is that we would move to prevent the RECORD from showing the votes that are cast in the Rules Committee.

We were very proud that we eliminated proxy voting when we came to majority status. Why? Because we wanted Members to show up to work, and we wanted the American people to see their work product.

Well, unfortunately, the American people understand what it means to show up to work. They understand

what it means for greater disclosure and accountability and transparency. We heard the opening remarks during this rule debate on letting the sunshine in. The sun is shining outside today, and it is going to shine in. Under this provision, we see a prevention for the opportunity for the sun to shine in the Rules Committee, and I find it very troubling.

Madam Speaker, I will be asking Members to vote "no" on the previous question so we can amend this rule to make in order to consider the Speaker's minority bill of rights as was outlined on May 25, 2006, in her document "New House Principles: A Congress For All Americans." We need to give the new majority an opportunity to live up to those commitments that were made.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment and extraneous materials in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a jurisdictional memorandum of understanding between the chairmen-designate from the Committee on Transportation and the Committee on Homeland Security.

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

There was no objection.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

January 4, 2007.

On January 4, 2005, the U.S. House of Representatives adopted H. Res. 5, establishing the Rules of the House for the 109th Congress. Section 2(a) established the Committee on Homeland Security as a standing committee of the House of Representatives with specific legislative jurisdiction under House Rule X. A legislative history to accompany the changes to House Rule X was inserted in the Congressional Record on January 4, 2005.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Homeland Security (hereinafter "Committees") jointly agree to the January 4, 2005 legislative history as the authoritative source of legislative history of section 2(a) of H. Res. 5 with the following two clarifications.

First, with regard to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's, FEMA, emergency preparedness and response programs, the Committee on Homeland Security has jurisdiction over the Department of Homeland Security's responsibilities with regard to emergency preparedness and collective response only as they relate to terrorism. However, in light of the federal emergency management reforms that were enacted as title VI of Public Law 109-295, a bill amending FEMA's all-hazards emergency preparedness programs that necessarily addresses FEMA's terrorism preparedness programs would be referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; in addition, the Committee on Homeland Security would have a

jurisdictional interest in such bill. Nothing in this Memorandum of Understanding affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

Second, with regard to port security, the Committee on Homeland Security has jurisdiction over port security, and some Coast Guard responsibilities in that area fall within the jurisdiction of both Committees. A bill addressing the activities, programs, assets, and personnel of the Coast Guard as they relate to port security and non-port security missions would be referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; in addition, the Committee on Homeland Security would have a jurisdictional interest in such bill.

This Memorandum of Understanding between the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Homeland Security provides further clarification to the January 4, 2005 legislative history of the jurisdiction of the Committees only with regard to these two specific issues. The Memorandum does not address any other issues and does not affect the jurisdiction of other committees.

JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Chairman-designate,
Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure.

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman-designate,
Committee on Homeland Security.

The material previously referred to by Mr. DREIER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA, MR. MCHENRY OF NORTH CAROLINA, AND MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the further amendments in section 6 shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 6. The amendments referred to in section 5 is as follows:

Strike section 503.

At the end of title III, insert the following new sections:

“Sec. 304. Bipartisan Administration of House of Representatives.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Rules of the House of Representatives are amended by adding at the end the following:

“RULE XXIX

“BIPARTISAN ADMINISTRATION OF HOUSE

“1. (a) The elected leadership of the majority and minority parties shall engage in regular consultations with each other to discuss scheduling, administration, and operations of the House.

“(b) The chair and ranking minority member of each committee, as well as their staffs, shall have regular meetings with each other.

“2. The House should have a predictable, professional, family-friendly schedule that allows the legislative process to proceed in a manner that ensures timely and deliberate dispensation of the work of the Congress.”

“(b) ALLOCATION OF COMMITTEE EXPENSES.—Clause 6 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(f) Of the amount provided to a committee under a primary expense resolution or a supplemental expense resolution under this clause, or during an interim funding pe-

riod described in clause 7, one-third of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, shall be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member.”

“Sec. 305. Regular Order for Legislation.

“RULE XXX

“REGULAR ORDER FOR LEGISLATION

“1. Legislation shall be developed following full hearings and open subcommittee and committee markups, with appropriate referrals to other committees. Members should have at least 24 hours to examine any legislation before its consideration at the subcommittee level.

“2. Legislation shall generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full, and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute.

“3. Members shall have at least 24 hours to examine bill and conference report text prior to floor consideration. Rules governing floor debate must be reported before 10 p.m. for any legislation to be considered the following day.

“4. Floor votes shall be completed within 15 minutes, with the customary 2-minute extension to accommodate Members' ability to get to the House Chamber to cast their votes. No vote shall be held open in order to manipulate the outcome.

“5. Conference committees shall hold regular meetings (at least weekly) of all conference committee Members. All managers appointed to a conference committee shall be informed of the schedule of conference committee activities in a timely manner, and given ample opportunity for input and debate as decisions are made toward final language for the conference report.

“6. The Suspension Calendar shall be restricted to non-controversial legislation, and the ratio of legislation on the Calendar which is sponsored by members of the minority party shall be the same as the ratio of the number of members of the party to the membership of the whole House.”

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress. Only political affiliation has been changed.)

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 Democratic 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 Democratic 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 a 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 Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 197, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Bishop (NY)	Carson
Ackerman	Blumenauer	Castor
Allen	Boren	Chandler
Altmire	Boswell	Clarke
Andrews	Boucher	Clay
Arcuri	Boyd (FL)	Cleaver
Baca	Boyd (KS)	Clyburn
Baird	Brady (PA)	Cohen
Baldwin	Braleigh (IA)	Conyers
Barrow	Brown, Corrine	Cooper
Becerra	Butterfield	Costa
Berkley	Capps	Costello
Berman	Cardoza	Courtney
Berry	Carnahan	Cramer
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Crowley

Cuellar Kind
 Cummings Klein (FL)
 Davis (AL) Kucinich
 Davis (CA) Lampson
 Davis (IL) Langevin
 Davis, Lincoln Lantos
 DeFazio Larsen (WA)
 DeGette Larson (CT)
 DeLauro Lee
 Dicks Levin
 Dingell Lewis (GA)
 Doggett Lipinski
 Donnelly Loebsock
 Doyle Lofgren, Zoe
 Edwards Lowey
 Ellison Mahoney (FL)
 Ellsworth Maloney (NY)
 Emanuel Markey
 Engel Marshall
 Eshoo Matheson
 Etheridge Matsui
 Farr McCarthy (NY)
 Fattah McCollum (MN)
 Filner McDermott
 Frank (MA) McGovern
 Giffords McIntyre
 Gillibrand McNeerney
 Gonzalez McNulty
 Gordon Meehan
 Green, Al Meek (FL)
 Green, Gene Meeks (NY)
 Grijalva Melancon
 Gutierrez Michaud
 Hall (NY) Millender-
 Hare McDonald
 Harman Miller (NC)
 Hastings (FL) Miller, George
 Herseith Mitchell
 Higgins Mollohan
 Hill Moore (KS)
 Hinchey Moore (WI)
 Hinojosa Moran (VA)
 Hirono Murphy (CT)
 Hodes Murphy, Patrick
 Holden Murtha
 Holt Napolitano
 Honda Neal (MA)
 Hooley Oberstar
 Hoyer Obey
 Israel Olver
 Jackson (IL) Ortiz
 Jackson-Lee Pallone
 (TX) Pascrell
 Jefferson Pastor
 Johnson (GA) Payne
 Kagen Pelosi
 Kaptur Perlmutter
 Kennedy Peterson (MN)
 Kildee Pomeroy
 Kilpatrick Price (NC)
 Rangel

Reyes LoBiondo
 Rodriguez Lucas
 Ross Lungen, Daniel
 Rothman E.
 Roybal-Allard Mack
 Ruppertsberger Manzullo
 Rush Marchant
 Salazar McCarthy (CA)
 Sánchez, Linda McCaul (TX)
 T. McCotter
 Sanchez, Loretta McCreery
 Sarbanes McHenry
 Schakowsky McHugh
 Schiff McKeon
 Lowey McMorris
 Mahoney (FL) Rodgers
 Maloney (NY) Mica
 Markey Scott (GA)
 Marshall Scott (VA)
 Matheson Serrano
 Matsui Sherman
 McCarthy (NY) Shuler
 McCollum (MN) Sires
 McDermott Skelton
 McGovern Slaughter
 McIntyre Smith (WA)
 McNeerney Snyder
 McNulty Solis
 Meehan Space
 Meek (FL) Spratt
 Meeks (NY) Stark
 Melancon Stupak
 Michaud Sutton
 Millender- Tanner
 McDonald Tauscher
 Miller (NC) Taylor
 Miller, George Thompson (CA)
 Mitchell Thompson (MS)
 Mollohan Tierney
 Moore (KS) Towns
 Moore (WI) Udall (CO)
 Moran (VA) Udall (NM)
 Murphy (CT) Van Hollen
 Murphy, Patrick Velázquez
 Murtha Vislosky
 Napolitano Walz (MN)
 Neal (MA) Wasserman
 Oberstar Schultz
 Obey Waters
 Olver Watson
 Ortiz Watt
 Pallone Waxman
 Pascrell Weiner
 Pastor Welch (VT)
 Payne Wexler
 Pelosi Wilson (OH)
 Perlmutter Woolsey
 Peterson (MN) Wu
 Pomeroy Wynn
 Price (NC) Yarmuth
 Rangel

NOT VOTING—16
 Bean Inslee
 Brown (SC) Johnson, E. B.
 Buyer Jones (OH)
 Capuano Kanjorski
 Gerlach Lamborn
 Gillmor Lynch

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS-ELECT

The SPEAKER (during the vote). Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) kindly come to the well of the House and take the oath of office.

Messrs. GOHMERT, MORAN of Kansas, and Rogers of Michigan appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will, well and faithfully, discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations.

□ 1630

Mr. AKIN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
 Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I was absent from the House floor during today's vote on the previous question that would allow for floor consideration of a Minority Rules Package.

Had I been present, I would have voted to support the previous question.

Stated against:
 Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, I was inadvertently detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, I was unable to make it to the floor in time to vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. DREIER
 Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ESHOO). The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Dreier moves to commit the resolution (H. Res. 5) to a select committee composed of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader with instructions to report back the same to the House forthwith with only the following amendment:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the further amendment in section 6 shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 6. The amendment referred to in section 5 is as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following new section:

SEC. 406. KEEPING AMERICANS' TAX DOLLARS SAFE.

At the end of clause 6(c) of rule XIII, strike the period, insert a semicolon, and insert the following:

“(3) A rule or order waiving the requirement of clause 10 of rule XX; or,
 “(4) A rule or order waiving the applicability of clause 5(b) or (c) of rule XXI.”

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to commit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. DREIER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read the motion to commit.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 199, nays 232, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]
 YEAS—199

Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt
Akin	Barton (TX)	Boehner
Alexander	Biggert	Bonner
Bachmann	Bilbray	Bono
Bachus	Bilirakis	Boozman
Baker	Bishop (UT)	Boustany
Barrett (SC)	Blackburn	Brady (TX)

NAYS—17

Aderholt Cole (OK)
 Akin Conaway
 Alexander Crenshaw
 Bachmann Cubin
 Bachus Culberson
 Baker Davis (KY)
 Barrett (SC) Davis, David
 Bartlett (MD) Davis, Jo Ann
 Barton (TX) Davis, Tom
 Biggert Deal (GA)
 Bilbray Dent
 Bilirakis Diaz-Balart, L.
 Bishop (UT) Diaz-Balart, M.
 Blackburn Doolittle
 Blunt Drake
 Boehner Dreier
 Bonner Duncan
 Bono Ehlers
 Boozman Emerson
 Boustany English (PA)
 Brady (TX) Everett
 Brown-Waite, Ginny Fallin
 Buchanan Feeney
 Burgess Ferguson
 Burton (IN) Flake
 Calvert Forbes
 Camp (MI) Fortenberry
 Campbell (CA) Fossella
 Cannon Foxx
 Cantor Franks (AZ)
 Capito Frelinghuysen
 Carter Gallegly
 Castle Garrett (NJ)
 Chabot Gilchrest
 Coble Gingrey
 Gohmert Gohmert
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves
 Hall (TX)
 Hastert
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Inglis (SC)
 Issa
 Jindal
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Jordan
 Keller
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kline (MN)
 Knollenberg
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder

Brown-Waite, Ginny	Heller	Pickering	Kaptur	Mollohan	Sestak	Farr	Lofgren, Zoe	Rush
Buchanan	Hensarling	Pitts	Kennedy	Moore (KS)	Shea-Porter	Fattah	Lowey	Ryan (OH)
Burgess	Herger	Platts	Kildee	Moore (WI)	Sherman	Filner	Lynch	Salazar
Burton (IN)	Hobson	Poe	Kilpatrick	Moran (VA)	Shuler	Frank (MA)	Mahoney (FL)	Sánchez, Linda
Calvert	Hoekstra	Porter	Kind	Murphy (CT)	Sires	Giffords	Maloney (NY)	T.
Camp (MI)	Hulshof	Price (GA)	Klein (FL)	Murphy, Patrick	Skelton	Gillibrand	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta
Campbell (CA)	Hunter	Pryce (OH)	Kucinich	Murtha	Slaughter	Gonzalez	Marshall	Sarbanes
Cannon	Inglis (SC)	Putnam	Lampson	Nadler	Smith (WA)	Gordon	Matheson	Schakowsky
Cantor	Issa	Radanovich	Langevin	Napolitano	Snyder	Green, Al	Matsui	Schiff
Capito	Jindal	Ramstad	Lantos	Neal (MA)	Solis	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Carter	Johnson (IL)	Regula	Larsen (WA)	Oberstar	Space	Grijalva	McColum (MN)	Scott (GA)
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Rehberg	Larsen (CT)	Obey	Spratt	Gutierrez	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Chabot	Jones (NC)	Reichert	Lee	Olver	Stark	Hall (NY)	McGovern	Serrano
Coble	Jordan	Renzi	Levin	Ortiz	Stupak	Hare	McIntyre	Sestak
Cole (OK)	Keller	Reynolds	Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Sutton	Harman	McNerney	Shays
Conaway	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	Lipinski	Pascrell	Tanner	Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Shea-Porter
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Loeb sack	Pastor	Tauscher	Herseth	Meehan	Sherman
Cubin	Kingston	Rogers (MI)	Lofgren, Zoe	Payne	Taylor	Higgins	Meek (FL)	Shuler
Culberson	Kirk	Rohrabacher	Lowey	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)	Hill	Meeks (NY)	Sires
Davis (KY)	Kline (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen	Lynch	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (MS)	Hinche y	Melancon	Skelton
Diaz, David	Knollenberg	Roskam	Mahoney (FL)	Pomeroy	Tierney	Hinojosa	Michaud	Slaughter
Davis, Jo Ann	Kuhl (NY)	Royce	Mahoney (NY)	Price (NC)	Towns	Holden	Millender-McDonald	Smith (WA)
Davis, Tom	LaHood	Ryan (WI)	Markey	Rahall	Udall (CO)	Hodes	Miller (NC)	Snyder
Deal (GA)	Lamborn	Sali	Marshall	Rangel	Udall (NM)	Holt	Miller, George	Solis
Dent	Latham	Schmidt	Matheson	Reyes	Van Hollen	Honda	Mitchell	Space
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner	Matsui	Rodriguez	Velázquez	Hooley	Mollohan	Spratt
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lewis (CA)	Sessions	McCarthy (NY)	Ross	Visclosky	Hoyer	Moore (KS)	Stark
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg	McColum (MN)	Rothman	Walz (MN)	Inslee	Moore (WI)	Stupak
Drake	Linder	Shays	McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman	Israel	Moran (VA)	Sutton
Dräger	LoBiondo	Shimkus	McGovern	Ruppersberger	Schultz	Jackson (IL)	Murphy (CT)	Tanner
Duncan	Lucas	Shuster	McIntyre	Rush	Waters	Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Patrick	Tauscher
Ehlers	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson	McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Watson	(TX)	Taylor	Thompson (CA)
Emerson	E.	Smith (NE)	McNulty	Salazar	Watt	Jefferson	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
English (PA)	Mack	Smith (NJ)	Meehan	Sánchez, Linda	Waxman	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Tierney
Everett	Manzullo	Smith (TX)	Meek (FL)	T.	Weiner	Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)	Towns
Fallin	Marchant	Souder	Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch (VT)	Jones (NC)	Oberstar	Udall (CO)
Feeney	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns	Melancon	Sarbanes	Wexler	Jones (OH)	Obey	Udall (NM)
Ferguson	McCaul (TX)	Sullivan	Michaud	Schakowsky	Wilson (OH)	Kagen	Olver	Van Hollen
Flake	McCotter	Tancredo	Millender-McDonald	Schiff	Woolsey	Kanjorski	Ortiz	Velázquez
Forbes	McCrery	Terry	Miller (NC)	Scott (GA)	Wu	Kennedy	Pallone	Visclosky
Fortenberry	McHenry	Tiahrt	Miller, George	Scott (VA)	Wynn	Kildee	Pascrell	Pastor
Fossella	McKeon	Turner	Mitchell	Serrano	Yarmuth	Kilpatrick	Paul	Wasserman
Fox	McMorris	Upton				Kind	Payne	Schultz
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Walberg				Klein (FL)	Perlmutter	Waters
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Walden (OR)				Kucinich	Peterson (MN)	Watt
Gallely	Miller (FL)	Walsh (NY)				Lampson	Pomeroy	Waxman
Garrett (NJ)	Miller (MI)	Wamp				Langevin	Price (NC)	Weiner
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Weldo (FL)				Lantos	Rahall	Welch (VT)
Gilchrest	Moran (KS)	Weller				Larsen (WA)	Rangel	Wexler
Gillmor	Murphy, Tim	Westmoreland				Larson (CT)	Reyes	Wilson (OH)
Gingrey	Musgrave	Whitfield				Lee	Rodriguez	Woolsey
Gohmert	Myrick	Wicker				Levin	Ross	Wu
Goode	Neugebauer	Wilson (NM)				Lewis (GA)	Rothman	Wynn
Goodlatte	Norwood	Wilson (SC)				Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth
Granger	Nunes	Wolf				Loeb sack	Ruppersberger	
Graves	Paul	Young (AK)						
Hall (TX)	Pearce	Young (FL)						
Hastert	Pence							
Hastings (WA)	Peterson (PA)							
Hayes	Petri							

NOT VOTING—3

□ 1650

Mr. OBEY, Mr. ELLSWORTH and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT of Virginia). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 195, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—235

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke

Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner

Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinche y
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski

Brown (SC)
Buyer
Saxton

Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge

NAYS—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin

Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dräger
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallely
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert

Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter

McHenry	Pryce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
McHugh	Putnam	Smith (TX)
McKeon	Radanovich	Souder
McMorris	Ramstad	Stearns
Rodgers	Regula	Sullivan
Mica	Rehberg	Tancredo
Miller (FL)	Reichert	Terry
Miller (MI)	Renzi	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Reynolds	Tiahrt
Moran (KS)	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi
Murphy, Tim	Rogers (MI)	Turner
Musgrave	Rohrabacher	Upton
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Neugebauer	Roskam	Walden (OR)
Norwood	Royce	Walsh (NY)
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Wamp
Pearce	Sali	Weldon (FL)
Pence	Saxton	Weller
Peterson (PA)	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Pickering	Sessions	Wicker
Pitts	Shadegg	Wilson (NM)
Platts	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Poe	Shuster	Wolf
Porter	Simpson	Young (AK)
Price (GA)	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Brown (SC)	McCrery
Buyer	Rogers (KY)

□ 1710

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the resolution just adopted, I call up House Resolution 6 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 6

Resolved,

TITLE I. ADOPTION OF RULES OF ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

SEC. 101. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress.

TITLE II. ETHICS

SEC. 201. That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress, with the following amendments:

SEC. 202. ENDING THE K-STREET PROJECT.

Rule XXIII is amended by redesignating clause 14 as clause 15, and by inserting after clause 13 the following new clause:

“14. A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not, with the intent to influence on the basis of partisan political affiliation an employment decision or employment practice of any private entity—

“(a) take or withhold, or offer or threaten to take or withhold, an official act; or

“(b) influence, or offer or threaten to influence, the official act of another.”.

SEC. 203. BAN ON GIFTS FROM LOBBYISTS.

(a) Clause 5(a)(1)(A) of rule XXV is amended by inserting “(i)” after “(A)” and adding at the end the following:

“(ii) A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House

may not knowingly accept a gift from a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal or from a private entity that retains or employs registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal except as provided in subparagraph (3) of this paragraph.”.

(b) Clause 5(a)(1)(B) of rule XXV is amended by inserting “not prohibited by subdivision (A)(ii)” after the parenthetical.

SEC. 204. VALUATION OF TICKETS TO SPORTING AND ENTERTAINMENT EVENTS.

Clause 5(a)(1)(B) of rule XXV is further amended by inserting “(i)” after “(8)” and adding at the end the following:

“(i) A gift of a ticket to a sporting or entertainment event shall be valued at the face value of the ticket or, in the case of a ticket without a face value, at the highest cost of a ticket with a face value for the event. The price printed on a ticket to an event shall be deemed its face value only if it also is the price at which the issuer offers that ticket for sale to the public.”.

SEC. 205. RESTRICTION OF PRIVATELY FUNDED TRAVEL.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Clause 5(b)(1) of rule XXV is amended—

(1) in subdivision (A), by striking “from a private source” and all that follows through “prohibited by this clause” and inserting “for necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses for travel to a meeting, speaking engagement, factfinding trip, or similar event in connection with his duties as an officeholder shall be considered as a reimbursement to the House and not a gift prohibited by this clause when it is from a private source other than a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal or a private entity that retains or employs registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal (except as provided in subdivision (C))”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subdivision:

“(C) A reimbursement (including payment in kind) to a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House for any purpose described in subdivision (A) also shall be considered as a reimbursement to the House and not a gift prohibited by this clause (without regard to whether the source retains or employs registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal) if it is, under regulations prescribed by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to implement this provision—

“(i) directly from an institution of higher education within the meaning of section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965; or

“(ii) provided only for attendance at or participation in a one-day event (exclusive of travel time and an overnight stay).

“Regulations prescribed to implement this provision may permit a two-night stay when determined by the committee on a case-by-case basis to be practically required to participate in the one-day event.”.

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

SEC. 206. LOBBYIST ORGANIZATIONS AND PARTICIPATION IN CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause 5 of rule XXV is further amended by redesignating paragraphs (c), (d), (e), and (f) as paragraphs (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (b) the following:

“(c)(1)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (8), a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House may not accept a reimbursement (including payment in kind) for transportation, lodging, or related expenses for a trip on which the traveler is accompanied on any segment by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal.

“(B) Subdivision (A) does not apply to a trip for which the source of reimbursement is an institution of higher education within the meaning of section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(2) A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House may not accept a reimbursement (including payment in kind) for transportation, lodging, or related expenses under the exception in paragraph (b)(1)(C)(ii) of this clause for a trip that is financed in whole or in part by a private entity that retains or employs registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal unless any involvement of a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal in the planning, organization, request, or arrangement of the trip is de minimis under rules prescribed by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to implement paragraph (b)(1)(C) of this clause.

“(3) A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House may not accept a reimbursement (including payment in kind) for transportation, lodging, or related expenses for a trip (other than a trip permitted under paragraph (b)(1)(C) of this clause) if such trip is in any part planned, organized, requested, or arranged by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal.”.

“(d) A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House shall, before accepting travel otherwise permissible under paragraph (b)(1) of this clause from any private source—

“(1) provide to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct before such trip a written certification signed by the source or (in the case of a corporate person) by an officer of the source—

“(A) that the trip will not be financed in any part by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal;

“(B) that the source either—

“(i) does not retain or employ registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal; or

“(ii) is an institution of higher education within the meaning of section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965; or

“(iii) certifies that the trip meets the requirements specified in rules prescribed by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to implement paragraph (b)(1)(C)(ii) of this clause and specifically details the extent of any involvement of a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal in the planning, organization, request, or arrangement of the trip considered to qualify as de minimis under such rules;

“(C) that the source will not accept from another source any funds earmarked directly or indirectly for the purpose of financing any aspect of the trip;

“(D) that the traveler will not be accompanied on any segment of the trip by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal (except in the case of a trip for which the source of reimbursement is an institution of higher education within the meaning of section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965); and

“(E) that (except as permitted in paragraph (b)(1)(C) of this clause) the trip will not in any part be planned, organized, requested, or arranged by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal; and

“(2) after the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has promulgated the regulations mandated in paragraph (i)(1)(8) of this clause, obtain the prior approval of the committee for such trip.”.

(b) CONFORMING CHANGES IN CROSS-REFERENCES.—Clause 5 of rule XXV is further amended by—

(1) in clause 5(a)(3)(E), striking “paragraph (c)(3)” and inserting “paragraph (e)(3)”; and

(2) in clause 5(e)(2) (as redesignated), striking “paragraph (d)” and inserting “paragraph (f)” .

(c) **TIMELINESS OF INFORMATION.**—Clause 5(b)(1)(A)(ii) of rule XXV is amended by striking “30 days” and inserting “15 days”.

(d) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Clause 5(b)(3) of rule XXV is amended by striking “of expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed”.

(e) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Clause 5(b)(5) of rule XXV is amended to read as follows:

“(5) The Clerk of the House shall make all advance authorizations, certifications, and disclosures filed pursuant to this paragraph available for public inspection as soon as possible after they are received.”

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on March 1, 2007.

SEC. 207. FURTHER LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR TRAVEL.

Rule XXIII is further amended by redesignating clause 15 (as earlier redesignated) as clause 16, and by inserting after clause 14 the following new clause:

“15. (a) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not use personal funds, official funds, or campaign funds for a flight on a non-governmental airplane that is not licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration to operate for compensation or hire.

“(b) In this clause, the term ‘campaign funds’ includes funds of any political committee under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, without regard to whether the committee is an authorized committee of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner involved under such Act.”

SEC. 208. EXPENSES FOR OFFICIALLY CONNECTED TRAVEL.

Clause 5 of rule XXV is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i)(1) Not later than 45 days after the date of adoption of this paragraph and at annual intervals thereafter, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall develop and revise, as necessary—

“(A) guidelines on judging the reasonableness of an expense or expenditure for purposes of this clause, including the factors that tend to establish—

“(i) a connection between a trip and official duties;

“(ii) the reasonableness of an amount spent by a sponsor;

“(iii) a relationship between an event and an officially connected purpose; and

“(iv) a direct and immediate relationship between a source of funding and an event; and

“(B) regulations describing the information it will require individuals subject to this clause to submit to the committee in order to obtain the prior approval of the committee for any travel covered by this clause, including any required certifications.

“(2) In developing and revising guidelines under paragraph (1)(A), the committee shall take into account the maximum per diem rates for official Government travel published annually by the General Services Administration, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense.”

SEC. 209. ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE.

Clause 5(b)(3) of rule XXV is further amended—

(a) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of subdivision (E);

(b) by redesignating subdivision (F) as subdivision (G); and

(c) by inserting after subdivision (E) the following new subdivision:

“(F) a description of meetings and events attended; and”.

SEC. 210. CLERICAL CORRECTION.

Clause 5(f)(1) of rule XXV (as earlier redesignated) is amended by striking “are” and inserting “is”.

SEC. 211. ANNUAL ETHICS TRAINING FOR MEMBERS, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE.

(a) Training Program.—Clause 3(a) of rule XI is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(6)(A) The committee shall offer annual ethics training to each Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, and employee of the House. Such training shall—

“(i) involve the classes of employees for whom the committee determines such training to be appropriate; and

“(ii) include such knowledge of the Code of Official Conduct and related House rules as may be determined appropriate by the committee.

“(B)(i) A new officer or employee of the House shall receive training under this paragraph not later than 60 days after beginning service to the House.

“(ii) Not later than January 31 of each year, each officer and employee of the House shall file a certification with the committee that the officer or employee attended ethics training in the last year as established by this subparagraph.”

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on March 1, 2007.

SEC. 212. DESIGNATING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.

(a) Clause 1 (e) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on Education and the Workforce” and inserting “Committee on Education and Labor”.

(b) Clause 3(d) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on Education and the Workforce” and inserting “Committee on Education and Labor”.

SEC. 213. DESIGNATING COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

(a) Clause 1 of rule X is amended by—

(1) redesignating the existing paragraphs (h) through (m), as paragraphs (m), (i), (V), (h), (k), and (l), respectively (inserting paragraph (h), as redesignated, after paragraph (g)); and

(2) in paragraph (h), as redesignated, striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

(b) Clause 3 of rule X is amended by—

(1) redesignating the existing paragraphs (b) through (i) as paragraphs (c), (e), (d), (i), (g), (f), (b) and (h), respectively (inserting paragraph (b), as redesignated, after paragraph (a); inserting paragraph (d), as redesignated, after paragraph (c); and inserting paragraph (f), as redesignated, after paragraph (e)); and

(2) in paragraph (f), as redesignated, striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

(c) Clause 11 (a)(1)(C) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

(d) Clause 2(d) of rule XII is amended by striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

SEC. 214. DESIGNATING COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.

(a) Clause 1 (I) of rule X (as earlier redesignated) is amended by striking “Committee on Resources” and inserting “Committee on Natural Resources”.

(b) Clause 3(h) of rule X (as earlier redesignated) is amended by striking “Committee on Resources” and inserting “Committee on Natural Resources”.

SEC. 215. DESIGNATING COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.

(a) Clause 1 of rule X is further amended by—

(1) inserting paragraph (m) (as earlier redesignated), after paragraph (I) (as earlier redesignated); and

(2) in paragraph (m) (as earlier redesignated), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

(b) Clause 2 of rule X is amended by—

(1) in paragraph (d)(1), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”; and

(2) in paragraph (d)(2), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

(c) Clause 3 of rule X is further amended by—

(1) inserting paragraph (i) (as earlier redesignated) after paragraph (h) (as earlier redesignated); and

(2) in paragraph (i), (as earlier redesignated), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

(d) Clause 4 of rule X is amended by—

(1) in paragraph (c)(1), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”; and

(2) in paragraph (c)(2), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

(e) Clause 5(d)(2) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

(f) Clause 4 of rule XV is amended by striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

SEC. 216. DESIGNATING COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) Clause 1 (o) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on Science” and inserting “Committee on Science and Technology”.

(b) Clause 3(k) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on Science” and inserting “Committee on Science and Technology”.

SEC. 217. SEPARATE ORDER: NUMBERING OF BILLS.

In the One Hundred Tenth Congress, the first 10 numbers for bills (H.R. 1 through H.R. 10) shall be reserved for assignment by the Speaker to such bills as she may designate.

TITLE III. CIVILITY

SEC. 301. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress, with the following amendments:

SEC. 302. PROPER CONDUCT OF VOTES.

Clause 2(a) of rule XX is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following sentence: “A record vote by electronic device shall not be held open for the sole purpose of reversing the outcome of such vote.”

SEC. 303. FULL AND OPEN DEBATE IN CONFERENCE.

In rule XXII—

(a) clause 12(a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(3) In conducting conferences with the Senate, managers on the part of the House should endeavor to ensure—

“(A) that meetings for the resolution of differences between the two Houses occur

only under circumstances in which every manager on the part of the House has notice of the meeting and a reasonable opportunity to attend;

“(B) that all provisions on which the two Houses disagree are considered as open to discussion at any meeting of a conference committee; and

“(C) that papers reflecting a conference agreement are held inviolate to change without renewal of the opportunity of all managers on the part of the House to reconsider their decisions to sign or not to sign the agreement.

“(4) Managers on the part of the House shall be provided a unitary time and place with access to at least one complete copy of the final conference agreement for the purpose of recording their approval (or not) of the final conference agreement by placing their signatures (or not) on the sheets prepared to accompany the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the managers.”

(b) add the following new clause at the end: “13. It shall not be in order to consider a conference report the text of which differs in any way, other than clerical, from the text that reflects the action of the conferees on all of the differences between the two Houses, as recorded by their placement of their signatures (or not) on the sheets prepared to accompany the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the managers.”

TITLE IV. FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

SEC. 401. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress, with the following amendments:

SEC. 402. RECONCILIATION.

Rule XXI is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“7. It shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget, or an amendment thereto, or a conference report thereon that contains reconciliation directives under section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that specify changes in law reducing the surplus or increasing the deficit for either the period comprising the current fiscal year and the five fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year or the period comprising the current fiscal year and the ten fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year. In determining whether reconciliation directives specify changes in law reducing the surplus or increasing the deficit, the sum of the directives for each reconciliation bill (under section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) envisioned by that measure shall be evaluated.

SEC. 403. APPLYING POINTS OF ORDER UNDER BUDGET ACT TO BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS CONSIDERED UNDER SPECIAL RULES.

Rule XXI is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“8. With respect to measures considered pursuant to a special order of business, points of order under title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall operate without regard to whether the measure concerned has been reported from committee. Such points of order shall operate with respect to (as the case may be)—

“(a) the form of a measure recommended by the reporting committee where the stat-

ute uses the term “as reported” (in the case of a measure that has been so reported);

“(b) the form of the measure made in order as an original bill or joint resolution for the purpose of amendment; or

“(c) the form of the measure on which the previous question is ordered directly to passage.”

SEC. 404. CONGRESSIONAL EARMARK REFORM.

(a) Point of Order against Congressional Earmarks.—Rule XXI is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“9. (a) It shall not be in order to consider—

“(1) a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee unless the report includes a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or in the report (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits;

“(2) a bill or joint resolution not reported by a committee unless the chairman of each committee of initial referral has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration;

“(3) an amendment to a bill or joint resolution to be offered at the outset of its consideration for amendment by a member of a committee of initial referral as designated in a report of the Committee on Rules to accompany a resolution prescribing a special order of business unless the proponent has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the amendment (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the proponent for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration; or

“(4) a conference report to accompany a bill or joint resolution unless the joint explanatory statement prepared by the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate includes a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the conference report or joint statement (and the name of any Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator who submitted a request to the House or Senate committees of jurisdiction for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

“(b) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a). As disposition of a point of order under this paragraph, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a). The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

“(c) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order raised under paragraph (a) may be based only on the failure of a report,

submission to the Congressional Record, or joint explanatory statement to include a list required by paragraph (a) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

“(d) For the purpose of this clause, the term ‘congressional earmark’ means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator providing, authorizing or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process.

“(e) For the purpose of this clause, the term ‘limited tax benefit’ means—

“(1) any revenue-losing provision that—

“(A) provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to 10 or fewer beneficiaries under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and

“(B) contains eligibility criteria that are not uniform in application with respect to potential beneficiaries of such provision; or

“(2) any Federal tax provision which provides one beneficiary temporary or permanent transition relief from a change to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(f) For the purpose of this clause, the term ‘limited tariff benefit’ means a provision modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.

(b) Related Amendment to Code of Official Conduct.—Rule XXIII is amended—

(a) by redesignating clause 16 (as earlier redesignated) as clause 18; and

(b) by inserting after clause 15 the following new clauses:

“16. A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not condition the inclusion of language to provide funding for a congressional earmark, a limited tax benefit, or a limited tariff benefit in any bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying report) or in any conference report on a bill or joint resolution (including an accompanying joint explanatory statement of managers) on any vote cast by another Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. For purposes of this clause and clause 17, the terms ‘congressional earmark,’ ‘limited tax benefit,’ and ‘limited tariff benefit’ shall have the meanings given them in clause 9 of rule XXI.

“17. (a) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who requests a congressional earmark, a limited tax benefit, or a limited tariff benefit in any bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying report) or in any conference report on a bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying joint statement of managers) shall provide a written statement to the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee of jurisdiction, including—

“(1) the name of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner;

“(2) in the case of a congressional earmark, the name and address of the intended recipient, or, if there is no specifically intended recipient, the intended location of the activity;

“(3) in the case of a limited tax or tariff benefit, identification of the individual or entities reasonably anticipated to benefit, to the extent known to the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner;

“(4) the purpose of such congressional earmark or limited tax or tariff benefit; and

“(5) a certification that the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or spouse has no financial interest in such congressional earmark or limited tax or tariff benefit.

“(b) Each committee shall maintain the information transmitted under paragraph (a), and the written disclosures for any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits included in any measure reported by the committee or conference report filed by the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall be open for public inspection.”

SEC. 405. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER.

Rule XXI is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“10. It shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the deficit or reducing the surplus for either the period comprising the current fiscal year and the five fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year or the period comprising the current fiscal year and the ten fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year. The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget relative to—

(a) the most recent baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 used in considering a concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(b) after the beginning of a new calendar year and before consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the most recent baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.”

TITLE V. MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress, with the following amendments:

SEC. 502. DEPOSITION AUTHORITY.

Clause 4(c) of rule X is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(3)(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform may adopt a rule authorizing and regulating the taking of depositions by a member or counsel of the committee, including pursuant to subpoena under clause 2(m) of rule XI (which hereby is made applicable for such purpose).

“(B) A rule adopted by the committee pursuant to this subparagraph—

“(i) may provide that a deponent be directed to subscribe an oath or affirmation before a person authorized by law to administer the same; and

“(ii) shall ensure that the minority members and staff of the committee are accorded equitable treatment with respect to notice of and a reasonable opportunity to participate in any proceeding conducted thereunder.

“(C) Information secured pursuant to the authority described in subdivision (A) shall retain the character of discovery until offered for admission in evidence before the committee, at which time any proper objection shall be timely.”

SEC. 503. RECORD VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The second sentence of clause 3(b) of rule XIII is amended by inserting “a report by the Committee on Rules on a rule, joint rule, or the order of business or to” after “to”.

SEC. 504. CHANGES TO REFLECT INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY REFORM.

Clause 11 of rule X is amended by—

(a) in paragraph (b)(1)(A), striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”;

(b) in paragraph (b)(1)(A), striking “Foreign”;

(c) in paragraph (b)(1)(D)(i), striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”;

(d) in paragraph (b)(1)(D)(i), striking “Foreign”;

(e) in paragraph (c)(2), inserting “the Director of National Intelligence,” before “the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency”;

(f) in paragraph (e)(2), striking “Central” and inserting “National”;

(g) in paragraph (i), striking subparagraphs (1) through (6) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“(1) The activities of the Director of National Intelligence and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

“(2) The activities of the Central Intelligence Agency.

“(3) The activities of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

“(4) The activities of the National Security Agency.

“(5) The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of other agencies and subdivisions of the Department of Defense.

“(6) The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of State.

“(7) The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(8) The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of all other departments and agencies of the executive branch.”

SEC. 505. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CHANGES.

(a) Clause 12(b) of rule I is amended to read as follows:

“(b)(1) To suspend the business of the House when notified of an imminent threat to its safety, the Speaker may declare an emergency recess subject to the call of the Chair.”

“(2) To suspend the business of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when notified of an imminent threat to its safety, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may declare an emergency recess subject to the call of the Chair.”

(b) Clause 6(b) of rule XIII is amended to read as follows:

“(b) Pending the consideration of a report by the Committee on Rules on a rule, joint rule, or the order of business, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn but may not entertain any other dilatory motion until the report shall have been disposed of.”

(c) Clause 1(b) of rule XV is amended to read as follows:

“(b) Pending a motion that the House suspend the rules, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn but may not entertain any other motion until the vote is taken on the suspension.”

(d) In clause 2(e) of rule XV, subparagraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) If a motion prevails to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of a resolution, the House shall immediately consider the resolution, pending which the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn but may not entertain any other dilatory motion until the resolution has been disposed of. If the resolution is adopted, the House shall immediately proceed to its execution.”

SEC. 506. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: 9/11 SELECT PANEL.

Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any

point of order to consider in the House a resolution to enhance intelligence oversight authority. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 507. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: 9/11 RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1) to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. 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) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

(b) During consideration of H.R. 1 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 508. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: MINIMUM WAGE.

(a) Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. 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) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

(b) During consideration of H.R. 2 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 509. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: STEM CELL.

(a) Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. 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) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

(b) During consideration of H.R. 3 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 510. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4) to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate lower covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. 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) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

(b) During consideration of H.R. 4 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 511. SEPARATE ORDERS.

(a) BUDGET MATTERS.—(1) During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, references in section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to a resolution shall be construed in the House of Representatives as references to a joint resolution.

(2) During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, in the case of a reported bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to a special order of business, a point of order under section 303 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be determined on the basis of the text made in order as an original bill or joint resolution for the purpose of amendment or to the text on which the previous question is ordered directly to passage, as the case may be.

(3) During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, a provision in a bill or joint resolution, or in an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, that establishes prospectively for a Federal office or position a specified or minimum level of compensation shall not be considered as providing new entitlement authority under section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(4)(A) During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 376 of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though the One Hundred Tenth Congress has adopted such a concurrent resolution.

(B) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget (when elected) shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record—

(i) the allocations contemplated by section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to accompany the concurrent resolution described in subparagraph (A), which shall be considered to be such allocations under a concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(ii) “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations,” which shall be considered to be the programs, projects, activities, or accounts referred to in section 401(b) of House Concurrent Resolution 376 of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, as adopted by the House.

(5)(A) During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, except as provided in subsection (C), a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report a bill to the House shall not be in order if the bill, as amended, exceeds an applicable allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as estimated by the Committee on the Budget.

(B) If a point of order under subsection (A) is sustained, the Chair shall put the question: “Shall the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted notwithstanding that the bill exceeds its allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974?”. Such question shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent of the question and an opponent but shall be decided without intervening motion.

(C) Subsection (A) shall not apply—

(i) to a motion offered under clause 2(d) of rule XXI; or

(ii) after disposition of a question under subsection (B) on a given bill.

(D) If a question under subsection (B) is decided in the negative, no further amendment shall be in order except—

(i) one proper amendment, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole; and

(ii) pro forma amendments, if offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees, for the purpose of debate.

(b) CERTAIN SUBCOMMITTEES.—Notwithstanding clause 5(d) of rule X, during the One Hundred Tenth Congress—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services may have not more than seven subcommittees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have not more than seven subcommittees; and

(3) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure may have not more than six subcommittees.

(c) EXERCISE FACILITIES FOR FORMER MEMBERS.—During the One Hundred Tenth Congress—

(1) The House of Representatives may not provide access to any exercise facility which is made available exclusively to Members and former Members, officers and former officers of the House of Representatives, and their spouses to any former Member, former officer, or spouse who is a lobbyist registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or any successor statute or agent of a foreign principal as defined in clause 5 of rule XXV. For purposes of this section, the term “Member of the House of Representatives” includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress.

(2) The Committee on House Administration shall promulgate regulations to carry out this subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the question shall be divided among each of the five titles of House Resolution 6. The previous question is ordered on each portion of the divided question, except as specified in sections 2 through 4 of House Resolution 5.

The portion of the divided question comprising title I is now debatable for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

First, Mr. Speaker, let me say, this is truly a proud and historic moment for this institution, the people’s House in our Nation. Today, for the first time in our history, the Members of this great body have elected a woman, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), to serve as our Speaker. I want to offer my heartfelt congratulations to Speaker PELOSI, as well as her husband Paul, and her children and all of her family.

Last November 7, the American people delivered a resounding message that was heard in every corner of this

Nation. They want change and a new direction in our Nation. Today, as we open this new 110th Congress, with hope and great optimism, we will take the first steps in offering the voters precisely that by changing the way business is done in Washington.

As we open this new chapter in American history, we will seek to elevate results over rhetoric and put progress before partisanship as we affirm our commitment to transparency, accountability, and civility.

Mr. Speaker, this rules package includes sweeping ethics reforms that begin to address some of the most egregious transgressions of the recent past. Among other things, we will ban gifts, including meals and tickets, from lobbyists and the organizations that employ them. We will ban lobbyists and the organizations that employ them from financing travel for Members or their staffs, except for one-day travel to visit a site, attend a forum, participate in a panel, or give a speech, all obviously in the pursuance of the Members’ duties. We will require Members and staff to obtain preapproval from the Ethics Committee for permitted travel; and, Mr. Speaker, we will end the K Street Project, a practice that brought shame on this House when some Members promised access in return for patronage hiring.

Now let me say, very frankly, as importantly as these rules changes are, they alone will not ensure the integrity of this institution. Rather, the Members of this House will ensure the integrity of this institution when we conduct ourselves with integrity and hold accountable those who fail to abide by these rules and the highest ethical standards.

□ 1715

Thus during the next 2 years, we have an obligation, each and every one of us, to ensure that the Ethics Committee does the job that it was constituted to perform. The implementation of rules, while vital, must be followed by effective, real enforcement.

Through this rules package, Mr. Speaker, we also signal our sincere intent to foster an environment in which civility, consensus, and compromise are nurtured. The American people are tired of partisanship. They are rightfully demanding progress on the critical priorities that face our Nation. Surely we will disagree on many issues, but that does not require us to be disagreeable, and we surely can disagree without impugning or questioning the motives, the character of our colleagues.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this rules package restores fiscal discipline by reinstating the budget rules that helped us produce record budget surpluses in the 1990s and which previously were supported on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot continue on our current fiscal course. In the last 72 months, our Nation has turned a projected 10-year budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion into a deficit of

more than \$3 trillion. It is, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, immoral of this generation of Americans to force our children and grandchildren to pay our bills. Our current course threatens our economic as well as our national security. Pay-as-you-go budget rules will help us restore the fiscal discipline that the American people demand. These measures represent the foundation of our mission and the basis for the good work we will do together as one body with the best interests of those we serve at heart.

Mr. Speaker, we have a profound responsibility to fulfill and make hard choices. However, we also share an extraordinary opportunity that is distinctive in the American experience, to heal a deeply divided Nation, to conquer national doubt and restore public confidence in the United States Congress. I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to working with each and every one in this body in our pursuit of that progress.

In conclusion, let me leave you with the words of our 35th President, John Kennedy, who said this: "Let us not seek the Republican answer or the Democratic answer, but the right answer. Let us not seek to fix the blame for the past. Let us accept our own responsibility for the future."

Mr. Speaker, let us now embrace our responsibility and fulfill the trust that the American people have placed in us to lead, to govern effectively, and to make the greatest Nation on Earth even greater. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would ask unanimous consent that the remaining time allocated to me be controlled by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, a member of the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT of Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) as the designee of the minority leader.

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

I would like to begin by extending my compliments to my very good friend from Maryland, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER. In fact, Mr. HOYER just quoted John F. Kennedy and I believe that he was right on target in focusing on that brilliant quote of President Kennedy's where he said that we should not seek the Republican answer, we should not seek the Democratic answer, we should seek the right answer. I was struck with that, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that we should join in strong support of this resolution, of support of this title; and I am going to urge my colleagues to join in voting in support of this title which uses the rules base of the 109th Congress as the basis for which these proposed changes are being offered.

But I think it is very important for us to note that if we are going to, in

fact, seek the right answer as opposed to the Republican answer or the Democratic answer, we need to do that by vigorously pursuing the deliberative process about which we all speak. And I know that during the past several years, my very distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle raised concerns about a lack of deliberation that existed in this House and the fact that more amendments could have been made in order. I will acknowledge that we could have made more amendments in order. That was clearly an option there. But as my friend, having served in the majority, knows very well, there are challenges that need to be addressed when you are in the majority, challenges of managing this institution. I see him sitting there very comfortably and I am glad that he is comfortable at this point, but I know full well that he, Mr. Speaker, is going to face many management challenges in the days and weeks and months ahead.

But during the past couple of years, what we have heard is a commitment to minority rights made by those who were formerly in the majority, who were in the minority at that time and are now back in the majority. And so I would argue that the words of President Kennedy can best be implemented if we in fact do increase the level of deliberation, and that is why as we look at the proposed changes that we are going to be considering, I have to say that when it comes to the actual management, I am concerned. I am concerned about the prospect of, for the first time in the history of this institution, taking prospectively five closed rules and placing that in the opening-day rules package.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the prospect of taking this issue of transparency, accountability, and disclosure about which we on both sides of the aisle regularly talk because we are here to represent all of the American people, the notion of now saying again for the first time in the history of this great institution that we are going to create an opportunity whereby we will not have accountability and transparency in our very important deliberations that will take place in the Rules Committee.

And so again I would say in response to the brilliant words of President John F. Kennedy, as outlined by our distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER, that we do seek the right answer; and I believe that the best way to seek the right answer is through enhanced deliberation, and we have a chance to do that.

Now, I will when it comes to this vote urge my colleagues to vote in favor of title I. Title I, as you know, Mr. Speaker, simply provides a chance to use the opening rules package of the 109th Congress, and I think that that is a correct thing for us to do; and I hope the Democrats and Republicans alike, and the majority leader has just called for support of title I and I will urge the

colleagues on our side of the aisle to join so that again we will be coming together and I think having the right answer on that.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, House rules allowing for cosponsors have yet to be adopted. Therefore, I would submit this list of cosponsors for House Resolution 6 for the RECORD.

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following sponsors are hereby added to H. Res. 6.

Louise Slaughter, David Obey, John Spratt, Zach Space, Chris Carney, Baron Hill, Heath Shuler, Steny Hoyer, James Clyburn, Rahm Emanuel, John Larson, Xavier Becerra, Chris Van Hollen, Rosa DeLauro, George Miller, Jim McGovern, Alcee Hastings, Doris Matsui, Kathy Castor, Betty Sutton, Peter Welch.

Gary Ackerman, Tom Allen, Jason Altmire, Rob Andrews, Michael Arcuri, Joe Baca, Brian Baird, Tammy Baldwin, Melissa Bean, Shelley Berkley, Howard Berman, Marion Berry, Tim Bishop, Earl Blumenauer, Madeleine Bordallo, Leonard Boswell, Nancy Boyda, Robert Brady, Bruce Braley.

G.K. Butterfield, Lois Capps, Mike Capuano, Dennis Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, Ben Chandler, Donna Christensen, Yvette Clarke, Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen, John Conyers, Jim Cooper, Joe Courtney, Joe Crowley, Henry Cuellar, Elijah Cummings, Susan Davis, Danny Davis, Artur Davis, Lincoln Davis.

Peter DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Bill Delahunt, Norm Dicks, John Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Joe Donnelly, Mike Doyle, Keith Ellison, Brad Ellsworth, Anna Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Eni Faleomavaega, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Barney Frank, Gabby Giffords, Kirsten Gillibrand, Bart Gordon.

Al Green, Gene Green, Raul Grijalva, John Hall, Phil Hare, Jane Harman, Stephanie Herseth, Brian Higgins, Maurice Hinchey, Mazie Hirono, Paul Hodes, Tim Holden, Michael Honda, Darlene Hooley, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Jesse Jackson, Sheila Jackson-Lee, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Hank Johnson.

Steve Kagen, Marcy Kaptur, Patrick Kennedy, Dale Kildee, Ron Kind, Ron Klein, Dennis Kucinich, Nick Lampson, Jim Langevin, Tom Lantos, Richard Larsen, Barbara Lee, Sander Levin, John Lewis, Dan Lipinski, Dave Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Stephen Lynch, Tim Mahoney, Carolyn Maloney.

Ed Markey, Carolyn McCarthy, Betty McCollum, Jim McDermott, Mike McIntyre, Jerry McNerney, Mike McNulty, Martin Meehan, Kendrick Meek, Michael Michaud, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Harry Mitchell, Dennis Moore, Jim Moran, Chris Murphy, Patrick Murphy, Jerry Nadler, Grace Napolitano, Eleanor Holmes Norton, James Oberstar.

John Olver, Frank Pallone, Bill Pascrell, Ed Pastor, Donald Payne, Ed Perlmutter, Collin Peterson, Earl Pomeroy, David Price, Nick Rahall, Charlie Rangel, Silvestre Reyes, Ciro Rodriguez, Mike Ross, Steve Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby Rush, Tim Ryan, John Salazar.

Linda Sánchez, John Sarbanes, Jan Schakowsky, Adam Schiff, Allyson

Schwartz, David Scott, José Serrano, Joe Sestak, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, Albio Sires, Ike Skelton, Adam Smith, Vic Snyder, Hilda Solis, Pete Stark, Ellen Tauscher, Bennie Thompson, Mike Thompson, John Tierney.

Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Mark Udall, Tom Udall, Nydia Velázquez, Tim Walz, Debbie Wasserman Shultz, Maxine Waters, Diane Watson, Henry Waxman, Anthony Weiner, Robert Wexler, Charlie Wilson, Lynn Woolsey, David Wu, Al Wynn, John Yarmuth, Rush Holt, Bobby Scott.

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

I enjoyed listening to my colleague and good friend, and he is my good friend, former chairman of the Rules Committee, speak about closed rules. Since he is the master of closed rules, I know he knows of what he speaks.

Title I of our rules package is, or at least should be, the least controversial part, as the ranking member has said, of what we are going to discuss over the next few hours. Title I is very simply the rules of the 109th Congress. We are taking the Republican rules from the last Congress and using this as our base. The changes we will make to improve on the previous Congress's rules will come later and will be discussed by the members of the Rules Committee. This section of the House rules package makes it clearer that the former chairperson of the Rules Committee, my friend from California, was being just a bit disingenuous when he said the other day that, and I quote him, we have not received even a draft, unquote, of the Democrats' rules. Of course he had, Mr. Speaker. They were the rules of the House that he helped draft as Chair of the Rules Committee 2 years ago. All we have done is taken the old House rules and improved them to make the House a more ethical, more democratic, more open institution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Of course I will yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. I really am very hesitant to interrupt the brilliance of my good friend from Fort Lauderdale.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Now that you have.

Mr. DREIER. Now that I have interrupted it, I just couldn't hesitate to interrupt when I heard that I somehow had a draft by virtue of knowing what the rules package that was put into place for the operation of the 109th Congress was? That was all we had. We had nothing whatsoever beyond the rules of the House and that is it.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Well, you helped make those rules, my good friend. Perhaps you didn't utilize the fact that you did as a draft. But in either event, I take it that I have made my point and you have made yours.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, many of the changes to House rules that our Republican colleagues did make in 1995 and subsequently, in my opinion, were good

ones and some of them we have kept. Proxy voting in committees was eliminated. That was an excellent reform. We have kept it. It is in our rules package. You gave the Speaker emergency power to recess the House and convene in another place in case of a terrorist incident. That was a good reform, and it is in the package that we have offered. You prohibited public works projects being named for serving Members of Congress. That always kind of bothered me, and I am glad that you got rid of it, and it was a good reform and it is in our package.

So, Mr. Speaker, title I, I think, is pretty straightforward. I think we should all be able to agree on it, and the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee has indicated he agrees. They are the Republican rules of last Congress that today's majority agrees with, draft or no draft. We will get to the changes later. But title I are the rules that today's minority wrote 2 years ago.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my good friend from Pasco, I would simply like to ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD at this point a copy of the draft that we received that is dated January 2, 2007. The time stamp on that is 5:45 p.m. I was informed that we had it last night at 6:10 p.m., and it had already been circulated to those in the press gallery by that point.

I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am glad my friend yields. You do agree that the rules that you wrote are the rules that are being adopted in this section that we are talking about?

Mr. DREIER. The section that we are talking about right now is simply implementation—

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Can I get a yes or no?

Mr. DREIER. It is simply implementation of the rules that have existed for the 109th Congress. I clearly was talking about the rules for the 110th Congress. In fact, if the gentleman was here when I had an exchange with the distinguished new Chair of the Rules Committee when she tried to argue that we somehow were debating the rules for the 109th Congress, the Chair confirmed the fact that we are in fact considering in toto the package for the 110th Congress using as base text the 109th.

What I have here and if I am able to gain unanimous consent for this, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD, is the draft which uses the 109th base text and has the proposed changes, the different titles for the proposed changes for the rules of the 110th Congress.

I would ask unanimous consent to include this draft with the date and the time on it showing that it did not fall within the 24-hour notification period of time that my friends have consistently insisted on.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I object, and I reserve the right to object.

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman objects to my including the draft?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserves the right to object and is recognized under his reservation.

□ 1730

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I just wish to share with Mr. DREIER in the spirit of bipartisanship that mincing words with reference to whether or not you knew that this portion of the draft of the 109th rules are those of the 110th actually don't even get to the level of substance that we ought be dealing with, with something as important as the rules.

You know the rules. I agree with you that that draft that you are talking about came from the 109th; but all I am suggesting to you is that you are not surprised by anything in title I, because you participated in writing it and, therefore, I think that the record should reflect that, notwithstanding the fact.

Now, I assure you, having served on the Rules Committee with you with distinction and respecting you greatly, that you can reasonably expect that you are not only going to have 24 hours notice, you are going to have a lot of notice regarding a lot of measures that we were never accorded. And, toward that end, in the spirit of bipartisanship, I will not object to your offer.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the simple point that I am trying to make is that we all know what the rules for the 109th Congress were. We have lived under those rules for the last 2 years. Yes, I was proud to have crafted those, working with my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and we passed those at the beginning of the Congress and we are going to have a chance in just a few minutes to vote on those again.

The point is, it is not the rules of the 109th Congress that we didn't have a draft of. We did not have a draft until January 3 at 5:45 p.m., which clearly did not comply with that 24-hour requirement that has been put forward. And that is the only point that I am trying to make.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman has made his point.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

January 3, 2007—4:45 p.m.

H. RES. 6

Resolved,

TITLE I. ADOPTION OF RULES OF ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

SEC. 101. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress.

TITLE II. ETHICS

SEC. 201. That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress, with the following amendments:

SEC. 202. ENDING THE K-STREET PROJECT.

Rule XXIII is amended by redesignating clause 14 as clause 15, and by inserting after clause 13 the following new clause:

"14. A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not, with the intent to influence on the basis of partisan political affiliation an employment decision or employment practice of any private entity—

"(a) take or withhold, or offer or threaten to take or withhold, an official act; or

"(b) influence, or offer or threaten to influence, the official act of another."

SEC. 203. BAN ON GIFTS FROM LOBBYISTS.

(a) Clause 5(a)(1)(A) of rule XXV is amended by inserting "(i)" after "(A)" and adding at the end the following:

"(i) A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House may not knowingly accept a gift from a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal or from a private entity that retains or employs registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal except as provided in subparagraph (3) of this paragraph."

(b) Clause 5(a)(1)(B) of rule XXV is amended by inserting "not prohibited by subdivision (A)(i)" after the parenthetical.

SEC. 204. VALUATION OF TICKETS TO SPORTING AND ENTERTAINMENT EVENTS.

Clause 5(a)(1)(B) of rule XXV is further amended by inserting "(i)" after "(B)" and adding at the end the following:

"(i) A gift of a ticket to a sporting or entertainment event shall be valued at the face value of the ticket or, in the case of a ticket without a face value, at the highest cost of a ticket with a face value for the event. The price printed on a ticket to an event shall be deemed its face value only if it also is the price at which the issuer offers that ticket for sale to the public."

SEC. 205. RESTRICTION OF PRIVATELY FUNDED TRAVEL.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Clause 5(b)(1) of rule XXV is amended—

(1) in subdivision (A), by striking "from a private source" and all that follows through "prohibited by this clause" and inserting "for necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses for travel to a meeting, speaking engagement, factfinding trip, or similar event in connection with his duties as an officeholder shall be considered as a reimbursement to the House and not a gift prohibited by this clause when it is from a private source other than a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal or a private entity that retains or employs registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal (except as provided in subdivision (C))"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subdivision:

"(C) A reimbursement (including payment in kind) to a Member, Delegate, Resident

Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House for any purpose described in subdivision (A) also shall be considered as a reimbursement to the House and not a gift prohibited by this clause (without regard to whether the source retains or employs registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal) if it is, under regulations prescribed by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to implement this provision—

"(i) directly from an institution of higher education within the meaning of section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965; or

"(ii) provided only for attendance at or participation in a one-day event (exclusive of travel time and an overnight stay).

"Regulations prescribed to implement this provision may permit a two-night stay when determined by the committee on a case-by-case basis to be practically required to participate in the one-day event."

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

SEC. 206. LOBBYIST ORGANIZATIONS AND PARTICIPATION IN CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause 5 of rule XXV is further amended by redesignating paragraphs (c), (d), (e), and (f) as paragraphs (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (b) the following:

"(c)(1)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House may not accept a reimbursement (including payment in kind) for transportation, lodging, or related expenses for a trip on which the traveler is accompanied on any segment by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal.

"(B) Subdivision (A) does not apply to a trip for which the source of reimbursement is an institution of higher education within the meaning of section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

"(2) A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House may not accept a reimbursement (including payment in kind) for transportation, lodging, or related expenses under the exception in paragraph (b)(1)(C)(ii) of this clause for a trip that is financed in whole or in part by a private entity that retains or employs registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal unless any involvement of a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal in the planning, organization, request, or arrangement of the trip is de minimis under rules prescribed by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to implement paragraph (b)(1)(C) of this clause.

"(3) A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House may not accept a reimbursement (including payment in kind) for transportation, lodging, or related expenses for a trip (other than a trip permitted under paragraph (b)(1)(C) of this clause) if such trip is in any part planned, organized, requested, or arranged by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal."

"(d) A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House shall, before accepting travel otherwise permissible under paragraph (b)(1) of this clause from any private source—

"(1) provide to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct before such trip a written certification signed by the source or (in the case of a corporate person) by an officer of the source—

"(A) that the trip will not be financed in any part by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal;

"(B) that the source either—

"(i) does not retain or employ registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal; or

"(ii) is an institution of higher education within the meaning of section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965; or

"(iii) certifies that the trip meets the requirements specified in rules prescribed by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to implement paragraph (b)(1)(C)(ii) of this clause and specifically details the extent of any involvement of a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal in the planning, organization, request, or arrangement of the trip considered to qualify as de minimis under such rules;

"(C) that the source will not accept from another source any funds earmarked directly or indirectly for the purpose of financing any aspect of the trip;

"(D) that the traveler will not be accompanied on any segment of the trip by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal (except in the case of a trip for which the source of reimbursement is an institution of higher education within the meaning of section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965); and

"(E) that (except as permitted in paragraph (b)(1)(C) of this clause) the trip will not in any part be planned, organized, requested, or arranged by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal; and

"(2) after the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has promulgated the regulations mandated in paragraph (1)(1)(B) of this clause, obtain the prior approval of the committee for such trip."

(b) CONFORMING CHANGES IN CROSS-REFERENCES.—Clause 5 of rule XXV is further amended by—

(1) in clause 5(a)(3)(E), striking "paragraph (c)(3)" and inserting "paragraph (e)(3)"; and

(2) in clause 5(e)(2) (as redesignated), striking "paragraph (d)" and inserting "paragraph (f)".

(c) TIMELINESS OF INFORMATION.—Clause 5(b)(1)(A)(ii) of rule XXV is amended by striking "30 days" and inserting "15 days".

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Clause 5(b)(3) of rule XXV is amended by striking "of expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed".

(e) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Clause 5(b)(5) of rule XXV is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The Clerk of the House shall make all advance authorizations, certifications, and disclosures filed pursuant to this paragraph available for public inspection as soon as possible after they are received."

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on March 1, 2007.

SEC. 207. FURTHER LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR TRAVEL.

Rule XXIII is further amended by redesignating clause 15 (as earlier redesignated) as clause 16, and by inserting after clause 14 the following new clause:

"15. (a) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not use personal funds, official funds, or campaign funds for a flight on a non-governmental airplane that is not licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration to operate for compensation or hire.

"(b) In this clause, the term 'campaign funds' includes funds of any political committee under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, without regard to whether the committee is an authorized committee of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner involved under such Act."

SEC. 208. EXPENSES FOR OFFICIALLY CONNECTED TRAVEL.

Clause 5 of rule XXV is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i)(1) Not later than 45 days after the date of adoption of this paragraph and at annual intervals thereafter, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall develop and revise, as necessary—

“(A) guidelines on judging the reasonableness of an expense or expenditure for purposes of this clause, including the factors that tend to establish—

“(i) a connection between a trip and official duties;

“(ii) the reasonableness of an amount spent by a sponsor;

“(iii) a relationship between an event and an officially connected purpose; and

“(iv) a direct and immediate relationship between a source of funding and an event; and

“(B) regulations describing the information it will require individuals subject to this clause to submit to the committee in order to obtain the prior approval of the committee for any travel covered by this clause, including any required certifications.

“(2) In developing and revising guidelines under paragraph (1)(A), the committee shall take into account the maximum per diem rates for official Government travel published annually by the General Services Administration, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense.”.

SEC. 209. ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE.

Clause 5(b)(3) of rule XXV is further amended—

(a) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of subdivision (E);

(b) by redesignating subdivision (F) as subdivision (G); and

(c) by inserting after subdivision (E) the following new subdivision:

“(F) a description of meetings and events attended; and”.

SEC. 210. CLERICAL CORRECTION.

Clause 5(f)(1) of rule XXV (as earlier redesignated) is amended by striking “are” and inserting “is”.

SEC. 211. ANNUAL ETHICS TRAINING FOR MEMBERS, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE.

(a) TRAINING PROGRAM.—Clause 3(a) of rule XI is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(6)(A) The committee shall offer annual ethics training to each Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, and employee of the House. Such training shall—

“(i) involve the classes of employees for whom the committee determines such training to be appropriate; and

“(ii) include such knowledge of the Code of Official Conduct and related House rules as may be determined appropriate by the committee.

“(B)(i) A new officer or employee of the House shall receive training under this paragraph not later than 60 days after beginning service to the House.

“(ii) Not later than January 31 of each year, each officer and employee of the House shall file a certification with the committee that the officer or employee attended ethics training in the last year as established by this subparagraph.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on March 1, 2007.

SEC. 212. DESIGNATING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.

(a) Clause 1(e) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on Education and the Workforce” and inserting “Committee on Education and Labor”.

(b) Clause 3(d) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on Education and the Workforce” and inserting “Committee on Education and Labor”.

SEC. 213. DESIGNATING COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

(a) Clause 1 of rule X is amended by—

(1) redesignating the existing paragraphs (h) through (m), as paragraphs (m), (i), (j), (h), (k), and (l), respectively (inserting para-

graph (h), as redesignated, after paragraph (g)); and

(2) in paragraph (h), as redesignated, striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

(b) Clause 3 of rule X is amended by—

(1) redesignating the existing paragraphs (b) through (i) as paragraphs (c), (e), (d), (i), (g), (f), (b) and (h), respectively (inserting paragraph (b), as redesignated, after paragraph (a); inserting paragraph (d), as redesignated, after paragraph (c); and inserting paragraph (f), as redesignated, after paragraph (e)); and

(2) in paragraph (f), as redesignated, striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

(c) Clause 11(a)(1)(C) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

(d) Clause 2(d) of rule XII is amended by striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

SEC. 214. DESIGNATING COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.

(a) Clause 1(l) of rule X (as earlier redesignated) is amended by striking “Committee on Resources” and inserting “Committee on Natural Resources”.

(b) Clause 3(h) of rule X (as earlier redesignated) is amended by striking “Committee on Resources” and inserting “Committee on Natural Resources”.

SEC. 215. DESIGNATING COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.

(a) Clause 1 of rule X is further amended by—

(1) inserting paragraph (m) (as earlier redesignated), after paragraph (l) (as earlier redesignated); and

(2) in paragraph (m) (as earlier redesignated), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

(b) Clause 2 of rule X is amended by—

(1) in paragraph (d)(1), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”; and

(2) in paragraph (d)(2), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

(c) Clause 3 of rule X is further amended by—

(1) inserting paragraph (i) (as earlier redesignated) after paragraph (h) (as earlier redesignated); and

(2) in paragraph (i), (as earlier redesignated), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

(d) Clause 4 of rule X is amended by—

(1) in paragraph (c)(1), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”; and

(2) in paragraph (c)(2), striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

(e) Clause 5(d)(2) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

(f) Clause 4 of rule XV is amended by striking “Committee on Government Reform” and inserting “Committee on Oversight and Government Reform”.

SEC. 216. DESIGNATING COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) Clause 1(o) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on Science” and insert-

ing “Committee on Science and Technology”.

(b) Clause 3(k) of rule X is amended by striking “Committee on Science” and inserting “Committee on Science and Technology”.

SEC. 217. SEPARATE ORDER: NUMBERING OF BILLS

In the One Hundred Tenth Congress, the first 10 numbers for bills (H.R. 1 through H.R. 10) shall be reserved for assignment by the Speaker to such bills as she may designate.

TITLE III. CIVILITY

SEC. 301. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress, with the following amendments:

SEC. 302. PROPER CONDUCT OF VOTES.

Clause 2(a) of rule XX is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following sentence: “A record vote by electronic device shall not be held open for the sole purpose of reversing the outcome of such vote.”.

SEC. 303. FULL AND OPEN DEBATE IN CONFERENCE.

In rule XXII—

(a) clause 12(a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(3) In conducting conferences with the Senate, managers on the part of the House should endeavor to ensure—

“(A) that meetings for the resolution of differences between the two Houses occur only under circumstances in which every manager on the part of the House has notice of the meeting and a reasonable opportunity to attend;

“(B) that all provisions on which the two Houses disagree are considered as open to discussion at any meeting of a conference committee; and

“(C) that papers reflecting a conference agreement are held inviolate to change without renewal of the opportunity of all managers on the part of the House to reconsider their decisions to sign or not to sign the agreement.

“(4) Managers on the part of the House shall be provided a unitary time and place with access to at least one complete copy of the final conference agreement for the purpose of recording their approval (or not) of the final conference agreement by placing their signatures (or not) on the sheets prepared to accompany the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the managers.”.

(b) add the following new clause at the end: “13. It shall not be in order to consider a conference report the text of which differs in any way, other than clerical, from the text that reflects the action of the conferees on all of the differences between the two Houses, as recorded by their placement of their signatures (or not) on the sheets prepared to accompany the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the managers.”.

TITLE IV. FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

SEC. 401. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress, with the following amendments:

SEC. 402. RECONCILIATION.

Rule XXI is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

"7. It shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget, or an amendment thereto, or a conference report thereon that contains reconciliation directives under section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that specify changes in law reducing the surplus or increasing the deficit for either the period comprising the current fiscal year and the five fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year or the period comprising the current fiscal year and the ten fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year. In determining whether reconciliation directives specify changes in law reducing the surplus or increasing the deficit, the sum of the directives for each reconciliation bill (under section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) envisioned by that measure shall be evaluated.

SEC. 403. APPLYING POINTS OF ORDER UNDER BUDGET ACT TO BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS CONSIDERED UNDER SPECIAL RULES.

Rule XXI is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

"8. With respect to measures considered pursuant to a special order of business, points of order under title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall operate without regard to whether the measure concerned has been reported from committee. Such points of order shall operate with respect to (as the case may be)—

"(a) the form of a measure recommended by the reporting committee where the statute uses the term 'as reported' (in the case of a measure that has been so reported);

"(b) the form of the measure made in order as an original bill or joint resolution for the purpose of amendment; or

"(c) the form of the measure on which the previous question is ordered directly to passage."

SEC. 404. CONGRESSIONAL EARMARK REFORM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS.—Rule XXI is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

"9. (a) It shall not be in order to consider—

"(1) a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee unless the report includes a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or in the report (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits;

"(2) a bill or joint resolution not reported by a committee unless the chairman of each committee of initial referral has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration;

"(3) an amendment to a bill or joint resolution to be offered at the outset of its consideration for amendment by a member of a committee of initial referral as designated in a report of the Committee on Rules to accompany a resolution prescribing a special order of business unless the proponent has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the amendment (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commis-

sioner who submitted a request to the proponent for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration; or

"(4) a conference report to accompany a bill or joint resolution unless the joint explanatory statement prepared by the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate includes a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the conference report or joint statement (and the name of any Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator who submitted a request to the House or Senate committees of jurisdiction for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

"(b) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a). As disposition of a point of order under this paragraph, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a). The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

"(c) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order raised under paragraph (a) may be based only on the failure of a report, submission to the Congressional Record, or joint explanatory statement to include a list required by paragraph (a) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

"(d) For the purpose of this clause, the term 'congressional earmark' means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator providing, authorizing or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process.

"(e) For the purpose of this clause, the term 'limited tax benefit' means—

"(1) any revenue-losing provision that—

"(A) provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to 10 or fewer beneficiaries under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and

"(B) contains eligibility criteria that are not uniform in application with respect to potential beneficiaries of such provision; or

"(2) any Federal tax provision which provides one beneficiary temporary or permanent transition relief from a change to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(f) For the purpose of this clause, the term 'limited tariff benefit' means a provision modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.

(b) RELATED AMENDMENT TO CODE OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.—Rule XXIII is amended—

(a) by redesignating clause 16 (as earlier redesignated) as clause 18; and

(b) by inserting after clause 15 the following new clauses:

"16. A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not condition the inclusion of language to provide funding for a congressional earmark, a limited tax benefit, or a

limited tariff benefit in any bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying report) or in any conference report on a bill or joint resolution (including an accompanying joint explanatory statement of managers) on any vote cast by another Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. For purposes of this clause and clause 17, the terms 'congressional earmark,' 'limited tax benefit,' and 'limited tariff benefit' shall have the meanings given them in clause 9 of rule XXI.

"17. (a) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who requests a congressional earmark, a limited tax benefit, or a limited tariff benefit in any bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying report) or in any conference report on a bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying joint statement of managers) shall provide a written statement to the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee of jurisdiction, including—

"(1) the name of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner;

"(2) in the case of a congressional earmark, the name and address of the intended recipient or, if there is no specifically intended recipient, the intended location of the activity;

"(3) in the case of a limited tax or tariff benefit, identification of the individual or entities reasonably anticipated to benefit, to the extent known to the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner;

"(4) the purpose of such congressional earmark or limited tax or tariff benefit; and

"(5) a certification that the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or spouse has no financial interest in such congressional earmark or limited tax or tariff benefit.

"(b) Each committee shall maintain the information transmitted under paragraph (a), and the written disclosures for any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits included in any measure reported by the committee or conference report filed by the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall be open for public inspection."

SEC. 405. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER.

Rule XXI is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

"10. It shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the deficit or reducing the surplus for either the period comprising the current fiscal year and the five fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year or the period comprising the current fiscal year and the ten fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year. The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget relative to—

(a) the most recent baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 used in considering a concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(b) after the beginning of a new calendar year and before consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the most recent baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985."

TITLE V. MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, including applicable provisions of law

or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth Congress, with the following amendments:

SEC. 502. DEPOSITION AUTHORITY.

Clause 4(c) of rule X is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(3)(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform may adopt a rule authorizing and regulating the taking of depositions by a member or counsel of the committee, including pursuant to subpoena under clause 2(m) of rule XI (which hereby is made applicable for such purpose),

“(B) A rule adopted by the committee pursuant to this subparagraph—

“(i) may provide that a deponent be directed to subscribe an oath or affirmation before a person authorized by law to administer the same; and

“(ii) shall ensure that the minority members and staff of the committee are accorded equitable treatment with respect to notice of and a reasonable opportunity to participate in any proceeding conducted thereunder.

“(C) Information secured pursuant to the authority described in subdivision (A) shall retain the character of discovery until offered for admission in evidence before the committee, at which time any proper objection shall be timely.”

SEC. 503. RECORD VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The second sentence of clause 3(b) of rule XIII is amended by inserting “a report by the Committee on Rules on a rule, joint rule, or the order of business or to” after “to”.

SEC. 504. CHANGES TO REFLECT INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY REFORM.

Clause 11 of rule X is amended by—

(a) in paragraph (b)(1)(A), striking “Director of Central Intelligence”; and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”;

(b) in paragraph (b)(1)(A), striking “Foreign”;

(c) in paragraph (b)(1)(D)(i), striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”;

(d) in paragraph (b)(1)(D)(i), striking “Foreign”;

(e) in paragraph (c)(2), inserting “the Director of National Intelligence,” before “the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency”;

(f) in paragraph (e)(2), striking “Central” and inserting “National”; and

(g) in paragraph (i), striking subparagraphs (1) through (6) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“(1) The activities of the Director of National Intelligence and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

“(2) The activities of the Central Intelligence Agency.

“(3) The activities of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

“(4) The activities of the National Security Agency.

“(5) The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of other agencies and subdivisions of the Department of Defense.

“(6) The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of State.

“(7) The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(8) The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of all other departments and agencies of the executive branch.”

SEC. 505. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CHANGES.

(a) Clause 12(b) of rule I is amended to read as follows:

“(b)(1) To suspend the business of the House when notified of an imminent threat to its safety, the Speaker may declare an emergency recess subject to the call of the Chair.”

“(2) To suspend the business of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when notified of an imminent threat to its safety, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may declare an emergency recess subject to the call of the Chair.”

(b) Clause 6(b) of rule XIII is amended to read as follows:

“(b) Pending the consideration of a report by the Committee on Rules on a rule, joint rule, or the order of business, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn but may not entertain any other dilatory motion until the report shall have been disposed of.”

(c) Clause 1(b) of rule XV is amended to read as follows:

“(b) Pending a motion that the House suspend the rules, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn but may not entertain any other motion until the vote is taken on the suspension.”

(d) In clause 2(e) of rule XV, subparagraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) If a motion prevails to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of a resolution, the House shall immediately consider the resolution, pending which the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn but may not entertain any other dilatory motion until the resolution has been disposed of. If the resolution is adopted, the House shall immediately proceed to its execution.”

SEC. 506. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: 9/11 SELECT PANEL.

Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House a resolution to enhance intelligence oversight authority. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 507. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: 9/11 RECOMMENDATIONS.

(1) Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1) to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. 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) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

(b) During consideration of H.R. 1 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 508. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: MINIMUM WAGE.

(a) Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. 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) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

(b) During consideration of H.R. 2 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 509. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: STEM CELL.

(a) Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. 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) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

(b) During consideration of H.R. 3 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 510. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4) to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate lower covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. 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) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

(b) During consideration of H.R. 4 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 511. SEPARATE ORDERS.

(a) BUDGET MATTERS.—(1) During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, references in section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to a resolution shall be construed in the House of Representatives as references to a joint resolution.

(2) During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, in the case of a reported bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to a special order of business, a point of order under section 303 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be determined on the basis of the text made in order as an original bill or joint resolution for the purpose of amendment or to the text on which the previous question is ordered directly to passage, as the case may be.

(3) During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, a provision in a bill or joint resolution, or in an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, that establishes prospectively for a Federal office or position a specified or minimum level of compensation to be funded by annual discretionary appropriations shall not be considered as providing new entitlement authority under section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(4)(A) During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008,

the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 376 of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though the One Hundred Tenth Congress has adopted such a concurrent resolution.

(B) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget (when elected) shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record—

(i) the allocations contemplated by section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to accompany the concurrent resolution described in subparagraph (A), which shall be considered to be such allocations under a concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(ii) “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations,” which shall be considered to be the programs, projects, activities, or accounts referred to in section 401(b) of House Concurrent Resolution 376 of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, as adopted by the House.

(5)(A) During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, except as provided in subsection (C), a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report a bill to the House shall not be in order if the bill, as amended, exceeds an applicable allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as estimated by the Committee on the Budget.

(B) If a point of order under subsection (A) is sustained, the Chair shall put the question: “Shall the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted notwithstanding that the bill exceeds its allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974?”. Such question shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent of the question and an opponent but shall be decided without intervening motion.

(C) Subsection (A) shall not apply—

(i) to a motion offered under clause 2(d) of rule XXI; or

(ii) after disposition of a question under subsection (B) on a given bill.

(D) If a question under subsection (B) is decided in the negative, no further amendment shall be in order except—

(i) one proper amendment, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole; and

(ii) pro forma amendments, if offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees, for the purpose of debate.

(b) CERTAIN SUBCOMMITTEES.—Notwithstanding clause 5(d) of rule X, during the One Hundred Tenth Congress—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services may have not more than seven subcommittees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have not more than seven subcommittees; and

(3) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure may have not more than six subcommittees.

(c) EXERCISE FACILITIES FOR FORMER MEMBERS.—During the One Hundred Tenth Congress—

(1) The House of Representatives may not provide access to any exercise facility which is made available exclusively to Members and former Members, officers and former officers of the House of Representatives, and their spouses to any former Member, former officer, or spouse who is a lobbyist registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or any successor statute or agent of a foreign principal as defined in clause 5 of rule XXV. For purposes of this section, the term “Mem-

ber of the House of Representatives” includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress.

(2) The Committee on House Administration shall promulgate regulations to carry out this subsection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pasco, Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I will say right up front I intend to support title I and the rules package, and I take literally what the gentleman, my friend from Florida, talked about what we can expect from the Rules Committee when we restructure, hopefully next week, as to the timing and so forth of the business that we take up.

But I want to talk about one issue that is not addressed in the proposed changes for the 110th that is in the 109th package, and that is, the requirement to have recorded votes in the Rules Committee.

What the provision in the bill and the proposed changes say is that the Rules members now will comply as the Ethics Committee does. I was the chairman of the Ethics Committee in the last Congress and the ranking member in this Congress, and we have recorded votes in those committees, but we have the option of making them public or not.

Under the proposed rules packages, for the life of me, I cannot understand why that needs to be extended to the Rules Committee. It is obvious for the Committee on Official Standards, it is obvious there. But why it is in the Rules Committee is beyond what I can understand. Now, I do understand one of the reasons is that if there are errors, then you would certainly want to be able to correct those errors.

My first term was the 104th Congress, and that is when we made some major changes in voting. Since that time, there have been 1,304 recorded votes in the Rules Committee; the number of errors in the rules report in those 12 years is zero. And I think one of the reasons why is because this is a committee of only 13. There are nine Democrats and there are four Republicans in this Congress. It was the reverse in the last Congress. As a matter of fact, I would suggest that you could probably, on most of those votes, predict what the outcome is going to be.

So why, for the life of me, we would want to take the transparency of the Rules Committee away from public knowledge is absolutely beyond me. It just simply doesn't make any sense.

So I enthusiastically support adopting the rules of the 109th Congress. It would be my wish that that would be the rules for the 110th Congress, but we are going to debate that later and we will see what happens. But, again, why we want to take transparency out of votes in the Rules Committee, and I understand there will be new members on your side, why they won't want to stand the transparency for their constituency is beyond me.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, some of us that have big huge districts use our airplanes to fly around the district to get to meetings just like some people use their automobiles, and there is concern amongst the few of us that do this about a provision in here. So, Mr. HASTINGS, could you clarify for me that it is not the intent of section 207 of House Resolution 6 to prohibit a Member to use his or her own airplane; specifically, that is not intended to apply to the use of the Members' representational allowance to reimburse a Member for mileage on his or her own airplane?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I want to assure my colleagues that this is not the intent of this provision. It is not intended to apply to a Member who is using her or his own airplane, whether or not it is on his personal campaign or official business. Specifically, it is not intended to apply to the use of the Members' representational allowance to reimburse a Member for mileage on his or her own airplane. We will work closely with the Ethics Committee and the Committees on House Administration to ensure that this is how these committees will interpret the rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida, my good friend, KATHY CASTOR, who is the first new Member to speak in the 110th Congress.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my fellow Floridian very much. And I am proud to stand here with many other new Members who are very reform-minded, and let me assure you we are ready to chart the new direction for America.

The election is over, and it is time for us to keep our commitment for honest leadership and open government rules changes. During this first 100 hours of the 110th Congress, all of us in this Congress must work together to pass key measures affecting the everyday lives of all Americans. We will begin by adopting the rules of the 109th Congress. This is the baseline proposal that is before us now. But then we shall continue on, on other proposals to clean up Washington, to sever unethical ties between lawmakers and lobbyists. We will start by banning travel and gifts from lobbyists, requiring full transparency to end the abuse of special interest earmarks, and ending the abusive processes that have undermined democracy in this House. These measures are the first steps to ensure that the Congress upholds the highest ethical standards.

Americans have paid the cost of corruption in Washington with skyrocketing prices at the pump, spiraling drug costs, and the waste and fraud of

no bid contracts in the Gulf and Iraq. No more. Reform is a top priority for this House because reform is a top priority for the American people.

As our first responsibility in fulfilling the mandate of this critical election, the Democrats are offering an aggressive reform package to restore the public trust. So, let's begin.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we can, in fact, join in a bipartisan way in supporting implementation of title I of this provision. And I believe that it is great that my friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) began heaping praise on the many accomplishments of the 104th Congress when we implemented things like an end to proxy voting, term limits on committee chairmen, and the other items which we have which go on and on and on, increased transparency and accountability and disclosure.

I will say that, as I have said, I am very, very troubled and saddened by the inconsistency when it comes to the issue of transparency and disclosure in light of the discussion that Mr. HASTINGS of Pasco, Washington and I have had about closing down transparency in the Rules Committee now.

My friend from Florida mentioned the fact that I may be the champion of closed rules. I will admit that as chairman of the Rules Committee, I did bring more than a few closed rules here, primarily on bills that related to tax issues, which was done under the Democratic majorities of the past and I suspect will be done in the future as well. But I will say this: Never before, never before have I, as chairman of the Rules Committee, prevented the Rules Committee from having an opportunity to deliberate and including in an opening day rules package five closed rules. I am concerned as we move forward with that. We will have that debate later on. But I look forward to urging my colleagues to join in support of title I.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 1¼ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, who is my neighbor, Mr. RON KLEIN, who I believe is speaking for the first time.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida and my new friend from California. My name is RON KLEIN, and today I am proudly sworn in as all of us were in the new Congress, and I represent Florida's 22nd district. I believe I can speak on behalf of all my fellow freshmen colleagues today in saying that we are all truly honored to be here to represent the value of America's families.

It is time to bring a new direction to Washington and promote honesty, integrity, and real leadership in the United States Congress. That is why we have introduced an ethics reform package that will restore the public's trust and confidence in Congress. Those of us

who were just recently on the campaign trail heard that frequently, and we know we need to do something about it.

One of these reforms has been introduced by my colleague, ZACK SPACE from Ohio's 18 district, and it is a measure banning Members of Congress and their staff from accepting gifts from lobbyists. This bill will also put a stop to the common but inappropriate practice of allowing Members of Congress to use money from their campaign coffers to pay for corporate jets for travel purposes.

□ 1745

Letting special interests run the Congress is simply not right, and we have a responsibility to put a stop to this unscrupulous practice.

Simply put, it is time to return Congress to the people's House, not the auction house. I congratulate Speaker PELOSI, and all of the Members of Congress who were sworn in today, and I ask all Members to join us in these new policy changes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the portion of the divided question comprising title I. The question is on that portion of the divided question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]
YEAS—426

Abercrombie Boyd (FL) Courtney
Ackerman Boyda (KS) Cramer
Aderholt Brady (PA) Crenshaw
Akin Brady (TX) Crowley
Alexander Braley (IA) Cubin
Allen Brown, Corrine Cuellar
Altmire Brown-Waite, Culberson
Andrews Ginny Cummings
Arcuri Buchanan Davis (AL)
Baca Burgess Davis (CA)
Bachmann Burton (IN) Davis (IL)
Bachus Butterfield Davis, David
Baird Calvert Davis, Jo Ann
Baker Camp (MI) Davis, Lincoln
Baldwin Campbell (CA) Davis, Tom
Barrett (SC) Cannon Deal (GA)
Barrow Cantor DeFazio
Bartlett (MD) Capito DeGette
Barton (TX) Capps Delahunt
Bean Capuano DeLauro
Becerra Cardoza Dent
Berkley Carnahan Diaz-Balart, L.
Berman Carney Diaz-Balart, M.
Berry Carson Dicks
Biggart Carter Dingell
Bilbray Castle Doggett
Bilirakis Castor Donnelly
Bishop (GA) Chabot Doolittle
Bishop (NY) Chandler Doyle
Bishop (UT) Clarke Drake
Blackburn Clay Dreier
Blumenauer Cleaver Duncan
Blunt Clyburn Edwards
Boehner Coble Ehlers
Bonner Cohen Ellison
Bono Cole (OK) Ellsworth
Boozman Conaway Emanuel
Boren Conyers Emerson
Boswell Cooper Engel
Boucher Costa English (PA)
Boustany Costello Eshoo

Etheridge Larson (CT) Regula
Everett Latham Rehberg
Fallin LaTourette Reichert
Farr Lee Renzi
Fattah Levin Reyes
Feeney Lewis (CA) Reynolds
Ferguson Lewis (GA) Rodriguez
Filner Lewis (KY) Rogers (AL)
Flake Linder Rogers (KY)
Forbes Lipinski Rogers (MI)
Fortenberry LoBiondo Rohrabacher
Fossella Loeb sack Ros-Lehtinen
Foxy Lofgren, Zoe Roskam
Frank (MA) Lowey Ross
Franks (AZ) Lucas Rothman
Frelinghuysen Lungren, Daniel Roybal-Allard
Gallegly E. Royce
Garrett (NJ) Lynch Ruppertsberger
Gerlach Mack Rush
Giffords Mahoney (FL) Ryan (OH)
Gilchrest Manzullo Ryan (WI)
Gillibrand Marchant Salazar
Gillmor Markey Sali
Gingrey Marshall Sánchez, Linda
Gohmert Matheson T.
Gonzalez Matsui Sanchez, Loretta
Goode McCarthy (CA) Sarbanes
Goodlatte McCarthy (NY) Saxton
Gordon McCollum (MN) Schakowsky
Granger McCotter Schiff
Graves McDermott Schmidt
Green, Al McGovern Schwartz
Green, Gene McHenry Scott (GA)
Grijalva McHugh Scott (VA)
Gutierrez McIntyre Sensenbrenner
Hall (NY) McKeon Serrano
Hall (TX) McMorris Sessions
Hare Rodgers Sestak
Harman McNerney Shadegg
Hastert McNulty Shays
Hastings (FL) Meehan Shea-Porter
Hastings (WA) Meek (FL) Sherman
Hayes Meeks (NY) Shimkus
Heller Melancon Shuler
Hensarling Mica Shuster
Herger Michaud Simpson
Herseth Millender Sires
Higgins McDonald Skelton
Hill Miller (FL) Slaughter
Hinche Miller (MI) Smith (NE)
Hinojosa Miller (NC) Smith (NJ)
Hirono Miller, Gary Smith (TX)
Hobson Miller, George Smith (WA)
Hodes Mitchell Snyder
Hoekstra Mollohan Solis
Holden Moore (KS) Souder
Holt Moore (WI) Space
Honda Moran (KS) Spratt
Hooley Moran (VA) Stark
Hoyer Murphy (CT) Stearns
Hulshof Murphy, Patrick Stupak
Hunter Murphy, Tim Sullivan
Inglis (SC) Murtha Sutton
Inslee Musgrave Tancredo
Israel Myrick Tanner
Issa Nadler Tauscher
Jackson (IL) Napolitano Taylor
Jefferson Neal (MA) Terry
Jindal Neugebauer Thompson (CA)
Johnson (GA) Nunes Thompson (MS)
Johnson (IL) Oberstar Thornberry
Johnson, E. B. Obey Tiahrt
Johnson, Sam Oliver Tiberi
Jones (NC) Ortiz Tierney
Jones (OH) Pallone Towns
Jordan Pascrell Turner
Kagen Pastor Udall (CO)
Kanjorski Paul Udall (NM)
Kaptur Payne Upton
Keller Pearce Van Hollen
Kennedy Pence Velázquez
Kildee Kildoe Perlmutter
Kilpatrick Peterson (MN) Visclosky
Kind Peterson (PA) Walberg
King (IA) Petri Walden (OR)
King (NY) Pickering Walsh (NY)
Kingston Pitts Walz (MN)
Kirk Platts Wamp
Klein (FL) Poe Wasserman
Kline (MN) Pomeroy Schultz
Knollenberg Porter Waters
Kucinich Price (GA) Watson
Kuhl (NY) Price (NC) Watt
LaHood Pryce (OH) Waxman
Lamborn Putnam Weiner
Lampson Radanovich Welch (VT)
Langevin Rahall Weldon (FL)
Lantos Ramstad Weller
Larsen (WA) Rangel Westmoreland
Wexler

Whitfield	Wilson (SC)	Wynn
Wicker	Wolf	Yarmuth
Wilson (NM)	Woolsey	Young (AK)
Wilson (OH)	Wu	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Brown (SC)	Jackson-Lee	McCaul (TX)
Buyer	(TX)	McCrery
Davis (KY)	Maloney (NY)	Norwood

□ 1811

Mr. KING of Iowa changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So that portion of the divided question was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Speaker, on Rollcall No. 6 with family in town I was given insufficient notice of the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). The portion of the divided question comprising title II is now debatable for 60 minutes.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it may seem like the November elections took place ages ago, but the sentiments that created new majorities in the House and Senate are still strong.

The American people spoke loud and clear on November 7. Together, Republicans and Democrats and independents from across this great Nation voted for change. They voted to end the cycle of corruption, pay to play, and junkets.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the new Democratic majority is fulfilling the pledge we made to the voters. We are going to clean up Washington, D.C. We are going to give the people their House back.

Two years ago my friends on the other side of the aisle brought forward a rules package that, in my opinion, did not go nearly far enough in upholding the highest ethical standards. Today we offer a package that is based on real change. Members of Congress are elected to serve the American people, not their own individual private interests. And I am proud to say that today, this House of Representatives will enact a reform package that ends the culture of corruption once and for all. The days of the K Street project are over. No longer will Members of this House be able to dictate to any private entity the hiring or firing of anyone based on their political affiliation.

This rules package prohibits Members of Congress from traveling on corporate jets. My constituents in Massachusetts don't have the opportunity to get cheap travel on corporate jets and neither should Members of Congress.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, this rules package also changes the way Members of Congress

and staff can travel for official business. I strongly believe that overseas trips and other travel can be important tools to helping Members of Congress understand complex domestic and international issues.

But the days of lobbyist-sponsored golf junkets will be relics of the past. The actions this package takes are simple and straightforward: no more junkets, no more gifts from lobbyists, no more travel on corporate jets.

This rules package is comprehensive, and it is historic. We are going to change the way this place is run, and we are going to change the way people look at the Congress. The American people don't want to pick up their morning newspapers and read about golf junkets to St. Andrews. They don't want to hear stories about how their Congressman or Congresswoman was wined and dined with \$100 steak dinners.

Mr. Speaker, this is not complicated. These are commonsense items that should have been dealt with years ago. The time has come to do what is right, to hold Members of this House to the highest ethical standards.

With the election of NANCY PELOSI as Speaker of the House, the first woman Speaker in the history of the United States, Democrats are ushering in a new era and putting an end to the culture of corruption. We are changing the tone in Washington, and we are changing the way we conduct business.

Now, I know full well that the ethical problems of the past were not limited to one side of the aisle, and the solutions to those problems can and should come from both Democrats and Republicans. I know that many of my Republican friends agree that change is needed, and they wish that their leadership in the past would have moved forward on some of these changes. I look forward to working closely with them in the weeks and the months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the American people demand, and they deserve, a higher standard of conduct from their elected officials. Today, we are raising the bar for how Members of the 110th Congress will carry out their duties and do their jobs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this package. Once again, I think we will have an opportunity for bipartisanship. The issue of ethics and lobbying reform is something that we believe is very, very important. As I sit here today, I am reminded of the fact that 1 year ago this month, Speaker HASTERT and I stood right upstairs in the press gallery and unveiled a package for lobbying and ethics reform, which was maligned by many of our colleagues, unfortunately.

But I will say that I am very pleased with the fact that we were ultimately able to pass out of the House our measure, which did a number of things that

I am happy to see are incorporated in this provision that is coming forward from the new majority.

The thing that troubles me most, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this was done in a unilateral way. We are all very proud of the fact that we have a working, strong, vibrant bipartisan Ethics Committee. It would have been great if we could have had the Ethics Committee come forward with these recommendations.

There has been no consultation whatsoever between the majority and the minority, although I will say, again, I congratulate those Members of the new majority for including, including many of the items that were either incorporated in H.R. 4975, which was our lobbying and disclosure act that we passed out of the House last year, and some of the provisions that Speaker HASTERT and I outlined a year ago this month: free clearance of travel, a ban on travel and an end to gifts. An end to the K Street Project. These are all very important reforms that I do think are essential.

I will say this, Mr. Speaker, as I listen to my very good friend from Massachusetts, and I congratulate him on his new position in the majority on the Rules Committee, what happens between today and March 1 of this year? Well, let us see, we have the month of January and the month of February, and, guess what, under this package, the status quo in the 110th Congress, under the Democratic majority, remains in place without any kind of reform or change.

So I have got to ask rhetorically, anyone who wants to answer as to why we are waiting until March 1 before we see any kind of implementation here. They want to see guidelines put forward, maybe by the Ethics Committee. If that is what they would like to do, why don't we impose an immediate ban until they come up with recommended guidelines?

So I will say that as I listen to these proposals, they are interesting, I am very pleased that they have incorporated them. I don't believe they go far enough. In a few minutes, my colleagues, Mr. KIRK and Mr. SHADEGG, will be talking about concern on the pension issue, which unfortunately has been left out of this, but I do believe that by and large this is a measure that is going to be worthy of bipartisan support, and I am going to urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my good friend from California, whom I have a lot of respect for, there is a big difference between what his leadership proposed in terms of higher ethical standards and what is being proposed here today. I have got to say to the gentleman that we include a little bit more than just banning lobbyists from the locker rooms. They are banned

from the locker rooms in this bill, but there is a heck of a lot more.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield? If you will recall, we passed H.R. 4975.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am in the middle of my statement. I would also say to the gentleman that his party has been in control for 12 years, and there has been ample opportunity to change the status quo. The gentleman's party not only embraced the status quo, but we saw a proliferation of the culture of corruption, and that is what this is a response to. In answer to the gentleman's question as to this March 1 deadline, that is to give the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct ample time to put the rules and regulations and the disclosure requirements into place so that this can be an effective change.

So this is real historic change. We are going to end the culture of corruption in this Congress today. I am glad that the gentleman has said that he is going to support it. I hope that this is a bipartisan vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes, for the purpose of debate, to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SPACE).

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you to support this historic rules package. The winds of change have brought me here. I don't think it is too much to say that my very presence before you constitutes a message to this body, a message sent from the good people of Ohio's 18th District. By these presence, I wish to deliver this message on behalf of my constituents.

The message is that the legislative process is broken. Rather than serving the needs of working families, this Congress has shown through past actions a preference for serving interests of the privileged few. Nowhere has this been more clear than in the influence wielded by lobbyists. The influence of lobbyists has compromised the reputation and even the health of this body.

In order to restore the integrity to this Chamber and restore America's faith in its elected officials, we must undertake substantial ethics reform. Our actions today will not only enhance the most fundamental principles of a democratic society; they will remind our constituents that we are a body of the people and not above the people.

The package before you will breach the circle of deceit between lobbyists, their wealthy clients, and this body. It represents long overdue real ethics reform. It bans House Members and their employees from accepting gifts from lobbyists and the organizations that hire them. It prohibits lobbyists from paying for or organizing Member travel, and it eliminates the all-too-common practice of legislative jet-setting. In short, the ethics package is the first step toward restoring integrity and beginning the process necessary to restore faith in our system of government.

Coming from a district whose previous Congressman became mired, and

then consumed, by scandal, my fellow district residents and I understand all too intimately the perils associated with weak and loosely monitored ethics regulations.

We have suffered the frustration, disappointment, and anger associated with betrayal. We have suffered from not having a Member of Congress available to attend to the needs of the citizens of our district. But we are not alone. Other districts have suffered similar letdowns. That is inexcusable, and it is unconscionable.

At a moment in time when our Nation needs truly heroic leadership, as the challenges of the changing world continue to grow, this body has failed to step up and lead. The institution of Congress has failed to make clear its commitment to the principles of democracy; and it has frustrated, disappointed, and angered the American public.

The winds of change have, indeed, blown many among us into this Chamber, and there is much work to do.

We cannot begin our work in good faith without this declaration today that we are of, and not above, the American people. The time to act is now. We have an extraordinary burden to prove to those who have given us this honor. We must make clear to them that we are representing their interests, not bartering legislative favors in order to gain gifts and trips.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important ethics reform package.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Omaha, Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Thank you, I appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Ohio, the new Member who just spoke, I appreciate and respect his point of view. I will add, though, that the disgust, the frustration with the ethics violation, the disregard for the public's trust in this body because of a few of our colleagues isn't relegated to one side of the aisle or the other, nor one district or the other.

I think all of us in this institution today that took the oath of office are disgusted by the past; and that is why this body that last May passed a comprehensive ethics bill, which mostly was incorporated in this one, ironically, I think, it is fairly humorous, that most of our colleagues on the other side voted against it because it was not good enough, yet substantially similar to the one that is brought forward without our input into the process today.

Now I stand here today saying this isn't good enough. We could have done a better job of tightening down with lobbyists and gifts. Frankly, I don't know how to interpret the plane part, but I am concerned about establishing the public trust when someone accepts bribes.

In our package that was voted against by a lot of our colleagues from

the other side of the aisle that are pounding their chests today, in that was saying that you cannot receive the fruits that you earned during your tenure in this office if you have violated the public's trust.

That is not part of the bill that stands before us today. If you have accepted a bribe, you are convicted of a felony and are sitting in jail, you should not be able to accept the part of the government-funded pension or other government-funded benefits that you earned while you were here. You just simply cannot do that.

My folks back in Nebraska think that is absolutely absurd. I just wish we had a process in place where we could have worked in a partnership to improve this bill, to make it better. But we didn't have that opportunity, and I don't have the opportunity on behalf of my Nebraskans, who feel that it is absurd that you have cash in a freezer, that you can accept bribes like we had in a California or in an Ohio district, and still accept your pension. I think it is absurd that we don't have that opportunity today.

Frankly, the fact that those folks that voted against a comprehensive ethics reform package introduced one without Republican input to improve the bill smacks of partisanship to me. I thought we were going to clear the decks of that and start working together for the public good, and it just doesn't seem like it is happening today.

That is a poor start for civility in this body.

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

Let me just educate the gentleman that the change that he is asking for requires a statutory change. Today we are dealing with the House rules. I will assure the gentleman and his constituents in Nebraska and people all over the United States who agree with him that we will have the opportunity to do that. We will go through House Administration and you will have the opportunity to do that. We will hopefully have a unanimous vote on that.

□ 1830

I am also happy to hear the gentleman and others on the other side of the aisle all of a sudden speak in favor of ethics reform and real change and ending the culture of corruption in this House. It is amazing what an election will do.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON), a new member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the rules package.

Trust is a fragile thing. It is difficult to win, but easy to lose. It finds its hold on promises kept and honesty sustained and unquestionable integrity.

As the representative of the 13th District of Ohio, I am honored to rise on

this historic day to speak for the first time on the floor of the people's House.

And in so rising, I am proud that I do so to keep the faith with the people who sent me here to serve.

With our actions today, on this first day of the reform Congress, we begin to fulfill the awesome responsibility entrusted to us by the American people.

We have heard the call for change and it shall be heeded. Today, we sever the links between those who would buy influence on Capitol Hill and those who would willingly sell it.

We act to clean up the corruption which has eroded the public trust and resulted in far too many policies that benefit the well connected and the privileged few, at the expense of the greater good.

Title II of our rules package does just this. We end the K Street Project, which took peddling of access and influence to soaring new heights. We act to eradicate the cronyism and corruption. We cut off the gifts, the perks and travel wielded by special interests. We take the darkest inner workings of government and sanitize them with the light of day.

We will work to adopt this set of anti-corruption reforms to dismantle the dark corridors and backrooms and avenues to abuse that have allowed corruption to grow and flourish.

We will beat back the culture and abuses that have hurt the American people, both in policy and in spirit.

Today, we heed the call to put a halt to the corruption that has tarnished this House.

Trust is a fragile, sacred thing. And we, in the new 110th Congress, will protect it with all the power of our office.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me, again, say that we look forward to supporting this package, much of which, the items that the gentlewoman just outlined, were included in H.R. 4975, which passed this House last May with strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Highland Park, Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, this House needs more ethics reforms, rather than less. And the package before the House makes a positive step, but falls short in several key areas.

The most important ethics reform that is missing from this package concerns taxpayer-funded pensions for Members of Congress convicted of a felony. Under current law, both Congressmen Trafficant of the Democratic Party and Cunningham of the Republican Party would still be eligible to collect a taxpayer-funded pension, even after being indicted and convicted beyond a shadow of a doubt by a jury of their peers of a felony.

Stopping taxpayer funded pensions for lawmakers who break the law is not a new issue. My home State of Illinois, a State not known for its clean government, in that State, we, at least, kill pensions for lawmakers who break the law, and we have done so for 30 years.

Ten years ago, Speaker PELOSI voted for H.R. 4011. That would have killed pensions for Congressmen for a conviction on any one of 21 separate felonies. She was right then, and it would be right now to terminate taxpayer-funded pensions for lawbreakers.

Mr. Speaker, Democratic Congressman BRAD SHERMAN and I joined to support these very reforms in the last Congress. And we, at least, passed limited reforms and allowed the Senate at least to consider them.

But today, the 100 hours fails to take up this issue. None of these pension killing reforms are in the package or are currently scheduled.

I take what the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) says very seriously, that he has made a commitment to bring up legislation to kill pensions for Members of Congress convicted of a felony.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 14, to do exactly that, modeled after the legislation supported by former Speaker HASTERT as well as Speaker PELOSI. These are commonsense reforms, already part of the law of the land in the land of Lincoln, and long ago should be part of the ethics reforms of this House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just respond to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) by saying I know I am from Massachusetts, and you may think I have a funny accent and you have trouble understanding me. But let me repeat what I said before. In order to make the changes on the pension issue that he is asking for, which we all support, it requires a statutory change. And I think the staff over there will help clarify that. We are all for that.

In H.R. 4011, which Ms. PELOSI supported that you mentioned was a statute. We are going to do that.

Let me just say one other thing to the gentleman. You keep on referring to your ethics reform package as if it was some kind of this monumental change and reform.

You didn't ban the K Street Project, which has really resulted in so much outrage across the country. You had a temporary suspension on the issue of travel, and you had no ban on lobbyists' gifts.

This is real reform. We are going to end the culture of corruption.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of debate only 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND).

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. Speaker, the honorable Member from my neighboring district, I am honored to be here. My new colleagues, thank you for the opportunity to speak on such an important issue.

The voters of my district and this Nation were very clear about this past election. They want change. They want real ethics reform, and they want our country to be placed in a new direction. This is what we are here to do today. We are going to restore the ethics and integrity back to Congress.

I am honored to be here today to have the opportunity to help do that restoration and take an important step to end the influence and corruption in Congress that special interests have over the legislative process.

The honest leadership package that we are voting on today and tomorrow specifically addresses the concerns that the American people have had about the legislative process and about our elected leaders. This legislation will end the practice of privately funded trips from lobbyists. If I take an official trip, my congressional budget will pay for it. If I take a vacation, I will pay for it. That is how it should be for everyone.

I also pledge to my constituents, and will vote as part of this legislation, to never accept any gifts from lobbyists, nor will my staff.

My job, and all of our jobs, is to represent the citizens of our districts. And this is the only group that I will be answerable to.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of ending the culture of corruption and providing the environment where we can get back to what is most important, working for the people of the United States.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on this very important issue to the constituents of my 20th Congressional District of New York.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just, before yielding to the gentleman from Marietta, say very quickly again, the legislation that passed the House, H.R. 4975, specifically banned the K Street Project. Look at the language. It is virtually identical. We focused on the issue of lobbyist travel and gifts. And I believe that we can come together in a bipartisan way. We want to work in a civil tone, as was outlined by Speaker PELOSI today.

Mr. Speaker, with that I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend, former member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Marietta, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised when reading title II of this resolution, as it looks conspicuously like the ethics package passed by the Republican majority last Congress; the ethics package that only eight Democrats voted to support. I suspect today more than eight Democrats will finally agree with the Republicans that meaningful ethics reform is a priority of the American people.

In fact, the most obvious change in the Democratic package is the overly partisan and adversarial tone, adding headlines like "Ending the K Street Project" to language that was included in the Republican legislation. And for what purpose other than a partisan poke in the minority's eye?

Democrats campaigned on the promise of a more open and inclusive government, assuring us of their bipartisan intentions. Well, today, on the first day of the 110th, that promise has

been broken. Indeed, it has been smashed.

Additionally, as the focus of title II is on fostering a spirit of civility, I find it particularly troubling that the Democrats have decided to allow only 10 minutes of debate, 5 minutes on each side, on title V of this resolution, which we will take up tomorrow.

During this brief 10 minutes of debate, we will dramatically change the way the Rules Committee does business and outline the process by which five bills, including stem cell research, the 9/11 Commission recommendation, and minimum wage legislation will be considered. That is not even 2 minutes per proposal.

So this is hardly, Mr. Speaker, the tone of civility my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are promising to foster in the 110th Congress.

The American people and the Members of this body expect more from the Democrats. Their false promises of bringing a new age of bipartisanship and transparency to the halls of this Congress have clearly not materialized, despite the insistence on this by my former colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, while a minority member of the Rules Committee who stated, on September 28, 2006, while discussing the Electronic Surveillance Modernization Act, and I quote, "If my Republican friends want that trend of closed rules and no amendments, of no democracy in the House to continue, then, by all means, vote for this. Just go along to get along. But if you believe, as I do, that the monopoly on good ideas is not held by a few members of the leadership in a closed room, then vote "no." Have the guts to vote "no." End quote.

Mr. Speaker, I know why the Democratic leadership is trying to limit debate on these liberal bills, but the American people deserve to have a voice in this process, the voice of their elected representatives. Today, it is clear we have been denied that voice.

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

Let me just say, respond to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), who I am going to miss on the Rules Committee, if he thinks that the Republican reform package was meaningful reform, I will lend you my bifocals so you can read it more carefully. What ended up happening, what you ended up enacting essentially, after 12 years in the majority, was banning lobbyists from the locker room. That is all that became law.

You controlled the House of Representatives. You controlled the Congress. And you controlled the United States Senate, and that is basically all that you did.

So I would just say to the gentleman, if he wants to vote "no" on this, he can go right ahead and vote "no" on it. But that is defending the status quo.

I think the American people made it very clear during the last election that they are sick of the culture of corruption; that they want a ban on lobby-

ists' gifts; that they want an end to the K Street Project. They want a ban on Members using corporate jets to fly around the country. And so if you want to vote for the status quo, vote "no" on this. If you want to vote for real meaningful change, vote "yes."

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, thank you to the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding time.

Dear colleagues, it is my great privilege to rise today for the first time as the Representative for New Hampshire's Second District. It is humbling to serve with so many men and women I have admired for so long and to stand in this Chamber, hallowed by American history as the people's House.

But while today is dedicated, in part, to celebration, there is no time to waste in fixing the ills that have plagued this House in recent years.

Traveling across my State of New Hampshire this fall, I heard one clear, consistent message from voters—from Democrats, Independents and Republicans. We are fed up with the mess in Washington. Go down there and fix it.

Mr. Speaker, while most Americans see Congress as somewhat distant from their lives, they probably couldn't rattle off the names of Congressional leadership, for example, or quote bill numbers, they do understand with absolute clarity when Members of Congress are working for them or when Members of Congress are working for themselves.

□ 1845

Now, the Democratic ethics reform package is much needed and it is long overdue. While some in this body may bristle at its stringency, and some are now heard to complain, apparently, that it doesn't go far enough, as a new Member, I can tell you that it is only logical and only just to make these changes to the House rules, starting today and starting now.

We must ban gifts and travel from lobbyists, we must put a stop to the pernicious K Street Project, we must reform the way we spend taxpayers' money and the way we write and pass the bills meant to protect taxpayers' interests.

I strongly support the adoption of the Democratic rules package. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to congratulate the gentleman from New Hampshire. We welcome him here. Unfortunately, this package doesn't start today and start now. It starts March 1 of 2007, 2 months from now.

I also want to say to my very good friend from Massachusetts once again that if you look at the package that we passed in May of last year, it is a package that enjoyed bipartisan support. It is one of which we are very proud. And I believe that if you look at the fact

that we did go beyond preventing registered lobbyists from coming onto the House floor and the gym, we are doing many of those same things here. It has been done before.

And that is why we are proud to be here in support of this effort, which, again, some of us believe does not go far enough and there are some problems with it, but we do believe it is a positive step. Why? Because it is a reaffirmation of what Speaker HASTERT led us to last year.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to express my concern about the tone of this debate. Let me make it clear: I compliment my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Ethics reform is needed here, and today you are making a good first step. But please listen carefully to those of us on this side of the aisle who will vote with you for this package when we implore you to go further and when we take some credit for the efforts of the past.

It is true that we passed as a law through this House, sadly the Senate did not follow suit, a bill that corrected many of these things. Your bill, in some respects, goes further, but some of us are concerned that it needs to go even further. And it is not because we are revisionists.

I have campaigned in this body and out of this body throughout my career for reform. I believe it is not enough just to do so-called lobbyist reform. We must direct our ethics reform at the Members of this institution. And one way to do that is a way that was recognized by our new Speaker a decade ago, and that is to say that the Hiss Act, passed clear back in 1954, which said a Member of Congress who was convicted of bribery would lose his or her pension, should be reinstated, because it was repealed in 1961.

Over a year ago, watching what I was disappointed in in the criminal conduct of some Members of this body, I introduced a bill with 57 cosponsors saying that any Member, any Member, Republican, Democrat or otherwise, convicted of bribery in connection with their office ought to, at an absolute minimum, lose their pension. And I believe that is the standard we owe the American people, and no less.

My colleague says this is just a rules package, but this is your first hundred hours. There is no rule that says you could not have brought a statute, and I implore the gentleman and tell him that I will join with him, as will my colleague from Illinois and my colleague from Nebraska, each of whom had introduced bills a year ago or more seeking to prohibit Members from collecting a taxpayer-funded pension when they have, as the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, used this office not as one of public trust but one of public abuse to benefit themselves.

There is no time for delay. Pass a reform now punishing Members who misuse their office. Take away their pensions and do it now.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will commit to the gentleman from Arizona that we are going to enter into that exchange, and I look forward to having that statute on the floor where he can speak in favor of it and we can speak in favor of it too.

Let me also, Mr. Speaker, correct the record. The distinguished former chairman of the Rules Committee said none of this ethics reform takes place for 4 months. That is true on the travel, and I clarified that earlier as to why that is the case, so we had time to implement the rules and regulations of disclosure. But everything else, I will assure him, takes place immediately.

So once this ethics package passes, I would urge my colleague from California not to go out to dinner with any of his lobbyist friends because he might be breaking the law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield for purposes of debate only 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY).

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today representing Florida's 16th District and a voice in support of title II of the rules of the House relating to ethics reform in the House of Representatives.

Today, Democrats, and I hope with the support of our Republican colleagues, will pass an aggressive reform package that keeps our promise to the American people and reforms how we do business here in Washington. These ethics reforms mark an end to a tragic era in American history where the pursuit of power has cost us the faith of the American people.

We are here today to rebuild America's trust and make a promise that never again will special interest trump the interest of this great Nation. As Americans communicated on election day, they want political debate and they want the ability to choose. They are not interested in monopolies by either party on political power.

As we move forward, we can only solve the key challenges facing this great Nation by reestablishing the credibility, our credibility, to the American people. Under the new House leadership, the era of special interest politics will end and hardworking families, not lobbyists, will have a voice in Congress again.

I urge my colleagues to support these important changes to the House ethics rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 9½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the body and speak to the issue of finance, ethics, and other reform that is before the body; and I do it in support of those you have already heard today, many of whom represent the outrage, as has been mentioned, of their constituencies because of situations that were faced by those that they ran against. It is an opportunity that we had to send a clear and positive message to the American people that what they called for in this past election is going to be carried out.

The exit polls all across this country reflected that the number one issue, the number one issue on which the voters cast their vote in the election of 2006 was concern about ethics and reforming ethics. We owe it to the American people, we owe it to all those in this body, and I sincerely recognize that everyone in this body is committed to this. We owe it to all of those to articulate and enact a rules package that incorporates this significant reform.

It is a privilege and an honor for me to stand in support of this package and in support of the ethics reforms being called for by the American people.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I do congratulate my colleagues. I want to begin by saying as a Californian that I am very proud of the fact that California has provided the first female Speaker of the House of Representatives. Similarly, I have congratulated our colleague, Ms. SLAUGHTER, who will be the first woman to chair the Rules Committee in our Nation's history.

This has been a historic day and I believe a very exciting day for us. I am pleased that we have been able to do a number of things already in a bipartisan way, and I think this issue of ethics and lobbying reform, building on the reforms that we passed in the 109th Congress, utilizing those very positive provisions, is exactly what we are about to vote on here in just a few minutes; and I think that it is a time when we can be civil.

And I will say to all of my friends on both sides of the aisle, the American people want us to deal with these problems, and I will reaffirm my commitment to my colleagues on the Rules Committee that I will continue to strive to comport myself in the most dignified way possible in dealing with my colleagues, and I urge support of this very important measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleague from California (Mr. DREIER) that I appreciate his words of cooperation and bipartisanship, and I do hope, and it is my belief, that you will see a change in terms of more outreach across the aisle and more respect, quite frankly, for the

opinions of every single Member of this House.

I agree this is a historic day. This is not only a historic day because we have elected the first woman Speaker of the House in the history of the United States of America, but this is also a historic day for what we are about to vote on. We are about to change the way we do business here in Washington. We are responding to what the American people made very clear on election day, that they are tired of the ethical lapses of their leaders in government; that they want an end to the culture of corruption; that they want a government that has high ethical standards; that they want Members of Congress to adhere to those high ethical standards and, if they do not, that they will be held accountable. So what we are doing today in this ethics package, I think, is also an important moment in our history.

What we are doing is we are doing what is right. We are holding the Members of this House to the very highest ethical standards. And I want to say to my colleague from Arizona (Mr. SHAD-EGG) that I agree with him on the pension issue. So do, I think, everybody on our side of the aisle. And we are going to address that and we are going to hopefully get a unanimous vote on that issue, because he is right on that issue. But, again, we are not dealing with that. That requires a statutory change, and today we are dealing with the House rules.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today, I will remind my colleagues again, is very important. We are ending gifts by lobbyists to Members of Congress, we are banning the use of corporate jets for Members of Congress for a minimal price so that they can take a corporate jet and fly anywhere in this country. No one else can do that, yet that has been a practice by too many Members in this Congress. That will be banned.

We will end the lobbyist-sponsored golf junkets. They will be relics of the past. This is a new day. This is a day where ethics and where integrity are going to hold a very, very high place. We are going to end the culture of corruption with this vote, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Title II of H.R. 6, the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress. With the adoption of this title, we begin to make good on our pledge to "drain the swamp" and end the "culture of corruption" that pervaded the 109th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is critically important that we adopt the ethics rules contained in Title II because Americans are paying for the cost of corruption in Washington with skyrocketing prices at the pump, spiraling drug costs, and the waste, fraud and no-bid contracts in the Gulf Coast and Iraq, for Administration cronies like Halliburton.

Ethics and legal scandals plagued the Republican Congress—from the resignation of Reps. Tom DeLay and Duke Cunningham to

the admission of illegal or improper conduct by Reps. Bob Ney and Mark Foley.

The cozy relationship between Congress and special interests we saw during the 109th resulted in serious lobbying scandals, such as those involving Republican super lobbyist Jack Abramoff. In this scandal, a former congressman pleaded guilty to conspiring to commit fraud—accepting all-expense-paid trips to play golf in Scotland and accepting meals, sports and concert tickets, while providing legislative favors for Abramoff's clients.

But that is not all. Under the previous Republican leadership of the House, lobbyists were permitted to write legislation, 15-minute votes were held open for hours, and entirely new legislation was sneaked into signed conference reports in the dead of night.

The American people registered their disgust at this sordid way of running the Congress last November and voted for reform. Democrats picked up 30 seats held by Republicans and exits polls indicated that 74 percent of voters cited corruption as an extremely important or a very important issue in their choice at the polls.

Ending the culture of corruption and delivering ethics reform is one of the top priorities of the new majority of House Democrats. That is why as our first responsibility in fulfilling the mandate of this critical election, Democrats are offering an aggressive ethics reform package. We seek to end the excesses we witnessed under the Republican leadership and to restore the public's trust in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman SLAUGHTER and the members of the Rules Committee for their excellent work in preparing this ethics reform package. The reforms contained in the package are tough but not nearly too tough for persons elected to represent the interests of the 600,000 constituents in their congressional districts. Indeed, similar bipartisan lobbying and government reform proposals were debated and passed by the House and Senate in 2006 but the Congress failed to reconcile the two versions.

Mr. Speaker, I support each element of the ethics reform package, which bans gifts from lobbyists; bans lobbyist financed trips and travel; requires pre-approval and certification for travel financed by outside groups; prohibits use of corporate aircraft; ends the notorious K Street Project; and mandates ethics training for all House employees.

BANS GIFTS FROM LOBBYISTS

Members of Congress are paid enough by the taxpayers to afford to pay for their own meals. Lobbyists can make their case by providing Members of Congress accurate, reliable, and persuasive information. Thus, it is appropriate that the House rules should ban gifts, including meals and tickets, from lobbyists and the organizations that employ them, and require that tickets to sporting and other events given to Members and staff by non-lobbyists are valued at market price.

BANS LOBBYIST TRAVEL

Another reform that I support is the ban on lobbyists and the organizations that employ them from financing travel for Members or staff, except for one-day travel to visit a site, attend a forum, participate in a panel, or give a speech. As the scandal involving Jack Abramoff revealed, lobbyist financed travel led to serious abuse. The new rules do not ban such travel altogether but directs the Com-

mittee on Standards of Official Conduct to develop guidelines for minimal lobbyist involvement for one-day/one-night travel. It should be noted, however, that travel provided by a private university is not to be affected by anything in the rules package.

REQUIRES CERTIFICATION AND PRE-APPROVAL FOR TRAVEL PAID FOR BY OUTSIDE GROUPS

I also support the travel certification and pre-approval provisions. The new ethics rules require sponsors of all other permitted travel to certify that they have abided by all restrictions on lobbyist involvement and requires Members and staff to obtain pre-approval from the ethics committee for travel to ensure trips are connected to official duties, the amount spent is limited to reasonable expenses, and the destination is related to the purpose of the trip. The rules require the full disclosure of all travel within 15 days after the trip. Travel provisions take effect beginning on March 1, 2007.

PROHIBITS USE OF COMPANY PLANES

Next, the new rules prohibit the use of official, personal or campaign funds to pay for the use of non-commercial, corporate jets. This provision does not apply to charter plane services or to airplanes owned by Members.

ENDS THE K STREET PROJECT

Clarifies that no Member can take or withhold an official act, or influence, or offer or threaten to influence, the official act of another with the intent to influence on the basis of partisan political affiliation an employment decision or employment practice of any private entity.

MANDATES ETHICS TRAINING

Finally, and effective March 1, 2007, the new rules require the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to offer annual ethics training to members, delegates, the resident commissioner, officers and employees of the House. This training would be required to involve the classes of employees deemed appropriate by the committee and must include the aspects of the Code of Official Conduct and related House rules deemed appropriate.

The required training is to be provided to new officers or employees within 60 days of their employment, and each officer or employee is to file a certification with the committee by January 31 certifying that they have attended training in the past year.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, it is wholly fitting and proper that the Members of this House, along with all of the American people, paid fitting tribute to the late President Gerald R. "Jerry" Ford, a former leader in this House, who did so much to heal our Nation in the aftermath of Watergate. Upon assuming the presidency, President Ford assured the Nation: "My fellow Americans, our long national nightmare is over." By his words and deeds, President Ford helped turn the country back on the right track. He will be forever remembered for his integrity, good character, and commitment to the national interest.

This House today faces a similar challenge. To restore public confidence in this institution we must commit ourselves to being the most honest, most ethical, most responsive Congress in history. We can end the nightmare of the last 6 years by putting the needs of the American people before those of the lobbyists and special interests. To do that, we must start by adopting Title II of H.R. 6, the ethics

reforms to the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Honest Leadership and Open Government rules package currently before the House.

Reform of the way this House conducts its business is not an option. It is an absolute necessity. A recent poll found that only 37 percent of Americans approve of how Congress is doing its job. Does anyone here doubt that the ethical scandals and procedural abuses of recent years are a major factor for this low public approval rating? In 2006 alone, four Members of the House resigned their seats under a cloud. Two of these former Members have already been convicted for unethical and illegal ties to lobbyists.

I do not believe that these specific abuses represent the majority of Members, but I do believe it is the responsibility of the Majority party to set out strong rules that can begin to regain the trust of the American people in their institution of Congress.

For many years now, our constituents have been bombarded by media reports of cozy relationships between Congress and special interests lobbyists. They are incensed by news reports of Members accepting all-expense-paid trips to play golf in Scotland, the flagrant abuse of House rules to hold 15-minute votes open for hours for the sole purpose of affecting the outcome, the widening Jack Abramoff lobbying scandal, and the lack of accountability and transparency in how congressional earmarks are awarded.

I mentioned that our constituents learned about these abuses from the media, in their morning newspapers and on the nightly news. Too often in recent years, it is also from the media that rank-and-file Members of Congress have learned about special interest provisions that were secretly inserted into legislation in the dead of night and brought up for a vote before Members had an opportunity to read what they were being asked to vote on. This form of secret legislating has got to stop, and it will stop under this reform package.

The reform package before the House will also curb a large number of the other abuses that have come to light. These reforms will ban gifts from lobbyists, expand and tighten the restrictions on congressional travel paid for by outside groups, prohibit travel on corporate jets, and require greater public disclosure of targeted special interest legislation. The reforms will also prohibit the practice of holding votes open for the sole purpose of affecting the outcome.

There are many other needed reforms contained here, but the one I want to single out is the provision that restores pay-as-you-go budgeting. Pay-as-you-go budgeting simply means that Congress will not consider any legislation to boost entitlement spending or cut taxes unless it is fully paid for. Before they were abandoned in 2002, the pay-as-you-go rules helped to turn record deficits into record surpluses in the 1990s. Since abandoning pay-as-you-go, the cumulative deficit for the past four years has totaled over \$1.36 trillion. We simply cannot continue to pile up more and more debt and pass it along to our children and grandchildren.

For all these reasons, I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for the House rules reform package before the House.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6.

Throughout history, there has been an on-going struggle to put the people's interest ahead of special interests. With this legislation, we put an end to this age-old struggle. The 110th Congress has been given a mandate by the people and make sure their's are the voices that are heard.

To do this, we must ban gifts and meals from lobbyists and the organizations that they represent. We must ban lobbyists from planning, organizing, financing and participating in travel for Members or staff. We must protect the American taxpayer by requiring full disclosure of earmarks so that they know how their money is being spent. We must ensure that the business of the people is completed in a fair and open way.

As we start the 110th Congress, we must govern our own chamber in a manner that represents the interests of our constituents. This is why I proudly rise in support of this measure and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep disappointment in the rules package we are considering today.

The message from the American public last fall was "we want Republicans and Democrats to work together." We all had high expectations for a "new way of doing business in Washington."

This past week during the Nation's remembrance of former President Gerald Ford, we were all reminded of the way Republicans and Democrats were able to find common ground to solve the country's problems. There was a time when the two parties could come together in the national interest.

Where, Mr. Speaker, did all of those grand and high-minded promises of bipartisanship go? I hope this is not a precedent for how the House will operate during the rest of the 110th Congress. Our constituents expect us to work together and get things done for the good of the country.

Included in this rules package are a number of ethics reforms, but they do not go far enough. We must have tougher and stronger ethics reform.

Today, there are Members serving in the House who have contributed to the American public's loss of confidence in this body. One Member was found to have \$90,000 in cash in his freezer; another Member of the Appropriations Committee established separate entities that were recipients of appropriation funds. Yet, this rules package and the ethics reforms in it do nothing to punish such behavior.

We must adopt tougher and stronger measures if we are going to regain the trust of the American public. In my District, Nebraskans sent a clear message that said if Members take bribes and abuse the public's trust, they should not be protected and should not be allowed to reap the benefits of their House service such as a pension paid for by the taxpayers. Under this new Congressional leadership, Nebraska's voice will not be heard. I won't be allowed to even offer an amendment to be denied by the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation that I introduced last year—to deny pension benefits to any Member or government official who is convicted of a crime that violates the public trust. Because of the lack of a fair and open process in this House, I have been denied the opportunity to offer this legislation as an amendment.

This is not what American voters wanted to see after last fall's election. We are being denied the chance to work together. We need to restore the public's confidence in this House and one way to do that is to work together to solve the problems facing this Nation.

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

□ 1900

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the portion of the divided question comprising title II.

The question is on that portion of the divided question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 430, nays 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—430

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney

Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr

Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)

Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud

Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky

Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Viscosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Burton (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Brown (SC)
Buyer

Davis, Lincoln
Norwood

□ 1929

So that portion of the divided question was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 7, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 5, further proceedings will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

S. RES. 5

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Robert C. Byrd as President of the Senate pro tempore.

S. RES. 10

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Nancy Erickson as Secretary of the Senate.

S. RES. 13

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Terrance W. Gainer as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 95-521, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints Patricia Mack Bryan, of Virginia, as Deputy Senate Legal Counsel, for a term of service to expire at the end of the 111th Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 95-521, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints Morgan J. Frankel, of the District of Columbia, as Senate Legal Counsel, for a term of service to expire at the end of the 111th Congress.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 159. An act to redesignate the White Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of Vermont as the "Robert T. Stafford White Rocks National Recreation Area".

□ 1930

ELECTION OF MAJORITY MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 7) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 7

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the fol-

lowing standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Mr. Peterson of Minnesota, Chairman.

(2) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—Mr. Obey, Chairman; Mr. Murtha, Mr. Dicks, Mr. Mollohan, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Visclosky, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Serrano, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Moran of Virginia, Mr. Olver, Mr. Pastor, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island, Mr. Hinchey, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Farr, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Ms. Kilpatrick of Michigan, Mr. Boyd of Florida, Mr. Fattah, Mr. Rothman, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. Berry, Ms. Lee, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Honda, Ms. McCollum of Minnesota, Mr. Israel, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Chandler, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Rodriguez.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Mr. Skelton, Chairman.

(4) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Spratt, Chairman.

(5) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—Mr. George Miller of California, Chairman.

(6) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Mr. Dingell, Chairman; Mr. Waxman, Mr. Markey, Mr. Boucher, Mr. Towns, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Gordon of Tennessee, Mr. Rush, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Stupak, Mr. Engel, Mr. Wynn, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Ms. DeGette, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Doyle, Ms. Harman, Mr. Allen, Ms. Schakowsky, Ms. Solis, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Inslee, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Ross, Ms. Hooley, Mr. Weiner, Mr. Matheson, Mr. Butterfield, Mr. Melancon, Mr. Barrow, Mr. Hill.

(7) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Chairman.

(8) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—Mr. Lantos, Chairman.

(9) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Chairman.

(10) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Ms. Millender-McDonald, Chairman.

(11) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—Mr. Conyers, Chairman.

(12) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mr. Rahall, Chairman.

(13) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Waxman, Chairman.

(14) COMMITTEE ON RULES.—Ms. Slaughter, Chairman.

(15) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Gordon of Tennessee, Chairman.

(16) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Ms. Velázquez, Chairman.

(17) COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.—Mrs. Jones of Ohio, Chairman.

(18) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—Mr. Oberstar, Chairman.

(19) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Filner, Chairman.

(20) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—Mr. Rangel, Chairman; Mr. Stark, Mr. Levin, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Neal of Massachusetts, Mr. McNulty, Mr. Tanner, Mr. Becerra, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Pomeroy, Mrs. Jones of Ohio, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Emanuel, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Kind, Mr. Pascarel, Ms. Berkley, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Meek of Florida, Ms. Schwartz of Pennsylvania, Mr. Davis of Alabama.

Mr. EMANUEL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 8) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 8

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Mr. Goodlatte.

(2) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—Mr. Lewis of California, Mr. Young of Florida, Mr. Regula, Mr. Rogers of Kentucky, Mr. Wolf, Mr. Walsh of New York, Mr. Hobson, Mr. Knollenberg, Mr. Kingston, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Tiahrt, Mr. Wamp, Mr. Latham, Mr. Aderholt, Mrs. Emerson, Ms. Granger, Mr. Peterson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Goode, Mr. Doolittle, Mr. LaHood, Mr. Weldon of Florida, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Culberson, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Rehberg, Mr. Carter, Mr. Alexander.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Mr. Hunter.

(4) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin.

(5) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—Mr. McKeon.

(6) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Mr. Barton of Texas.

(7) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—Mr. Bachus.

(8) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.

(9) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—Mr. King of New York.

(10) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Mr. Ehlers, Mr. Daniel E. Lungren of California, Mr. McCarthy of California.

(11) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—Mr. Smith of Texas.

(12) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mr. Young of Alaska.

(13) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Tom Davis of Virginia.

(14) COMMITTEE ON RULES.—Mr. Dreier, Mr. Lincoln Diaz-Balart of Florida, Mr. Hastings of Washington, Mr. Sessions.

(15) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Hall of Texas.

(16) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Chabot.

(17) COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.—Mr. Hastings of Washington.

(18) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—Mr. Mica.

(19) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Buyer.

(20) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—Mr. McCrery, Mr. Herger, Mr. Camp of Michigan, Mr. Ramstad, Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas, Mr. English of Pennsylvania, Mr. Weller of Illinois, Mr. Hulshof, Mr. Lewis of Kentucky, Mr. Brady of Texas, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin, Mr. Cantor, Mr. Linder, Mr. Nunes, Mr. Tiberi, Mr. Porter.

Mr. PUTNAM (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN
MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 9) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 9

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, the six minority employees authorized therein shall be the following named persons, effective January 3, 2007, until otherwise ordered by the House, to-wit: Jo-Marie St. Martin, Mike Sommers, Dave Schnittger, Brian Kennedy, George Rogers, and Jay Cranford, each to receive gross compensation pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 119, Ninety-fifth Congress, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of Public Law 95-94. In addition, the Minority Leader may appoint and set the annual rate of pay for up to three further minority employees.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 10) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 10

Resolved, That unless otherwise ordered, before Monday, May 14, 2007, the hour of daily meeting of the House shall be 2 p.m. on Mondays; noon on Tuesdays; and 10 a.m. on all other days of the week; and from Monday, May 14, 2007, until the end of the first session, the hour of daily meeting of the House shall be noon on Mondays; 10 a.m. on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays; and 9 a.m. on all other days of the week.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGARDING CONSENT TO ASSEMBLE
OUTSIDE THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 1

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That pursuant to clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, during the One Hundred Tenth Congress the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, may notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to assemble at a place outside the District of Columbia if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING PROFOUND REGRET
AND SORROW OF THE HOUSE ON
THE DEATH OF GERALD R.
FORD, 38TH PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 11) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 11

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has learned with profound regret and sorrow of the death of Gerald R. Ford, thirty-eighth President of the United States of America.

Resolved, That the House tenders its deep sympathy to the members of the family of the former President in their bereavement.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy of the same to the family of the former President.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the former President.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will observe a moment of silence in honor of former President Ford.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER, MAJORITY
LEADER, AND MINORITY
LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNA-
TIONS AND MAKE APPOINT-
MENTS DURING THE 110TH CON-
GRESS

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the 110th Congress, the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

GRANTING MEMBERS OF THE
HOUSE PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND
REMARKS AND INCLUDE EXTRA-
NEOUS MATERIAL IN THE CON-
GRESSIONAL RECORD DURING
THE 110TH CONGRESS

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the 110th Congress, all Members be per-

mitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material within the permitted limit in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extensions of Remarks."

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER MORNING HOUR
DEBATE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the first session of the 110th Congress:

(1) on legislative days of Monday when the House convenes pursuant to House Resolution 10, the House shall convene 90 minutes earlier than the time otherwise established by the resolution solely for the purpose of conducting morning hour debate; and

(2) on legislative days of Tuesday when the House convenes pursuant to House Resolution 10:

(A) before May 14, 2007, the House will convene for morning hour debate 90 minutes earlier than the time otherwise established by that resolution; and

(B) after May 14, 2007, the House shall convene for morning hour debate 1 hour earlier than the time otherwise established by that resolution; and

(3) on legislative days of Monday or Tuesday, when the House convenes for morning hour debate pursuant to an order other than House Resolution 10, the House shall resume its session 90 minutes after the time otherwise established by that order;

(4) the time for morning hour debate shall be limited to the 30 minutes allocated to each party, except that on Tuesdays after May 14, 2007, the time shall be limited to 25 minutes allocated to each party and may not continue beyond 10 minutes before the hour appointed for the resumption of the session of the House; and

(5) the form of proceeding for morning hour debate shall be as follows:

(a) the prayer by the Chaplain, the approval of the Journal and the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag shall be postponed until resumption of the session of the House;

(b) initial and subsequent recognitions for debate shall alternate between the parties;

(c) recognition shall be conferred by the Speaker only pursuant to lists submitted by the majority leader and by the minority leader;

(d) no Member may address the House for longer than 5 minutes, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip; and

(e) following morning hour debate, the Chair shall declare a recess pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I until the time appointed for the resumption of the session of the House.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO
NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty.

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, January 4, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAME SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Ms. Marjorie C. Kelaher, Deputy Clerk, and Mr. Jorge E. Sorensen, Deputy Clerk, to sign any and all papers and to do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 110th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2001, and the order of the House of today, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) as members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with herself.

LIEUTENANT (JG) GERALD FORD

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, during the great World War II, the U.S. aircraft carrier *Monterey* faced its fiercest naval battle, not with the Imperial Japanese Navy, but the storm of the sea, Typhoon Cobra.

A naval lieutenant (jg) answering the call to action motivated the crew to combat against the Cobra's bone-crushing waves, torrential rains, and consuming fires it caused on board the ship.

Refusing the order to abandon the ship, this warrior valiantly went below, marching into the mouth of the fire, rescuing those trapped within its grasp. He ignored the searing heat of

the flames and the blackness of the smoke. Hour upon hour this man led others in the charge to extinguish the demon fire, saving fellow sailors and officers.

He did not seek recognition in the darkness of 1944; it sought him. When it called, this naval officer answered in a manner of all American patriots, with courage, valor, and victory.

Twenty-nine years later, this same individual helped rescue an entire Nation from the fire of corruption and war. And he brought peace. His name was President Gerald Ford, and we thank him.

And that's just the way it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that the whole number of the House is 435.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

□ 1945

LANCE CORPORAL LUKE YEPSSEN,
TEXAS WARRIOR

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, it has been said, "We are United States Marines, and for two and a quarter centuries we have defined the standards of courage, spirit, and military prowess."

These are words spoken by United States Marine Corps General James Jones. This describes the elitism of those chosen few who wear the title of United States Marines.

Luke Yepsen was one man whose life was making a difference at a very young age. He personified the core values of the United States Marine Corps of honor, courage, commitment.

He was from Kingwood, Texas, a close-knit community near Houston, Texas. He was a graduate of Kingwood High School, and he was known for his big heart and ability to live life to its fullest extent. He enjoyed travel and he was proud of the fact that he had already traveled to 20 different foreign countries in his short lifetime.

Luke deeply cared about his family back home in Texas and his military family. His fellow Marines said he was

more than just a friend; he was a brother, a brother to everyone who knew him.

Like many Texans, especially those Texans who go to war, Luke chose to enroll in Texas A&M after high school. During his freshman year, he made a decision to leave Texas A&M University. Gary Yepsen, Luke's father, asked him why he didn't want to graduate college and then enter the United States Marine Corps as an officer. Luke said, "I don't want to go into the Marines to tell people what to do. I want to go into the Marines so they can tell me what to do."

Here is what President Ronald Reagan said about the Marines: "Some people spend an entire lifetime wondering if they made a difference in the world. But the Marines, they don't have that problem."

Luke Yepsen was one of those Marines. With faith in God and country, at 18 Luke enrolled in the United States Marine Corps. He was an assaultman, later a mechanic, which came easy to him because of his love of cars. "He had so much courage and pride, you can't even imagine. You could hear it in his voice how proud he was," said Luke's brother, Kyle. In October of 2006, Luke was deployed to Iraq with the 1st Tank Battalion, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force. Amid the violence and anarchy in Iraq, Luke's thoughts never waned from the security of home and American freedom. When told by his college roommate that he was praying for him, Luke quickly responded, "Well, I'm praying for you."

On December 14, 2006, at the age of 20, Luke, while fighting the forces of evil, was killed by enemy action in Iraq. For his military service, he was awarded the Purple Heart, the Combat Action Ribbon, the National Defense Service Medal, and the Iraq Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, and the Sea Service Deployment Ribbon.

On the morning of December 22, 2006, hundreds of Kingwood, Texas, residents lined the streets of this community paying tribute to the family of this patriot. Many of those on the streets carried flags, yellow ribbons. Many held banners saying "Proud of You," "Proud to be an American." Some said, "Thank You." As the funeral procession made its way to the church, the residents of Kingwood, with tearful eyes and grateful hearts, saluted the Yepsen family.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that patriotism is alive and well in the United States. And as the Kingwood, Texas, community mourns the loss of America's son, Luke Yepsen, and all those who came before him and all those that will come after him, we know that freedom is not free, and we thank this fearless Marine for dedicating his life to America.

Luke's sacrifice will be etched in the catalogue of history as another Marine

who was always faithful. A sacrifice made for his parents, Sheila and Gary; his brother, Kyle; and his fiancée, Sandra Bruman; the Kingwood community; and this great Nation.

As we honor the life of Luke Yepsen, reflect on those timeless words from the Marine Corps Hymn that say:

“In many a strife
We’ve fought for life
And never lost our nerve.
If the army and the navy
Ever look on heaven’s scenes,
They will find the streets are guarded
By United States Marines.”

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that Lance Corporal Luke Yepsen is patrolling the streets of heaven tonight and guarding the pearly gates.

So Semper Fi, Lance Corporal Yepsen. Semper Fi.

And that’s just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOUCHER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HONORING DEREK RYAN KEHOE

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of a courageous young man from my district, and of his friends and family and supporters, who are trying to use his untimely demise to help make the world a better place.

Derek Ryan Kehoe graduated from Nazareth High School in 2005, which this high school is located in Nazareth, Pennsylvania. And he was a star player on the school’s basketball team, a team he led to the District 11 Tournament in 2005.

He was a freshman at Albright College when, in April of 2006, he discovered a lump on his back. The lump turned out to be leiomyosarcoma, or LMS as it is better known, a rare and deadly form of cancer. LMS currently has no cure. And though Derek was a strong, healthy 19-year-old, the disease overcame him, and he passed on on October 28, 2006.

Throughout his illness, Derek was cheerful and encouraging, more concerned with the feelings of those who came to see him than of his own condition. On January 5, 2007, Derek’s life will be commemorated at half time of the Nazareth High-Northampton High boys basketball game. A full house is expected, and 150 of Derek’s classmates are returning for the event. All proceeds from the game will be earmarked to fight this dreaded disease of LMS that took Derek away from us way too soon.

I want to extend my condolences to Derek’s parents, Maureen Kehoe and Kevin Kehoe. I also want to express my

support for all the people who have put together this event, including the Kehoes, the administration of Nazareth Area High School, and the Nazareth High School Booster Club. I also want to convey a special word of thanks to Nazareth basketball coach Joe Arndt, who loved Derek as he would a son and who played a key role in making this event a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert a copy of these words into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this 4th day of January, 2007, as part of the effort to commemorate for all time the life of Derek Ryan Kehoe.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of a courageous young man from my District, and of his friends, family, and supporters who are trying to use his untimely demise to help make the world a better place.

Derek Ryan Kehoe graduated from Nazareth High School in 2005 (in Nazareth, PA) and was a star player on the school’s basketball team, a team he led to the District 11 Tournament in 2005. He was a freshman at Albright College when, in April of 2006, he discovered a lump on his back. The lump turned out to be leiomyosarcoma (LMS), a rare and deadly form of cancer. LMS currently has no cure, and though Derek was a strong, healthy 19-year old, the disease overcame him, and he passed on October 28, 2006.

Throughout his illness, Derek was cheerful and encouraging, more concerned with the feelings of those who came to see him than with his own condition. On January 5, 2007, Derek’s life will be commemorated at the half-time of the Nazareth High-Northampton High boys basketball game. A full house is expected, and 150 of Derek’s classmates are returning for the event. All proceeds from the game will be earmarked to fight this dreaded disease of LMS that took Derek away from us way too soon.

I want to extend my condolences to Derek’s parents, Maureen Kehoe and Kevin Kehoe. I also want to express my support for all the people who have put together this event, including the Kehoes, the administration of Nazareth Area High School, and the Nazareth High Booster Club. I also want to convey a special word of thanks to Nazareth basketball coach Joe Arndt, who loved Derek as he would a son, and who played a key role in making this event a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a copy of these words be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this 4th day of January 2007, as part of the effort to commemorate, for all time, the life of Derek Ryan Kehoe.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

CLEAN ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening on truly what is a historic day, the beginning of this Congress. Historic, I will mention two reasons: One, the first woman Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, NANCY PELOSI, something that certainly has caused a lot of joy here and across the country and it is something worthy of noting. But a second historic event arises from Speaker PELOSI’s first address as Speaker of the House today that I think marks a pivotal moment in our future of the country when it comes to our energy policy.

Speaker PELOSI today, in some of her very first comments, made a commitment to the country that our Nation would start a titanic and historic shift from old technologies associated with fossil fuels that are now putting massive amounts of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere and towards the use of new technologies that can produce our mode of power for our cars and our planes and our buses and our homes and our computers, and even our hair dryers in a way that does not contribute to global warming. And this is her commitment and her very first comment, I think it was telling, that this House will pass a measure in very short order, in the next several weeks, that will shift a huge amount of our national resources away from work in these fossil fuels that are now contributing to global warming and put that money into a fund that will be dedicated to the use of new high-technological energy sources that can free us from Middle Eastern oil, create jobs in our country, and stop global warming.

This is certainly a three-fer. And the way that she has made a commitment that this House will do is that we basically will repeal some of the less prudent activities of the former Congress that gave \$7 billion of taxpayer money to the oil and gas industry, a very imprudent move, an industry that is in tip-top form financially, making profits hand over fist, the most profitable corporation in American history, indeed, world history. And yet the last Congress saw fit to give billions of dollars of tax relief to these organizations.

And these organizations are good organizations. They have good people in them. But there was no reason to give that money away when it has higher purpose. And that higher purpose that Speaker PELOSI talked about today is

to take those billions of dollars, those tax goodies given away to these corporations, repeal those giveaways and shift that money, shift those public resources, into a pool of funds that will be used to develop new high-tech, clean energy sources that we can go forward to build energy independence and reduce our contributions of carbon dioxide and other gases that are contributing to global warming. And I think this is a fundamental shift in American history.

We have had a steam revolution starting with American ingenuity, with Fulton and others. We had an industrial revolution led by American inventors, Ford and others. We have had an IT revolution led by many people in the software business. Many of them in my district in North Seattle and Redmond, Washington.

And now we are heading into a fourth revolution in the industrial base of America, and that is an energy revolution, where we make a transition from dirty fuels to clean fuels, many of which we will talk about tonight, and we will do it in a smart, prudent, fiscally sound way of using funds that are being wasted essentially on these old dirty technologies and shift them over, starting today with Speaker PELOSI's wise comments, towards these new technologies.

And in doing so, we will use the most fundamental character of Americans, which is technological brilliance, innovation, creativity, tinkering. We are the greatest tinkerers and inventors, not speaking personally but our country, in human history. And now starting today, we are taking the first step what I call the road down to new Apollo. We had the first Apollo project with John F. Kennedy where we went to the moon.

Today, with Speaker PELOSI's comments, we took the first step on the road to a new Apollo clean energy future for this country to move these resources into a clean energy future. And I am very excited about it because it will build upon the scientific prowess of America.

I would like to yield now to one of the Members of Congress who is a leader in the scientific community, a physicist with a history at Princeton, who personifies what science can do for this country, who has been a leader on these clean energy issues, for some comments on this issue, RUSH HOLT of New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE). And I look forward to joining him again in the Apollo energy legislation as I did in the last Congress, and this time I hope we will get it through because the way we produce and use energy in the United States is the greatest insult to our planet.

There are a lot of things that we do that are dangerous, unclean, unproductive. But the way we produce and use energy is the greatest insult. And I think what we want to talk about is

the word "sustainable." We should be in this for the long haul for centuries to come.

As we look back on a day like today when we celebrate the ongoing experiment of the American republic, we should be thinking, as those who wrote the Constitution were thinking, about something that would last for centuries. We should be embarking on a sustainable energy path. Not just clean energy, not just renewable energy, but a sustainable energy path that is environmentally sustainable, that is economically sustainable, and that is climatically sustainable.

One of the big changes that has occurred, and I think Mr. INSLEE would agree, in the last year or 2 is here in Washington, and I think around the country, we have come to the conclusion, some of us years ago, but most people very recently, have come to the conclusion that global climate change, human induced global climate change, is real. They have come to the conclusion that it is real and they have come to the conclusion that it is serious.

They have not yet come to the conclusion that it is harmful. I would argue that it is costly and deadly. They have not come to the conclusion that there is something that we can do about it. But, indeed, I would argue that there is a great deal we can do about it. Some damage has been done.

□ 2000

There is much more we can do.

Mr. INSLEE. We want to turn to the things that can be done, because one of the messages of the new Apollo Project is that we have a clear path to use technology to solve this problem. But before we launch into a discussion now, I just wanted to note three conversations on this issue about global warming I have had in the last two weeks, that I want to note about why this is so compelling to have new energy.

The first conversation I had last week was with a woman who was a leader in the first city in the United States that is being relocated as a result of global warming. That is the village of Shishmaref in Alaska; it is on the Arctic coast of Alaska. This woman told me that last week the city voted to move their city, I think it is about 13 miles off of a coastal barrier island, that is disappearing because sea levels are rising, the tundra is melting, and the ice that serves as a barrier protecting their village is melting, and their island is disappearing, right literally underneath them.

They are having to move their whole city at a cost of \$150 million, onto an inland area, that is Shishmaref, Alaska. When we have to start moving cities in this country to start dealing with global warming, it is time to have a new energy policy.

Second, I had a conversation with the president of the Marshall Islands. It is an independent nation in the South Pacific of 60,000 people. The president of the Marshall Islands told me that they

are in an emergency situation because of the rising seas and the increasing frequency of big storms which are literally overtopping their islands, which are just a few feet. They are built on coral reefs. Their coral reefs are dying because the oceans are becoming warmer and more acidic due to global warming. We have a whole country that may go under water as a result of global warming.

The third conversation I had last week was with a woman who was a climatologist, I may have butchered that word, meteorologist. She is an expert on the Arctic, basically. The University of Washington just published a study that said with a fairly high degree of probability the Arctic ice pack will have disappeared in months of September, disappeared with just marginal little bits of it hanging on to the coastline by the year 2050, with all of the changes that portends, including the disappearance of the polar bear, that even the current administration under George Bush agrees should be listed as a threatened species because the Arctic ice is going to disappear.

I just note these because since Mr. HOLT and I last discussed this in the last Congress 2 months ago, these three changes have taken place. This is a dramatically rapidly changing climate we have that demands an answer to energy policy.

So I just want to set the urgency for taking steps, the first step.

Mr. HOLT. The gentleman makes a very good point, but this is not just a matter of the frost line moving a little bit north or spring coming a little bit earlier so you can get your tomatoes out sooner. No, it is much more serious than that. The pattern of storms, the pattern of droughts, even the pattern of freezes will change. Ocean currents are already showing signs of changing. That is what I mean when I say this is very costly and even deadly.

It is not just inconvenient. It does not just mean that, well, they are going to start growing sugar cane in Minnesota as the climate warms up. No, it means that lives will be lost and huge expenses will be incurred.

So that is the point. Let me just finish the two further steps we need to take in public understanding and, I would say, in legislative understanding. Once we recognize that human-induced climate changes, that it is real, that it is serious, that it is costly, and that something can be done, we have to figure out what those things are, and the new Apollo Energy Act of the last Congress that we will get in shape for this Congress will give you some of those ideas, I think. But then we have to convince ourselves that it is worth doing these things, that the benefits will be greater than the cost.

Well, I can assure you the cost will be great. But even more, we can make this a winner by stopping climate change, and we are in the best position in the world of all countries to do that

because we have set the pattern for energy use for a century, and we can set the pattern for the coming century.

We are behind other countries, are doing more, we are buying windmills from Europe, not the United States, just to take one example, but we can go on and on. We could take the lead, and I can assure you, I can assure the gentleman from Washington, and anyone else, that it will be better to sell these technologies to the world than to buy them, and there is going to be a huge market for alternative sustainable technologies.

Mr. INSLEE. That point of being able to sell American technology to the world, I want to mention two companies, their CEOs I have talked to in the last month. One I talked to this morning is called Greenpoint Energy. It is a company in Boston that has developed a way to take coal and to process it into natural gas, then burn the natural gas in a way that eliminates the mercury emissions that typically come out of a coal stack, eliminates the sulfur dioxide that comes out of a smokestack and most importantly reduces carbon dioxide, the global warming gas by 60 to 65 percent.

Now, when I asked this young entrepreneur, who formerly did very well in the software industry, and is now into energy, what he saw as the future of this, he said it is unlimited. The reason it is unlimited is that we can take this technology that we build here, we can build these plants and sell them to China.

China is building one dirty coal plant a week, a 500-megawatt coal plant a week in China, which is creating massive CO₂ contributing to global warming gas. Here is a company right now, they have got 25 employees right now, and 20 subcontractors, they can have thousands at some point when we start selling this technology to the Chinese.

Another company called Nanosolar in Silicon Valley, California, they developed a way to make a solar cell using a thin cell material that can increase the efficiency, or at least decrease the cost at least by 40 to 50 percent of solar energy, using a thin cell that is about 5 percent of the current thickness of a silicone-based solar cell. They want to sell this technology when we develop it. We have the first 450-megawatt capacity plant they are building right now, as we speak tonight. They want to start selling these around the world.

So here is a tremendous opportunity for America to reverse our balance-of-payments problem and start selling things to the world rather than buying them.

Mr. HOLT. The Chinese will be buying technology. There is no question. They would prefer not to pollute their skies. They are trying to clean up for the Olympics; but they are growing fast, they need the power, they would welcome cleaner power. As evidence of that, I would say that their auto fleet is already more efficient than ours.

Because the technology is available, that is what they are buying. It would

apply across the board in energy technologies, China, Southeast Asia, India, yes, and Europe.

The gentleman from Washington spoke about American ingenuity. You know we in Jersey call it Yankee ingenuity, but no aspersions on those from Southern States or Western States. That is what it was known as, or good old American know-how. We can do it.

The new Apollo Energy legislation that I joined the gentleman in the last Congress, talked about incentives, demonstration projects and investments and research and development. They are, indeed, investments that would pay off big.

Mr. INSLEE. You mentioned transportation. I just want to note what I consider to be a very exciting development in the last 7 days in this country in transportation. I want to yield to a real leader in there, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

But when it comes to cars, we have not improved the efficiency of our cars in 25 years. We get less mileage today in our cars than we did 25 years ago. But in the last 30 days something very dramatic happened in the auto industry.

General Motors announced that they were going to start developing a plug-in vehicle in the next 5 years where you can go home at night, plug in your car, charge your batteries off your electrical grid from one to two cents, effectively, a mile, you are now spending ten to fifteen. For one to two cents a mile off the grid, you can run your car for, we hope, for the first 20 miles. Then after you run out of juice, if you drive more than 20 miles, and 60 percent of our trips a day are less than 20 miles, but if you go more than 20 miles then you start burning either the gas or the ethanol that you got from corn and soybeans and rye grass. You have a flex-fuel vehicle, you plug it in at night, you are off to the races. That is the first thing.

The second thing is the Department of Energy last week issued a study which concluded that there is enough energy-generating capacity in the United States, excuse me, it was a Pacific Northwest laboratory out in Washington State, actually, an arm of the Department of Energy. They concluded there was enough electrical generating capacity today to fuel 85 percent of our cars and trucks using a plug-in battery system and not build a single new generating plant.

In other words, we could fuel 85 percent of all of our cars once we get a plug-in battery system developed without building a single new dirty plant coal or even a clean coal, for that matter, because you have all of this excess capacity at night that is sitting there that we don't use. We have all these plants that just sit there unused at night. We can use them to charge our cars. These are two very exciting developments using home-grown technology if Congress acts to move these subsidies away from the oil and gas industry, as Speaker PELOSI pledged to do

today, and move them into support for these new businesses and consumers to get the new end higher energy.

I want to yield to Mr. EARL BLUMENAUER, who has been a real leader in trying to bring transportation, particularly public transit which is a very, very effective way of reducing our pollution and making our transportation more efficient.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate your courtesy, Mr. INSLEE, in permitting me to speak on this. I appreciate your continued leadership in spotlighting issues of global warming, energy efficiency, and the difference it will make for Americans across the country.

I too was impressed today with the clear, articulate vision set forth by our new Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, reemphasizing the commitment that the Democratic leadership and our caucus has to deal meaningfully with problems of global warming, energy independence and efficiency.

Having an opportunity this evening to focus on this is important because for the first time in a dozen years we won't just be talking about this. We have legislative leadership that is committed to action, to dealing with the redirection of vast subsidies that have been given to people who need them the least, and, instead, rationalizing investments in areas that you have championed with alternative energy, wind, solar, biomass and, particularly, conservation.

You are right, tracking the problems of transportation is central to dealing with greenhouse gases, global warming and our alarming dependence on oil imported from increasingly unstable areas of the world.

I appreciate the conversation that you and Mr. HOLT have had about the positive impact, the President and the Republican leadership in the last half dozen years have been baring their head, claiming that we can't deal with problems of global warming, climate change, energy conservation because of the economic disruption.

You have cited examples from our Pacific Northwest where there are entrepreneurs ready to go, rolling up their sleeves, with things that will make a difference, creating jobs in this country, that will, in fact, conserve resources and save money.

□ 2015

Our ability to invest in wise, diverse transportation choices for the American public has the opportunity to put money in the pockets of Americans while it fights greenhouse gas. We consume approximately 10 percent of the world's petroleum supply each year driving our SUVs to work and back. The commitment to make sure that the Arctic wildlife refuge is the last place we drill, not the next, that makes energy conservation more available to Americans, and unlocks the economic potential of a whole array of new technologies and products.

I look forward to continuing our conversation here over the next few minutes. I, personally, am committed to continuing, as I have in both of your districts in the past. I know you both have constituents that are concerned about transportation choices. This Congress might be able to do something to provide equity, for instance, for cyclists, people who burn calories instead of petroleum, but are treated differently in our Tax Code for their commuting costs, for instance. I look forward to working with you to make these a reality and make a difference to enhance the planet, protect our national security and put money in the pockets of the American taxpayer.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. HOLT.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to elaborate on a point that Mr. BLUMENAUER made about transportation. Not only do we use a lot of energy going to and from work, we waste a lot of energy that no one wants to use sitting in congestion. There are some parts of the country, we certainly see it in my State of New Jersey, where an enormous amount of energy is lost. And if we could avoid that congestion, it would make everyone happier, I can assure you, not just at a sense of savings, but it would remove the aggravation.

Well, it is a whole lot easier to move electrons than it is to move chunks of metal. Smart transportation systems that take account of where the traffic is and where it can go, and compute in real time where you should go, rather than you running a car-sized computer system where you are trying this and you are trying that and you have got a million cars in this computer system in real-time trying to figure out the best routes. You can do that with smart transportation system cheap, relatively, save energy, save money, save aggravation. That is just one example of what we should do.

Mr. INSLEE. I would like to point out a shining example of what Mr. HOLT is talking about, and that is in Portland, Oregon, in part, because of the leadership of Mr. BLUMENAUER, Portland, Oregon achieved two very significant milestones in the last year. First, it was the first city ever to essentially meet the Kyoto targets for reduction of carbon dioxide. This proves it can be done.

A smart transportation policy and a smart energy policy can be both good for your economy and meet these targets to reduce carbon dioxide. Portland, Oregon has achieved that, and one of the reasons is because of their second accomplishment, the first city in the last 30 years in America, has had less miles driven per individual in the last several decades. It is the first city that has ever accomplished that by developing a very sophisticated public transportation system and developing a living system that can reduce the need for some of our long commutes. And I want to point out Portland's success on this has been an enormous ben-

efit to its economy, because Portland, Oregon's economy has been booming. The value of property has been booming as a result of these smart energy choices it has made, and people want to live there. And it is because of some of the smart choices that have been made in order to use energy more efficiently.

Mr. HOLT. If I may just insert, some of those choices have been made by our now-colleague, Mr. BLUMENAUER. Much of the success of Portland traces back to some of the decisions that he had a part in some years ago.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If the gentleman would yield

Mr. INSLEE. Yes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate your positive words about our community. And I do take pride in essentially having reached 1990, emission levels for carbon dioxide and actually having reductions in per capita emissions for each of the last 4 years. And it has been done, not at the expense of economic development and choice, but rather, as a result of providing it. And this is a point, I guess, that I am eager for us to pursue. And I appreciate the leadership that you gentlemen have exercised, both in terms of looking and investigating what's going on in Oregon and providing leadership in your own States and in your own communities.

The average American family, today, pays more for transportation than anything else in their budget, except for housing. And for Americans who make less than \$40,000 a year, typically, they pay more for transportation than for housing. So our being able to have sensible development patterns where people can live closer to where they work, employing what Mr. HOLT was talking about in terms of smarter technology to let people know what they are getting into in terms of congestion, and giving people choices. This is not about saying you can't drive a car.

But when I go to other communities, and since I have been in Congress, I have been in more than 200 communities across the country working on issues of transportation, land use and affordable housing. What I find is that people are complaining not that we are trying to take away their choices, but because they have no choice. Too many communities, people can only drive to work in a single occupant vehicle. In many of these communities, 90 percent of the children cannot go to school safely on their own by bicycle or walking. And what we are talking about here is giving back choices to the American public about where they live, how they travel, choices that will not only reduce congestion, improve air pollution, it will put money in the pockets of American families.

Mr. INSLEE. If I can allude to a choice, another sort of choice, I think that is a very fundamental principle that we want to give people choices in their uses of energy. But I want to allude to a choice, if you do decide to drive a car, what kind of fuel you use.

And it is a Democratic Party principle now under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI that Americans are going to have more choices about what fuel you use because as part of our effort to move money away from this giveaway to the oil and gas industry that have enslaved Americans, you are a slave to the oil and gas industry if you have got a car right now, to move it over to give more fuel choices to Americans. We intend to develop a vision for this country that you have the same freedom that Brazilians have, because in Brazil today when you pull up to the pump you are not a slave to the oil and gas industry, you are the boss because when you pull up to a pump in Brazil you decide whether you want gasoline or whether you want domestically manufactured ethanol made from sugar cane in Brazil and soon to be made through cellulosic ethanol, through corn and wheat and corn stovers and switch grass and who knows what kind of products we are going to develop so that consumers can decide what product they are going to put into the tank. And when we do that, we are going to create thousands of jobs across the country, particularly in the agricultural

I got an e-mail just as I was walking over here tonight about a little article about a company in Wisconsin that are building sort of the foundations for wind turbines. They can't hire people fast enough. Right down the road, at the Chippewa Valley co-op they are brewing ethanol in Minnesota to give people a choice to put ethanol in their tank rather than gasoline, and they have created source of jobs in this little town in Minnesota that was sort of a declining town at the time. We want to give choices to people.

And we have another leader here tonight on those issues, Representative KAPTUR from the great State of Ohio, that has been a leader in an effort to make a transition from just an oil and gas economy to one based on biofuels. And I have to tell you that I am very excited about this because I have been talking to scientists who tell me that we now have the possibility of having two to four times more bio fuels per acre than we even have today, and with our corn usage today that is certainly being successful with a consequent reduction of carbon dioxide that Representative KAPTUR can tell us about. I would like to yield to Representative KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Representative INSLEE for taking this special order tonight on the very first night of the new Congress, the 110th Congress which is going to be so historic. And Speaker PELOSI's remarks today about energy independence for our country just rang so true. In a district like ours, which is a major new solar manufacturer, as well as wind turbine manufacturer and research region of the country. Coming from the auto belt, you don't think about that. But yet we are a biofuels leader. We

have four plants being built now, both soy diesel and corn-based ethanol within our radius of 25 miles of our major community of Toledo, and in fact, some of them right in Toledo.

And I wanted to just take a few minutes, if I might, and I thank Congressman BLUMENAUER and Congressman HOLT. These gentlemen who are with us tonight are really the new age energy thinkers for our country, and I am really so happy to join you on this first night that we are here together.

And I just wanted to put on the record some interesting information that I have been sharing in the committees that I serve on. This particular chart talks about total petroleum consumption in our country, and looks at the growing share of imported petroleum as a percentage of everything that we consume.

And of course, since the beginning of the Bush administration, America is consuming one billion more barrels of oil per year, largely imported. Imports now constitute nearly three-quarters of what we use in this economy. Americans need to understand that. And over a period of time, from the beginning of the 90s, the share of imports has just risen until where now it comprises a majority of what we consume. This is a diminishing resource. Actually it is a dirty resource.

And I wish to place on the record tonight an article that was in The Financial Times back in December that lists the major companies in the world that are privately held. And I won't read the whole list tonight, except to say, of the top 20 companies, three-quarters are all oil companies, and they are not based in the United States. So all this money that the United States is spending on an imported product could be invested here at home in the new technologies that these fine gentlemen and I are talking about tonight.

Just to give you an idea, Saudi Aramco is number one on the list. Its value, estimated market value, is three-quarters of \$1 trillion, \$781 billion. And of course, Saudi Arabia has been a very important back up supplier to our country. I wish it were not so, but we have become very addicted to that supplier.

Petroleos Mexicanos, that oil and gas company worth \$415 billion, our hard earned dollars flowing to that privately held company.

I won't go through all of them, but the next, Number 3 on the list, and the gentleman discussed Latin America, is Venezuelan Petroleum, valued at \$388 billion.

Go down to Kuwait Petroleum, Number 4, \$378 billion. Malaysian Petroleum, \$232 billion. The idea is you go

down and then you get into the companies financing this import, such as the Carlisle Group which has moved up now at \$71 billion to Number 22 on the list. So I would like to submit this to the RECORD. The top three-quarters of these companies, the top 20 largest privately held companies in the world are all oil and gas. I wanted to make sure this was placed on the RECORD tonight, and to say that as the author of the first title in any farm bill in American history, a biofuels title, Title IX, we have been incentivizing at a very small level, about \$23 million, not billion, \$23 million dollars a year, efforts to try to help agriculturalists across this country own the future. It has been such a fight. And I heard the gentleman saying earlier this evening, finally, I think Mr. BLUMENAUER said, after 12 years, we finally have a chance to uncork this really developing answer for our Nation. And we hope that with the new farm bill and with the leadership of Congressman Colin Peterson, who is the right man at the right time in the right committee in the right country, from the Red River Valley of Minnesota, in the farm bill that will be produced this year, that we will be able to piece together the solutions that we know exist.

FT NON-PUBLIC 150

	Company	Country	Sector	Estimated Market Value as of Dec 2005 (\$bn)	Type	Type (1)
1	Saudi Aramco	Saudi Arabia	Oil gas	781	S	State owned
2	Petroleos Mexicanos (Pemex)	Mexico	Oil gas	415	S	State owned
3	Petroleos de Venezuela SA	Venezuela	Oil gas	388	S	State owned
4	Kuwait Petroleum Corporation	Kuwait	Oil gas	378	S	State owned
5	Petroliaim Nasional Berhad (Petronas)	Malaysia	Oil gas	232	S	State owned
6	Sonatrach	Algeria	Oil gas	224	S	State owned
7	National Iranian Oil Company	Iran	Oil gas	220	S	State owned
8	Japan Post	Japan	Postal services	156	S	State owned
9	Pertamina	Indonesia	Oil gas	140	S	State owned
10	Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation	Nigeria	Oil gas	120	S	State owned
11	Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC)	UAE	Oil gas	103	S	State owned
12	INOC	Iraq	Oil gas	102	S	State owned
13	Libya National Oil Company	Libya	Oil gas	99	S	State owned
14	Sparkassen-Finanzgruppe	Germany	Banking	98	P	Association
15	State Grid Corporation of China	China	Electric utilities	87	S	State owned
16	Nippon Life Insurance Company	Japan	Insurance	87	P	Mutual
17	Kohlberg Kravis Roberts Co	United States	Private equity	83	P	Partnership
18	Qatar Petroleum	Qatar	Oil gas	78	S	State owned
19	State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company	United States	Insurance	76	P	Mutual
20	European Investment Bank	Luxembourg	Banking	73	S	State owned

Ms. KAPTUR. I will attest and sort of end with this. In our district today, Dr. Al Campaan, the head of Physics at the University of Toledo, has a solar-powered house from equipment made in Toledo. He takes his truck, with six batteries home, maybe eight, every night. He drives it from the university back home and he plugs it into his house. The technology exists in Toledo, Ohio. He drives it the next morning, a fully charged truck, back into the University of Toledo.

As we move to develop the technology of future, I would just recommend to those who are listening tonight, here in the Chamber and elsewhere, a wonderful book by a former decorated CIA agent, Robert Baer, for whom I have great admiration. He retired. He is in his 50s. We have probably had no better human intelligence offi-

cer throughout the Middle East and Central Asia. He wrote a book, Sleeping with the Devil.

□ 2030

When I read that book, I thought I have to meet this man, because he is speaking my language. The life he lived is very different than the life that we have lived, but he looked the problem straight in the eye. The subtitle of the book is: "How Washington Became Addicted to Saudi Crude."

And I think it is important to note that the American people know this. They want us to do something. They want us to help transform the country. And I thank all my dear colleagues for allowing me these few minutes on the floor this evening. I was not intending to come here, but you have hit sort of the bull's eye of what this Member of

Congress has been involved in for several years, and you could not be on a more important job creation, environmentally right set of initiatives for this country, and it will be a joy to be here working with you on this.

Mr. INSLEE. We appreciate the gentlewoman from the State of Ohio. We know the State of Ohio is going to do some great work on energy under the leadership of the new governor, Ted Strickland, who is committed to this agenda. And he would have been here tonight, but he is serving as governor, or will be in about a week.

I want to make two comments on the transition to a biofuels economy in the United States. First off, some people have said, well, we should not use fiber or plants for fuel. We have to use it only for food. I want to point out the fallacy of that argument. Right now we

are exporting an enormous percentage of the foodstuffs we grow. We send it around the world and they send us the cash. What do we do? We take the cash and send it to Saudi Arabia.

Let us cut out the middleman. Let us grow our own. This is time to grow our own. We are sending it all over the world and then sending the cash to Ridya and Saudi Arabia. Let us keep it right here. Let us grow our own fuel.

By the way, this is no pie in the sky. The Department of Agriculture has concluded we could have 30 percent of our fuel easily in the next 20 years, easily, using very conservative efforts. This is a very achievable goal.

The second point I want to make is that this may happen eventually without Congress's help, but it will be too late. Brazil took 30 years to make this transition to an energy independent condition using their biofuels. They use sugar cane there. They took 30 years. We do not have 30 years to wait. We have a problem with al-Qaeda tonight, we have trouble with global climate change tonight, and we have trouble with a loss of a manufacturing base in America tonight. We do not have 30 years. So we need to act and we need to do some things that the past Congresses and the current administration have not done.

Let me just mention three of them. Number one, they have not given loan guarantee assistance to get some of these plants going. The first cellulosic plant in the world, commercial cellulosic plant in the world is a company called Iogen. They are ready to build a plant. They have contracts with 300 farmers to grow a plant using the leavings of wheat to use cellulosic ethanol in Idaho, but they can not get the loan guarantee to get the job done.

We want to get that job done and get that plant up and running in Idaho. And this is going to be three or four more times effective per acre with increasing profits to farmers as a consequence.

Second, to give Americans this freedom to choose what fuel to use, they have to have cars that burn both gasoline and ethanol and, frankly, the industry has not been willing to do that. So we need to have some requirement to make sure that they make cars that burn gasoline or ethanol. They make a car for less than \$100 to burn either one, so it is basically nothing to the manufacturers. We need to require that to be done. Now, they say they are going to do more of them in years, but we do not have years.

Third, we need the pumps that pump either gasoline or ethanol made from midwestern corn or wheat or biodiesel. But the folks in Brazil will tell you that companies do not like putting those pumps in, because now you're competing with their gas and oil. They have a monopoly on gas and oil, and they are not crazy about putting in a pump that competes with them.

So we are going to need to require that Americans be given a choice in

pumps. Maybe we start by saying 10 percent of the stations have to have an alternative pump of ethanol, if you have 25 stations. We do not want the moms and pops that have to do this, if they cannot afford it. But if you have a big chain, why not have 10 percent of your stations at least have one ethanol pump so Americans can have that choice.

We took the first step in this journey tonight when Speaker PELOSI said we are going to start making a shift from giveaways to oil and gas towards these new clean energy futures, and I am looking forward to making progress.

And I yield to Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you. And I am intrigued with the conversation, the way that it is going at this point. We talked a moment ago about giving Americans more choices as to how they transport themselves. We can avoid the disastrous policies of this administration and the past congressional leadership of picking winners and losers and picking the wrong ones to win.

What you have described I have seen in my own State. There are people going gung ho in terms of biomass, in terms of wave energy, and technology that is emerging around the country in colleges and universities, in small businesses and large to take advantage of the opportunity.

If we just level the playing field, if we shift the massive subsidies away from the people who do not need it and do not deserve it, and help level the playing field for these emerging technologies dealing with biomass from any of a variety of fuel stocks, of dealing with electrical, solar, wind, wave, if we level the playing field, if we give them a fair and predictable tax treatment, which we do not do now, we can take these subsidies that are frankly not buying us anything.

It was interesting, the report that was suppressed by the administration for a year, that revealed we actually would have done more for energy supplies in this country, rather than lavishing tax breaks on the most profitable corporations in the world, the oil companies, selling the most profitable product, oil and gas, we would have been farther ahead just buying it up.

By our redirecting these investments, we can help this nascent technology grow around the country and we can have unleashed the potential of making a difference and allowing the free market to work after we level the playing field, after we enable them.

As you indicated, we are probably going to need to have some rules of the game to be able to jump-start these markets. But I really appreciate what you are talking about here.

I was in over a dozen States this last fall working on behalf of a number of our new colleagues, including in Ohio. I am intrigued that they to a person are concerned about global warming, to a person they understand before they become Members of this body what you are talking about here, and it makes

me think that we have a real opportunity to tap some creative energy in this body to finally, as I say, stop talking about it and actually do something.

Mr. INSLEE. I would like to note that when Mr. BLUMENAUER talks about leveling the playing field, I think that is very, very important. Because when you look at these entrepreneurs, small businessmen and women that maybe have 10, 15, or 20 employees who are working out of their garage or a little warehouse they have rented somewhere and they are developing some new way. For instance, there is a company called Fiber Forge in Colorado, and they are developing a new way to use composites to build the body of an automobile that can be four times stronger than steel and weigh 30 to 40 percent as much.

Now, the challenge in doing this, we are building a composite airplane, the first one ever, the Boeing 787, but the challenge is how do you do that quickly in mass manufacturing, because it takes a lot of hand labor right now. Well, here is a little company called Fiber Forge and they are developing a way to manufacture this using mass production methods that will decrease the cost so you can build cars someday, the body of a car, out of composites that are stronger and weighs about half as much. Do not hold me to that exact number, but significantly less. But they are not getting subsidies, tax breaks, or help, whereas the giant oil companies of the world are getting those huge tax write-offs given to them by Congress.

I want to mention two other subsidies the oil and gas companies have that these new competitor businesses do not have. Subsidy number one. Probably a third of our defense budget is dedicated to the protection of our oil lanes to protect the oil these companies get and then sell to us at \$3 or \$2.50 a gallon. That is a multibillion dollar subsidy to the oil and gas industry that solar, wind, biofuels, clean coal that we can dig up and hopefully someday burn cleanly, they do not get that subsidy at all. That is number one.

Subsidy number two. The solar people, the wind people, the clean coal people, the wave power people, the transit people, people who do not put carbon dioxide in the air, they are competing with a company that is using the atmosphere as a free dump. The oil and gas companies today, and those using dirty coal today, are using the atmosphere as a free dumping ground to put their carbon dioxide in and they are not paying a penny for it. These other business people do not have that subsidy.

We have to do something about that so that there is some cost associated with using the air we breathe as a private dumping facility. When you go to the garbage dump now it costs us 25 bucks to dump a bunch of stuff out of your pickup into the dump, but these industries can put it into our air for free.

Now, we fixed that with sulfur dioxide and we fixed that with nitrous oxide, we have a cap and trade system, but there is a giant loophole, a giant loophole that these companies use for carbon dioxide. It is the most serious pollutant in the world today, but there is a loophole in our laws that does not impose any cost associated with putting that pollutant into our atmosphere. That needs to get fixed as well.

Now, we are going to have a long discussion about the best way to do that, but we have to do it.

I would yield to Ms. KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to agree with what the gentleman is saying, and look back at the last century, which was the century of hydrocarbons. This century will be the century of carbohydrates and unlocking the power of the carbohydrate molecule in a way we have never understood it before.

Those who came before us were on this track but got derailed from it. In the early part of the 20th century, in our district, we had a car that was kind of famous called the Clyde car. It was built by the Clyde Bicycle Works, and it was built around 1898 or 1902, somewhere in there. You see this Clyde car and you look at the steering wheel and it has two levers on it. One lever is for alcohol-based fuel. You know, they knew how to build stills back then. And the other is for petroleum-based fuel. And I have been amazed to open the trunk of the car and see two different fuel tanks and think, my gosh, how did we move from that, which was what the gentleman was talking about, choice at the pumps and choice of vehicles, and where we are today. Because certain people made certain choices.

I just mention that particular example and say that as our industries and our small businesses try to bring up these new technologies, what the gentlemen are saying tonight, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. HOLT about financing and the tax aspects of this, if you look at certain farmers in Ohio who have tried let's say to raise the capital to build a plant, amazing things are happening that are not so good out there.

The big buck players come in and they offer people on the board money so they never bring up that production, because there is an effort by those who are currently big buck dealers, in alcohol-based fuels, let's say, to want to control the market just like the oil companies are controlling the market. We see that some farmers do not have the organizational structure that they need in order to own some of this so that our rural communities across America will be able to find new value added and lift themselves to a new economic future.

I think, and I am not sure that everyone on the Agriculture Committee agrees with me on this yet, but we need some type of loan guarantee program or long-term financing in a structure like the Federal Land Banks or our Rural Electrics, which we started years

ago, so that we have a system that is long term and permits them to stay in business so that some big buck operator does not come in, drive the price down in a given small market, and not permit them to be able to bring up and let this industry flower.

So the tax and financing aspects that we have been talking about are very, very important.

I also just wanted to say something about the science, as a member of the Agriculture Committee. It is amazing that in 2007, we do not know, in terms of row crop production, how to get the most yield out of a carbohydrate-based plant and a planting system that does the least damage to the atmosphere and yields the most combustible product.

□ 2045

For example, everyone is into ethanol from corn because we have subsidized corn up to here. But what about beans that have more oil? What about canola? What about castor? We stopped growing castor beans because of the by-product of ricin. But could we biogenetically take ricin out of castor beans and get more oil per acre?

We have got to do the science of planting, and we are just at the beginning of that age. We only have a glimmer of what that could be like. This is a major area for research where we could make a huge difference.

Mr. INSLEE. I just want to comment on that. I think basically a way to say this is that our current biofuels economy, which is very productive, and I believe is at least a small improvement on net CO₂, is really a first generation of biofuels. We have a second and third generation that are very close to coming.

One of them is this cellulosic ethanol that I have talked about. There is a company called Logen, there are several other companies doing this, to use a cellulosic method in an enhanced way of breaking open the cell to get at the carbohydrates. When we do this, this second generation of biofuels is really going to kick in and make this competitive.

I want to mention one thing before I yield to Mr. HOLT, and that is we have just Democrats participating in this discussion. But our fellow Republicans are also involved in this discussion. I, myself, and others are talking to some of our Republican colleagues, developing a bill to try to enhance this second generation of ethanol.

We do want to make this, and believe we can make this, a bipartisan effort now that we have new leadership that will free us from the chains of the oil and gas companies that have shackled the Congress to date. We are going to have some colleagues on the other side of the aisle work with us, too.

I yield to Mr. HOLT.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. For years, ethanol was dismissed as a net energy loser. It cost more energy to grow the crops and fer-

ment them and produce useful fuel; it took more fuel than it provided. It was a net energy user. So it was easy to dismiss that and not invest much money in distribution systems and so forth.

Then, because there were not distribution systems, there was not much motivation to develop more efficient catalytic processes, to work with the waste, as you would be doing with cellulosic ethanol, for example. It really was, if we may mix an agricultural metaphor here, a chicken and egg problem, and we need to step in.

This is the sort of thing that the government can do at low cost without picking winners and losers by actually providing more choice, by making it possible for people to distribute the fuel as the new technology makes it economical and efficient to produce that fuel. It is a matter of investment in research and investment in infrastructure. Some of this is done through incentives, some of it is done through demonstration projects, some of it is done through direct investment of research and development. We can break out of this self-defeating chicken and egg cycle, or chicken and egg restriction.

Mr. INSLEE. I want to note too, as we do that, we want to do in a way that is fiscally responsible. One of the things we have done is to pay for these things by repealing some of these tax breaks that have gone to the oil and gas companies, and then shifting them over to these investments, to do this in a fiscally responsible way.

We also want to do it in a way that helps businesses rather than hurts them. Some of the incentive programs that have been done in the past have been done in a way to ensure their failure.

For instance, some previous Congresses have been in the terrible habit when they do tax incentives that are intended to help businesses grow, they have done it for one year at a time or two years at a time; and venture capitalists, and I have talked to many of them, say we are not going to make multibillion dollar investments, realizing the rug can be pulled out from under us.

That has been done because Congress has tried to hide the deficit, so they have tried to make these things seem like they are short term.

We only have about two more minutes. I would just like to yield to anyone who has a closing comment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If I could briefly comment, I appreciate what you have each indicated in terms of the new generation of dealing with biofuels. I think this is an example of how we move forward.

You are absolutely right in terms of being able to zero in on the research, to squeeze out of this, to have tax incentives that are uniform, predictable and deal with the second and third generation of ethanol development and dealing with what might happen in terms of unlocking the power of biology here.

I have been struck by how there are many opportunities for us in the new farm bill to redirect, what is it, \$23 billion of subsidy at this point that flows increasingly to a very small number of farmers, often corporate farms or large ones in a small limited area in a small, limited number of crops. We have an opportunity to unlock that, help farmers with their energy production, allow more farmers into it and find out how we unlock the power of this ingenuity.

Mr. INSLEE. We just have a few seconds. I would like to just make a closing comment.

First, I would thank my colleagues and say that I really do believe this is a historic moment for the industrial base and agricultural base of America, which is today's date, to start to move to a new base away from just a dirty fossil fuel-based system to a clean energy system. We are starting to do this starting today. We are going to join Republicans, hopefully, in finding a bipartisan way to do it.

We can tell people that the genius of Americans is in these new wind sources, wind turbines, solar cells, transit, flex-fuel vehicles, plug-in vehicles, cellulosic ethanol, wave power, geothermal, fuel efficient appliances, energy efficient homes; this job is going to get done by a new Congress and it is a bright day for the country.

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOUCHER). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate once again the opportunity to come to the floor of the House, and I am pleased to do it on the first day of the 110th Congress. It is an exciting day, a historic day.

I want to thank the leadership for allowing me the opportunity to host an hour of the Official Truth Squad. We started this 2 years ago, and did so because there were many of us who were concerned about the fact that on the floor of the House oftentimes the words that were spoken and the presentations made oftentimes bore little resemblance to the truth. So we began 2 years ago to institute the Official Truth Squad, to try to come to the floor like this every so often and try to do it at least once a week to bring light to issues of concern to the American people.

Today is no different. This is a historic day, the first day of the 110th Congress. It was an exciting day. The first day is always exciting. It is full of families and celebration and children on the floor of the House sharing the remarkable experiences of Members being sworn in, oftentimes new Members, of which we have today, Mr. Speaker, as you know, over 50 new Members in the House of Representatives. So it is an important occasion.

We heard a lot of discussion leading up to today, and that discussion was

culminated in November by a vote by the American people, and the American people voted and changed the majorities in the House of Representatives. And in terms of the American people's decision, it was the right decision for them because it was the decision that they made at the polls. It was important for us, it is important for all of us to appreciate that, yes, they did, the American people spoke.

I think one of the things that they said is that they want a different process here. They were tired of some of the things that had gone on here in the past, so they spoke and said a different process is needed.

Many of my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, talked as we led up to the November elections about the need for civility in Congress, which we believe wholeheartedly, about the need for openness, which is imperative for us to have in our system of government, openness, and then fiscal responsibility, kind of three tenets that they brought to the American people. I would concur with each and every one of those.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those principles by the now-majority party ought to last longer than one day of speeches. So we have some concerns about what has occurred and some disappointments already, and we would like to share some of those with the American people as we are presenting things to the House of Representatives this evening.

Now, in pointing these out, the purpose is not to say how good it was when we were in the majority, because it can always be better. As many of us talked in the election process, the campaign process, we talked about the kinds of improvements that we would like to see. The purpose is to shed light on both word and deed, and it is important, because what folks say and what they do, it is important for the American people to know that those two things are the same.

In our system of government, we have elections where people go to the polls and vote. They vote based on a lot of things, but probably most importantly they base their vote on the fact that they believe that the person that they voted for and what they said they were going to do was in fact what they were going to do. So when individuals say things that they are going to do once they get into office and then they break those promises, then it is important for people to be held accountable. The American people do that time and again.

It is also important as a Member of now the minority party for us to hold the majority party accountable. One of the responsibilities we have in our dynamic form of government is to hold them accountable, and we do this as a matter of principle. It is a matter of principle, and we believe it is a matter of principle that elected officials ought to be held accountable for not just what they say, but also what they do.

To that end, I would like to share, Mr. Speaker, some quotes. We are going to talk a fair amount tonight about what individuals have said in the past, oftentimes the recent past, and what we have some concerns with in terms of their action.

This first quote is from the "Declaration on Honest Leadership and Open Government," which was one of the Democrat Party's publications that they had prior to the election. The quote there is from the now-Speaker. It says: "Our goal is to restore accountability, honesty and openness at all levels of government." It is a noble goal. It is a noble goal. We would agree with that. It is just important that when one says that that is your goal and that is your purpose that, in fact, you comply with that.

The Washington Post on December 17, 2006, said Speaker PELOSI is determined to try to return the House to what it was in an earlier era "where you debated ideas and listened to each other's arguments." Where you debated ideas and listened to each other's arguments. That is important as we go through the process of what is of concern to many of us here in the House of Representatives about how the process is already being implemented.

This is a quote from July of 2005 from Representative RAHM EMANUEL, now the chairman of the Democrat Caucus, and he voiced some frustration about the inability to have either an amendment or a vote on the floor. He said, "Let us have an up and down vote. Don't be scared. Don't hide behind some little rule. Come on out here. Put it on the table and let us have a vote. So don't hide behind the rule. If this is what you want to do, let us have an up and down vote."

It is important to remember that the purpose of that was to say that every Member of the House of Representatives ought to have the opportunity to in fact offer amendments and have their opportunity for people to say, yes, I agree with you and your amendment or your bill, or, no, I don't.

Here is a quote from Representative STENY HOYER, now the majority leader, in October of 2005. The one that I would like to highlight here is a quote where he said these provisions are an outrage, talking about the rules that were in place: "These provisions are an outrage and this process is an outrage. As one Member of this body complained, once again the vast majority of Americans are having their representatives in Congress gagged by the closed rule committee."

□ 2100

Now, we will talk a fair amount this evening about what a closed rule is and why Representative HOYER in October 2005 would have made that comment, saying that the representatives were being in effect disenfranchised in the House of Representatives.

This quote comes from our now Speaker, Speaker PELOSI, who, in a letter to then-Speaker DENNY HASTERT in October of 2006 said, and this is an important quote, because this is one of those promises that were made prior to the election and that I believe affected individuals all across this Nation and what they were going to do when they went to the polls in November.

This, again, is from now-Speaker PELOSI to then-Speaker HASTERT. And what this says is, "More than two years ago, I first sent you Democratic proposals to restore civility to the Congress. I reiterate my support for these proposals today. We must restore bipartisanship to the administration of the House, reestablish regular order for considering legislation," and we will talk about what that means, "and ensure the rights of the minority, whichever party is in the minority." Restore the rights of the minority, whichever party is in the minority. "The voice of every American has a right to be heard."

We would certainly concur with that. And, again, we will point out some of the concerns and disappointments that many of us have about the process that we have already seen in place today.

This quote here, Mr. Speaker, is from a Washington Post article of January 2, 2007, 2 days ago. And it says, "As they prepare to take control of Congress this week and face up to the campaign pledges to restore bipartisanship and openness, Democrats are planning to largely sideline Republicans from the first burst of lawmaking. Instead of allowing Republicans to fully participate in deliberations as promised after the Democrats victory in the November 7 midterm elections, Democrats now say they will use House rules to prevent the opposition from offering alternative measures."

And so we think it is important for people to be held accountable for what they say and what they do. We also think it is important, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of principle for people to do what they say they are going to do, especially elected officials.

So, Mr. Speaker, I place into the RECORD an article which appeared in The Washington Post on January 2 that included this quote, in addition to that an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post yesterday entitled, "A Fairer House, But Not Quite Yet."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 2, 2007]

DEMOCRATS TO START WITHOUT GOP INPUT:
QUICK PASSAGE OF FIRST BILLS SOUGHT

(By Lyndsey Layton and Juliet Eilperin)

As they prepare to take control of Congress this week and face up to campaign pledges to restore bipartisanship and openness, Democrats are planning to largely sideline Republicans from the first burst of lawmaking.

House Democrats intend to pass a raft of popular measures as part of their well-publicized plan for the first 100 hours. They include tightening ethics rules for lawmakers, raising the minimum wage, allowing more research on stem cells and cutting interest rates on student loans.

But instead of allowing Republicans to fully participate in deliberations, as promised after the Democratic victory in the Nov. 7 midterm elections, Democrats now say they will use House rules to prevent the opposition from offering alternative measures, assuring speedy passage of the bills and allowing their party to trumpet early victories.

Nancy Pelosi, the Californian who will become House speaker, and Steny H. Hoyer of Maryland, who will become majority leader, finalized the strategy over the holiday recess in a flurry of conference calls and meetings with other party leaders. A few Democrats, worried that the party would be criticized for reneging on an important pledge, argued unsuccessfully that they should grant the Republicans greater latitude when the Congress convenes on Thursday.

The episode illustrates the dilemma facing the new party in power. The Democrats must demonstrate that they can break legislative gridlock and govern after 12 years in the minority, while honoring their pledge to make the 110th Congress a civil era in which Democrats and Republicans work together to solve the nation's problems. Yet in attempting to pass laws key to their prospects for winning reelection and expanding their majority, the Democrats may have to resort to some of the same tough tactics Republicans used the past several years.

Democratic leaders say they are torn between giving Republicans a say in legislation and shutting them out to prevent them from derailing Democratic bills.

"There is a going to be a tension there," said Rep. Chris Van Hollen (Md.), the new chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. "My sense is there's going to be a testing period to gauge to what extent the Republicans want to join us in a constructive effort or whether they intend to be disruptive. It's going to be a work in progress."

House Republicans have begun to complain that Democrats are backing away from their promise to work cooperatively. They are working on their own strategy for the first 100 hours, and part of it is built on the idea that they might be able to break the Democrats' slender majority by wooing away some conservative Democrats.

Democrats intend to introduce their first bills within hours of taking the oath of office on Thursday. The first legislation will focus on the behavior of lawmakers, banning travel on corporate jets and gifts from lobbyists and requiring lawmakers to attach their names to special spending directives and to certify that such earmarks would not financially benefit the lawmaker or the lawmaker's spouse. That bill is aimed at bringing legislative transparency that Democrats said was lacking under Republican rule.

Democratic leaders said they are not going to allow Republican input into the ethics package and other early legislation, because several of the bills have already been debated and dissected, including the proposal to raise the minimum wage, which passed the House Appropriations Committee in the 109th Congress, said Brendan Daly, a spokesman for Pelosi.

"We've talked about these things for more than a year," he said. "The members and the public know what we're voting on. So in the first 100 hours, we're going to pass these bills."

But because the details of the Democratic proposals have not been released, some language could be new. Daly said Democrats are still committed to sharing power with the minority down the line. "The test is not the first 100 hours," he said. "The test is the first 6 months or the first year. We will do what we promised to do."

For clues about how the Democrats will operate, the spotlight is on the House, where the new 16-seat majority will hold absolute power over the way the chamber operates. Most of the early legislative action is expected to stem from the House.

"It's in the nature of the House of Representatives for the majority party to be dominant and control the agenda and limit as much as possible the influence of the minority," said Ross K. Baker, a political scientist at Rutgers University. "It's almost counter to the essence of the place for the majority and minority to share responsibility for legislation."

In the Senate, by contrast, the Democrats will have less control over business because of their razor-thin 51-to-49-seat margin and because individual senators wield substantial power. Senate Democrats will allow Republicans to make amendments to all their initiatives, starting with the first measure—ethics and lobbying reform, said Jim Manley, spokesman for the incoming majority leader, Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.).

Those same Democrats, who campaigned on a pledge of more openness in government, will kick off the new Congress with a closed meeting of all senators in the Capitol. Manley said the point of the meeting is to figure out ways both parties can work together.

In the House, Louise M. Slaughter (D-N.Y.), who will chair the Rules Committee, said she intends to bring openness to a committee that used to meet in the middle of the night. In the new Congress, the panel—which sets the terms of debate on the House floor—will convene at 10 a.m. before a roomful of reporters.

"It's going to be open," Slaughter said of the process. "Everybody will have an opportunity to participate."

At the same time, she added, the majority would grant Republicans every possible chance to alter legislation once it reaches the floor. "We intend to allow some of their amendments, not all of them," Slaughter said.

For several reasons, House Democrats are assiduously trying to avoid some of the heavy-handed tactics they resented under GOP rule. They say they want to prove to voters they are setting a new tone on Capitol Hill. But they are also convinced that Republicans lost the midterms in part because they were perceived as arrogant and divisive.

"We're going to make an impression one way or the other," said one Democratic leadership aide. "If it's not positive, we'll be out in 2 years."

House Republicans say their strategy will be to offer alternative bills that would be attractive to the conservative "Blue Dog" Democrats, with an eye toward fracturing the Democratic coalition. They hope to force some tough votes for Democrats from conservative districts who will soon begin campaigning for 2008 reelection and will have to defend their records.

"We'll capitalize on every opportunity we have," said one GOP leadership aide, adding that Republicans were preparing alternatives to the Democrats' plans to raise the minimum wage, reduce the interest on student loans, and reduce the profits of big oil and energy companies.

Several Blue Dog Democrats said they do not think Republicans can pick up much support from their group.

"If they've got ideas that will make our legislation better, we ought to consider that," said Rep. Allen Boyd Jr. (D-Fla.), leader of the Blue Dogs. "But if their idea is to try to split a group off to gain power, that's what they've been doing for the past 6 years, and it's all wrong."

To keep her sometimes-fractious coalition together, Pelosi has been distributing the

spoils of victory across the ideological spectrum, trying to make sure that no group within the Democratic Party feels alienated.

Blue Dogs picked up some plum committee assignments, with Jim Matheson (Utah) landing a spot on Energy and Commerce and A.B. "Ben" Chandler (Ky.) getting an Appropriations seat. At the same time, members of Black and Hispanic caucuses obtained spots on these panels, as *Ciro Rodriguez* (Tex.) was given a seat on Appropriations and *Artur Davis* (Ala.) took the place of Democrat *William J. Jefferson* (La.) on Ways and Means.

Democrats acknowledged that if they appear too extreme in blocking the opposing party, their party is sure to come under fire from the Republicans, who are already charging they are being left out of the legislative process.

"If you're talking about 100 hours, you're talking about no obstruction whatsoever, no amendments offered other than those approved by the majority," said *Rutgers's Baker*. "I would like to think after 100 hours are over, the Democrats will adhere to their promise to make the system a little more equitable. But experience tells me it's really going to be casting against type."

"The temptations to rule the roost with an iron hand are very, very strong," he added. "It would take a majority party of uncommon sensitivity and a firm sense of its own agenda to open up the process in any significant degree to minority. But hope springs eternal."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 3, 2007]

A FAIRER HOUSE: BUT NOT QUITE YET

The new Democratic House majority has an ambitious plan for its first 100 hours in power, from increasing the minimum wage to strengthening ethics rules to having the federal government negotiate prescription drug prices. Unfortunately, its plans don't include getting those provisions passed in the democratic fashion that the Democrats promised to adhere to once in the majority. When Republicans took over in 1995, they at least went through the motions of putting their "Contract With America" proposals through the normal committee process. Democrats under Speaker *Nancy Pelosi* (D-Calif.) have decided not to bother with that, nor to let Republicans offer amendments on the floor, nor even to put a GOP alternative up for a vote. This is exactly the kind of high-handed mistreatment that Democrats complained about, justifiably, when they were in the minority.

Democrats offer various rationales for their about-face. They say the streamlined process is necessary because they've pledged to accomplish so much in their first 100 legislative hours. But what makes living up to that self-imposed deadline—which will stretch on for weeks, in any event—more important than living up to their promise of procedural fairness? And why, even if that deadline is sacrosanct, couldn't Republicans at least be offered an opportunity to offer alternatives on the floor?

Democrats also argue that their proposals have been fully vetted and debated, but in fact many of them involve complex policy choices and some are new proposals. Democrats howled when Republicans moved unilaterally to change the rules governing the operations of the House ethics committee; why is it different for them to move unilaterally to change ethics rules? Questions such as whether the minimum wage increase should be combined with tax breaks for small businesses and whether the federal government should be the only party negotiating Medicare prescription prices ought to be put up for discussion and a vote. If that causes a fracture in the Democratic caucus, so be it.

Republicans, who were only too happy to strong-arm and ignore Democrats when the GOP was in the majority, are now, of course, moaning about being abused. In a nice bit of political theater, they plan to offer Ms. *Pelosi's* own "Minority Bill of Rights" from 2004, which would provide for, among other things, "open, full and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process."

Democrats say that they'll adhere to their previous promises once their first flurry of business is finished. We look forward to that. But if they don't reconsider, they will set an unfortunate precedent that fairness will be offered on sufferance, when the majority finds it convenient, and not as a matter of principle. That would not be a good start for the 110th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased tonight to be joined in our discussion about truthfulness and our discussion about keeping promises and our discussion about the rules process by a couple of my colleagues, and others may join. And I would like to ask first for a comment or two from Congressman *McHenry* from North Carolina.

Congressman *McHenry* is an individual that came to Congress with me after the 2004 election, and has shown just great perspective and great work ethic in making certain that he understands and appreciates all of the nuances of the House and, as a matter of fact, has championed ethics reform in this House. And so I thank you so much for joining us tonight for the Official Truth Squad and look forward to your comments on the ethics that we have seen so far and also on the minority bill of rights that we have co-authored together.

Mr. *McHenry*. Thank you, Congressman *Price*. I appreciate your leadership, friendship, and support in our first term in Congress and as we begin our second. And I appreciate you pulling together the Official Truth Squad and taking this from an idea and actually making it into reality. After all, that is what this legislative process and indeed this House of Representatives is all about, is taking an idea, a powerful idea and making it happen for the American people.

To that end, the Official Truth Squad is here to make sure that the American people know what happens here in these hallowed halls of Congress. And I think it is important, what you point out today from the Democrat leaders' words and actions on their opening day and the lead-up to taking control of this new Congress. It is indeed a new day here, and the American people know that. And I think what the American people see is that the Democrats worked very hard in the campaign and were rewarded by taking control of this wonderful Congress of us, the people's House, and they campaigned on a number of things. But one of the key tenants and key principles upon which they ran their campaigns and the rhetoric they used during the campaign was about openness, honesty, and fairness.

This openness idea, it is a wonderful thing to talk about and I think it is something that I stand for and I know

my colleague from Georgia does as well, and we have worked very hard during our times in public service to provide this for the American people. But it was their number one tenant in the campaign, their number one principle, openness.

Well, on the opening day of Congress, we were hoping as the new minority that this new Democrat majority would ensure openness and fairness. And that is why Congressman *Price* and I, along with some of my other colleagues, joined together to offer the minority bill of rights. And what the minority bill of rights is, in essence, is what all fifth graders in America are taught: It is the legislative process that, when you file a bill in this House, it goes to committee or subcommittee, and it is heard, it is debated, it is amended, it is crafted, and there is compromise in the process. All sides, Democrats, Republicans, conservatives, moderates, liberals, they are all heard. And then it comes to this House floor, where it again goes through that very same process of compromise and input. Well, that is what the minority bill of rights is all about. And what we offered as the minority bill of rights and what we offered here on the House floor today with our two procedural votes today, was ensuring that these principles, which then minority leader *Nancy Pelosi*, now Speaker *Pelosi*, advocated just 3 years ago.

So what we offered was, in fact, the *Pelosi* minority bill of rights. It is not simply a Republican idea, it is actually the minority leader, now the Speaker, her ideas on the way this place should be governed. And when we offered it here on the floor, it was flatly rejected. So it became clear here on the opening day, the opening hours of this new Democrat majority, the campaign on openness, that they really advocated closed process and they only want their ideas, their few ideas heard. They don't want any input or any dissenting opinion.

The bottom line is that Speaker *Pelosi* thinks that Minority Leader *Pelosi* was wrong. I think some people call that hypocrisy, some call it ironic to campaign on that. I think it is ridiculous on the opening day of Congress, after a new majority is elected on openness, that they cram down the throats of all the Members of this House a closed rule that does not allow for input, does not allow for amendment, doesn't allow for full, open, and fair debate, on their opening day of their first act as a majority. That is what is so egregious about what we saw here on the House floor.

In fact, this type of abuse has never happened before in the history of the U.S. House of Representatives, the idea that you put a rule out, a rule forward that closes off debate on an unknown bill. We can't even see the text of the bills that they are offering in their 100-hour proposal. They have closed it off from minority view. Simply because I have an "R" beside my name, they believe that I am not able to view it.

Well, I have got news for them. I have got news for this new Democrat majority. 140 million Americans voted for a Republican for U.S. Congress. They are not simply silencing a Member of Congress from North Carolina or a Member of Congress from Georgia; they are silencing the constituents who elected me. That is not fair. That is not openness. That is not a new way of operating. In fact, it is a very old way of operating that the Democrats used when they were in the majority before.

So I think that we should set aside the first day and be hopeful for a second day and a new beginning. We like second chances as Americans. Let's give the Democrats a second chance for true openness, input, and dialogue in a bipartisan basis; not simply use it as a rhetorical device during the campaign, but to actually govern that way, to actually do it, make sure it happens here on this House floor, not for us as Members of Congress, but for our constituents and for the American people.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate those comments so much, because they really bring into focus and clarity exactly what happened today.

As I mentioned before, the purpose of this is not to say to folks, well, it was better when we were in the majority. The purpose is to say the promises that were made to the American people and decisions that the American people made upon those promises are not being followed. They are not being followed. And when they are not being followed, what that means when it comes to rules, it means that the individuals who represent those 140 million people are not allowed a voice, which means in essence that those 140 million people have no voice in the House of Representatives as it relates to the rules that have been put in place.

I also think it is important to talk about the fact that it never happened before. There is kind of this general sense by some that this is just business as usual. Well, it is not business as usual. And one of my colleagues who knows better than most, who understands and appreciates that, is my good friend from Georgia, fellow colleague from Georgia, Congressman GINGREY, who is a former member of the Rules Committee, who I think has a wonderful perspective on the rule that will enact bills in place on this floor of the House without any review by committee, any review by anybody other than potentially, I guess the Speaker, and that may be it.

So, I am so pleased that you joined us this evening to talk about what is a closed rule within a closed rule and to talk about the bills and the consequences of that for the American people. I welcome my good friend, Congressman GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank my colleague from Georgia (Dr. PRICE) for yielding, and I thank my friend from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the two co-authors of the minority bill of rights. I am a proud co-sponsor of that, and I

am proud of their ethics in regard to that.

And also, Mr. Speaker, let it be known to our colleagues that this Official Truth Squad of the former freshman Members, now sophomore Members, this is not something they just dreamed up tonight. This is something that they have been doing for the entire 109th Congress and putting some sunshine out there on a lot of these issues and shining that light of day, and this is, of course, part of a continuing process.

Dr. PRICE and Mr. MCHENRY are exactly right; I was enjoying very much being on that select powerful, powerful Rules Committee, and had that opportunity to go home and tell the folks back home that I am a member of the powerful Rules Committee. And as a member, many times I had an opportunity to hear the minority, the current chairman, Ms. SLAUGHTER, the vice chairman, Mr. MCGOVERN, the senior members, Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. MATSUI, talk about the process and talk about this idea, the appalling idea of a closed rule as Congressman PRICE points out, and what they are doing in this rules of the House package that they are sort of forcing upon us in asking us to vote on with much less than 24-hour notice.

Just listen to some of the quotes of the former four minority members of the Rules Committee who are now running the show and driving this package that contains not one significant piece of legislation, but five pieces of legislation, including the minimum wage bill, the stem cell research bill, which indeed is truly life and death issues, the 9/11 Commission Report, completing the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. I mean, these are not naming of post offices, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues. We all know that and we know the significance. But listen to what my colleagues would say and did say many times in regard to one piece of legislation.

First of all, let me quote Ms. SLAUGHTER: "If we want to foster democracy in this body, we should take the time and thoughtfulness to debate all major legislation under an open rule, Mr. Speaker, not just appropriations bills which are already restricted. An open process should be the norm and not the exception." This is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 2005.

□ 2115

Listen to what my good friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, had to say on September 28, 2006: "If the Republican leadership does not agree with the bipartisan substitute, then they should defeat it on the House floor after a full and open debate. Instead, they cower behind procedural tricks, parliamentary sleight of hand and closed rules. No wonder the American people are disgusted with Congress. If my Republican friends want this trend of closed rules, of no amendments, of no democracy in the House to continue, then by all means

vote for this rule. Just go along to get along. But if you believe, as I do, that the monopoly on good ideas is not held by a few members of the leadership in a closed room, then vote 'no.' Have the guts to vote 'no.'"

That was Representative JIM MCGOVERN.

Listen to what our good friend, a senior member on the Rules Committee, Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS, had to say on September 28, 2006: "I have said it before: the way the majority runs the House is shameful. It is hypocritical, it is un-American, it is undemocratic, and it happens every single day that we have a closed rule, and in other circumstances as well." He goes on to say "closed rules are an affront to our democracy. We should stop it now. My outrage and the outrage of all on this side is as much about process as it is about policy. Pure partisan politics never produces sound public policy." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 12, 2005.

Finally, the gentlewoman from California, Ms. MATSUI: "The American people want to hear practical, well-thought ideas from their elected representatives. Today we could have had that honest, engaged and realistic debate. These proposals and ideas deserve to come to the floor. They deserve to be debated, and they deserve a vote. Unfortunately, under the rule reported out, this will not happen. Instead, we will have a gripping session that yields no results. Congress is part of this government. In fulfillment of its responsibilities, this House should reject this rule and bring real policy to the floor." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 15, 2006.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but I think you get my drift. They are doing exactly what they railed against us about. The righteous indignation that we heard on a continuing basis in the Rules Committee, and here they come with the rules of the House, and they include in it five pieces of legislation with no rule whatsoever. What do we get? A motion to recommit.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's quotes are quite illuminating about the rhetoric that the Democrat Members used versus their actions on opening day. Your expertise on the Rules Committee is quite prescient.

There are three additional quotes that come to mind from earlier today. In the new Speaker's speech today, her rather elaborate speech today about the agenda for this new Congress, she said three things that are of importance to what we are talking about here. She said first, respect for every voice. That is what their new majority is about. And it is also to work for all of America. And, finally, it is for common ground for the common good.

Those are wonderful things and wonderful ideals that this House should live up to. But as my colleague from Georgia said, it shouldn't be simply a speech. It shouldn't simply be rhetoric; it should be reality. It should be the practice of this House to seek common ground to work for all of America, even

those that didn't vote for the Democrat majority, all of America, and respect every voice, even if you have an "R" beside your name, respect for every idea that comes out of this place so that we can do what is best and right for America. It is not simply about process.

I think my colleague from Georgia said that very well. It is not about process. It is about the effects that that process have on public policy and the outcomes. If you rig the process, which I think there are countries around the world that rig their voting process, that is not true democracy. Fairness and openness, that is what brings about the best result for all of America. It is not about a Democrat idea or a Republican idea; it is about doing what is right on a bipartisan basis for the American people.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate those comments, and I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

I think it is appropriate now to ask my good friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), to make some comments about civility. Congresswoman FOXX is a dear friend and has had great concern about the level of discourse in this House of Representatives, has participated actively in the Official Truth Squad. I know you had some comments that you wanted to make about the level of civility and the importance of that in this House.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank you, Congressman PRICE, for bringing the Truth Squad back. It is unfortunate that we had to do it on the first day of session, but it was necessary to do that. As some folks know who may have seen us in the 109th Congress, and you know to me it seems like it was only yesterday we were here. It does not seem like a while ago.

We began the Official Truth Squad because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were constantly saying things that we knew were not true, and we felt that somebody needed to respond to them. It fell to a group of primarily freshmen Members to form the Truth Squad, although we had great help from some of our colleagues, some of whom are here tonight, to talk about the truth.

Unfortunately, a lot of what our colleagues said in the 109th Congress, some of those things that were not true were believed by the American people, and they believed a lot of the things that they said that were not true about the economy, about things that were happening in the government; but they believed them on their promises of what they said they would do.

They offered to make changes, and we know that there were some Republicans who didn't do all that they should have done, not just in the last Congress but in others. And so the American people have held our feet to the fire on this. I think we came back here, though, with a very positive spirit and we all came in today knowing it

was going to be a very historic day, but we were going to celebrate the very positive day that we have here.

All of us are very grateful for the wonderful opportunity to serve in the Congress of the United States, and we came here with the idea that we were going to solve problems that all Americans face. We see that happening in our communities every day. We see Democrats and Republicans working together side by side in many different ways.

I marvel every time I go to a parade or to some fair or some event that is put on by a community and how the people have worked together to do that, very often without any support from any government body because they put aside political differences for the good of the community. That is obviously what we Republicans want to be happening in the 110th Congress.

We believe that the American people are united in their desire for peace and national security. They want solutions to problems, not partisan bickering that only creates deadlocks and no solutions.

Again, the people in our communities do that every day, and so we looked forward to the goal and the promise of the new majority to restore the House to civility, to restore open debate so that ideas can be examined, always reviewed and respected. And as Leader BOEHNER said today in his speech, "May the best idea win."

We are here to debate ideas. We want to put the best ideas out there and know that if we put our good ideas out there and get them up for a vote, many times they are going to win; and many times we are going to vote for the ideas that the Democrats bring up. But we should be united in a common goal, although they are different perspectives. All Members agree they should be able to voice their opinions on behalf of their constituents and the constituents that sent them here to represent them.

We are going to hold the Democrats accountable to their promises, just as the Truth Squad during the 109th Congress came in and brought in the facts. And we are not going to compromise our ideals or principles, but we are going to do everything we can to make America better.

We want open debate on legislation. We want Members to be able to voice their concerns, their opinions, offer amendments in subcommittees, full committee and in consideration of any legislation on the floor. There should be plenty of time to review legislation and every Member should be allowed the opportunity to participate. After all, this is the people's House. It doesn't belong to the Members of Congress; it does belong to the American people. We are here not for a lifetime but temporarily to serve the people who sent us here.

As we are reminded again today, this House has been here for a long time and will be here for a long time to come. We want to make sure that it is

strengthened and not weakened in what we do.

I don't believe there was a direct mandate in this last election. Folks lost races and won races for lots of different reasons; but I do believe the American people want change in the way we operate.

As I said the other day in our conference, as I have heard the rhetoric and seen the actions of our Democratic colleagues, the North Carolina State motto just kept going over and over in my head. The North Carolina State motto is "esse quam videri" which means: to be rather than to seem.

What we want to make sure is that our Democratic colleagues don't try to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people by seeming rather than being. And what we have seen on the first day is the seeming rather than the being.

So we want to do what I think the American people want us to do, to find solutions to the problems we face. We don't think that is going to be done behind closed doors and legislation ramrodded through here because of the majority. We don't want Members stripped of the ability to address the House with their ideas, principles and amendments. Those things don't affect us individually as much as they affect our constituents.

So I am going to remind our colleagues over and over and over again of the North Carolina State motto and say to them we hold you to the principles of doing what you said you were going to do and being rather than seeming.

Again, I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for organizing the Truth Squad in the 110th Congress, and I look forward to working with you, although I hope we are not going to have to be here too many nights a week.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina and the wonderful words and focus that you bring to the need for civility and appropriateness in terms of word and deed on the floor of the House and in actions throughout our careers as elected officials.

I am so pleased to be joined by another good friend and colleague from Tennessee, Congresswoman MARSHA BLACKBURN, who has participated actively in the Official Truth Squad. I guess I share the gentlewoman from North Carolina's lament in having to be here on the first day because there is some straightening out in terms of bringing truth to the issue that has occurred even on this first day. We welcome you and look forward to your comments as they relate to the issues that have already occurred in this 110th Congress.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his work on this issue and for his work on the Truth Squad.

Today is a historic day, as my colleagues have mentioned. I commend my colleagues from both sides of the

aisle on their collegiality and their tone as we have approached this day, and have recognized the historic importance and the significance of the first female taking the position of Speaker of this wonderful body which is the people's House.

You know, as the gentleman was saying, it is so important that we note, we are not here to complain. We are not here to gripe. What we are here to do is to highlight for our constituents some of the content of a rules package that seems to be hastily pulled together that did not go through the committee process, that didn't have hearings, and was brought to the floor for a vote.

I think it is important that our constituents know, because we have a lot of new Members of this body, and those voters that voted in the elections this fall did not go to the ballot box voting to have a government that was going to be carried out in the shadows. They went to the ballot boxes saying we want government that is more accountable. We want government that is more open. We want government that is more responsive to the needs of our constituents. We want government that is going to work more effectively and more efficiently for the American people.

□ 2130

And the very first vote that is taken on the rules package presented in the people's House today is a vote that would eliminate recorded votes in the Rules Committee.

Now, in my great State of Tennessee, we have had this discussion, and in our general assembly in the great State of Tennessee, we have had this debate, and people said over and over again we want those votes recorded. We want sunshine. We want openness. And that is something that needs to be highlighted with our constituents. They need to realize the format that they are wanting to push forward would deny the minority the opportunity to hear, have their amendments heard in the Rules Committee. Dr. GINGREY has highlighted some of the provisions, and he does such a wonderful job with our Rules Committee and the concerns that we have with the format that would go before the Rules Committee that would deny recording some of these votes, which means there is less accountability. So it is our responsibility to come and highlight those things.

You know another thing that the people did not vote for this November was to raise their taxes. They did not go to the poll and vote saying, "Representatives, we want you to make it easier to raise the taxes on us." And one of the things that we find with the PAYGO rules is that it is basically pay as you go on a spending spree. Even the Concord Coalition has estimated that this 100 hours would cost \$800 billion over 10 years if everything was funded. That is \$80 billion a year for 10 years, \$80 billion a year additional, additional, new spending.

Now, I can tell you one thing for certain. I don't know a lot, but one thing I do know is that the people of the Seventh District of Tennessee do not want to be forking over another \$80 billion a year.

What they did vote for this November was to see government spending reduced, and that is where they want our emphasis to be. And it is important that we spell this out for our constituents, for the American people, for them to know what is transpiring as we come into the 110th Congress.

Words are important and it is important that we provide the clarification that is there and that is needed. And as I have viewed the package that we have debated some today and will debate tomorrow, I have come to realize that one of the things our colleagues across the aisle, the Democrats, have said is they want to go back to the way things were. I even said maybe Barbara Streisand's "The Way We Were" should be their theme song because that is how they want to go back to doing business where it is closed. This is what people voted against with the revolution in 1994. They voted then for more openness.

This past November, people thought they were going to see more action and more openness, and the first votes that are being taken are closing that process and are excluding people, excluding representatives of as many as 140 million Americans from participation in that process.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I wanted to highlight the new rule for the Rules Committee, which says that votes don't have to be recorded, and I appreciate so much your bringing that up because nobody at home, none of my constituents, believe that any Member of Congress ought to be able to come here and vote and not have their constituents be able to look and see what they have done.

And, in fact, part of this rules package that I think breaks a number of promises that were made by our friends in the majority as they ran up to the election, part of this package says that those votes don't have to be recorded. And I would be happy to yield to you, but for the life of me, I can't think of a reason that one would want to do that.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman would yield and also yield to Dr. GINGREY, who is on the Rules Committee, but having served in a State legislative body, that is one of the things that our constituents who were tuned into watching so closely would say, how in the world can you represent me and then not tell me how you voted and try to keep that a secret? I am having a difficult time finding words to say how egregious that is and how offensive it is to our constituents.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding and giving me an opportunity to talk about

that a little bit because at the beginning of my remarks, I talked about the powerful Rules Committee. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a powerful Rules Committee in that you decide how long you can talk on an issue. That is, you limit the time of debate. You have the power to make amendments in order to give a Member on either side of the aisle, majority or minority, an opportunity to come and talk about their amendment on the floor. They may get beat 434-1, but they have that opportunity.

As an all powerful member of the Rules Committee, as Representative PRICE was just saying, all of a sudden, in this rules package, they are saying that one of these all powerful members can make these votes, can set this time of debate, can deny the amendment opportunity for Members on either side of the aisle and then not take a public vote, not take a roll call vote, and not go home and face their constituents, these all powerful members of the Rules Committee, not answer to their constituents for why they denied maybe a Member of their own party a good idea to debate on the House floor, their body.

And I am going to tell you the rhetorical question Dr. PRICE asked, was why would this new majority do this? I can offer a suggestion. They now, of course, have nine members. The four that were in the minority are now the majority including the chairman of the Rules Committee and the vice chairman of the Rules Committee, but they also have an additional five seats, which they are filling with some of their newly elected freshmen Democrats who can go home in these marginal districts, these red Bush districts, if you will, and say that I am an all powerful member of the Rules Committee, re-elect me, but yet not have to answer for these difficult votes that they took probably in opposition to what their constituents would want them to do.

So I thank you for giving me the opportunity to explain the rhetorical question of why they might want to do that.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. And if the gentleman would yield, if my memory is correct, in 1995, when Speaker Gingrich and the House Republicans set the rules, that was at the time that they started recording those votes; is that not correct?

Mr. GINGREY. I think the gentleman from Tennessee is absolutely correct on that.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. And before that, the votes were not recorded and it was the process. That is why I say we are returning to the way we were, the way they were. And it is different from the way business was conducted from 1995 until now. And I think that is an important distinction for our constituents who have stopped us on the campaign trail and stopped us as we have prepared to come in and take our solemn oath of office today and have said we want to be certain that this Congress is going to function in an open,

accountable manner. We want to know what is happening in the people's House, and it is your charge to keep with us to keep us informed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman and I thank my good friend from Georgia for his answer to my rhetorical question, because the answer was the only thing that can be possible as a reason to do it is politics. That is it. That is the only thing that can be possible. There can be no good reason, from a process standpoint, for this House of Representatives not to record those votes. So I appreciate so much your enlightening me and helping me understand why that would have been done.

I do know that constituents at home are tired, are tired of decisions that are made up here in Washington based solely on politics. And, in fact, I would suggest to my friends on the other side of the aisle who now find themselves in the majority that decisions like that and being held accountable for those decisions make it so that lives in majorities can sometimes be very, very short.

So I appreciate your comments and appreciate your input and would be happy to yield if either of you had anything else to comment regarding the rules.

If not, I do want to comment a little bit about the process and about why discussion of the process is important. My good friends know and most Americans know we live in the longest surviving democracy ever in the history of man, ever in the history of man. And there is a reason for that. I think people can conjecture about why that is the case, but I think one of the reasons for that is that we as a Nation have respected the process by which we develop policy. And the reason it is important is because everybody that is an elected official, is a representative of the people, has an opportunity to have input into the process, and that process itself not only produces the best product because as you have more people involved who represent more diverse areas, I think you get a better product, but what it does do is it ensures that people trust the outcome.

They trust the outcome of not just elections, but they trust the outcome of the process of legislation. And when that process gets truncated or gets cut down or is closed, we use that term "closed rule" here, when the American people hear about a closed rule, what that means is that it does not allow your representative at home to be able to offer amendments, be able to have input into what the ultimate work product is, what the ultimate bill, what the ultimate law is.

So, Mr. Speaker, many individuals across this Nation who went to the polls and voted in November have elected people who because of changes in these rules today will not be able to have input into very, very important issues like 9/11 Commission recommendations and whether or not they

are adopted; like stem cell research and whether that goes forward paid for with Federal taxpayer money; minimum wage, an important issue, but it ought to be debated, ought to have opportunity for amendment; and then something that is near and dear to my heart as a physician in my former life along with Dr. GINGREY and my other colleagues is the issue of prescription drugs and the Medicare part D prescription drug program. An extremely complex issue. Extremely complex issue.

And today, what the majority party did was say that we will bring within the next week to the floor of this House a bill that has never been discussed in committee. It has never had a hearing. It has never had anybody in this body be able to offer an amendment officially and have folks vote on it and say "yes" or "no," they believe that that is the case, that has never been through that process that results in the best work product that is available for a bill and for ultimately a law. And from the rumors that we hear, and we only hear rumors because we don't have the legislative language, because we do not know what is going to be in that bill, but from the rumors that we hear, the result of that bill will be a decrease in the kinds of medications that are available to the American people.

That may go into effect, Mr. Speaker, if the majority party goes forward with the rule that they adopted today. That may go into effect without anybody in this House of Representatives ever having an opportunity to affect that outcome.

□ 2145

Some on the majority side would say, well, it has been talked about for a long time. It was voted on, the Medicare prescription drug program was voted on in 2003, got a lot of hearings then. There were a lot of people that talked about it and voiced their opinion on it at that time.

That is true, Mr. Speaker, but what hasn't happened is that every single freshman Member of this House was duly elected in their districts and has a right, a right, under our system of government to have input into a bill that comes out of the House of Representatives. Every single freshman will have no input into that bill or into the bill as it relates to minimum wage, as it relates to stem cell research or anything else that was included in the rules package today. Never.

That has never been done, as my colleagues said before, never been done in the history, in the history of this Nation, to have that kind of substantive legislation dealt with in a way that does not allow that kind of input.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of rule, that kind of process, which is difficult to get your arms around, but that kind of process, I would suggest to you, is an abuse of majority power. Our job, on the minority side, is to hold people accountable for their actions and for their decisions.

It is important that the American people understand and appreciate that these decisions that were made on the very first day, which, by and large, are procedural issues, that are difficult to get folks interested in, but they not only set the tone for this Congress, but they set the rules under which we make major decisions that will affect the American people as it relates to their income, as it relates to their security, and as it relates to their health. Nothing, nothing could be more important.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a historic day. But it is also a day of concern. It is a day of concern, because what goes on here is extremely important. Within these walls we can effect change that will benefit citizens all across our Nation. We can also effect change that will harm citizens all across our Nation. If we work together, we will do much more of the former and very little of the latter.

Let me close by just saying, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, the challenges that we face in this Nation are huge. They are immense. But they are not Republican challenges, and they are not Democrat challenges. They are American challenges.

If we work together as a body of elected representatives from all across this wonderful and glorious Nation, we will come up with the best product, the best legislation, the best laws that will result in the most amount of benefit to our citizens all across this Nation. So I challenge, I challenge my Democrat colleagues to fulfill the promises that they made on the election, during the election campaign, to fulfill the promises that they made, to fulfill the promises that they made when they talked to citizens in their districts all across this Nation about openness and about civility and about fiscal responsibility. That challenge, that challenge making certain that you fulfill those promises is what will ring true to the American people.

I appreciate once again, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to come to the floor tonight.

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. INSLEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and January 5.

Mr. DENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, January 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, January 5.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 159. An act to redesignate the White Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of Vermont as the "Robert T. Stafford White Rocks National Recreation Area"; To the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 5, 2007, at 9:30 a.m. as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Gerald R. Ford, 38th President of the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2. A letter from the Director, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emergency Mine Evacuation (RIN: 1219-AB46) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting reports in accordance with Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a six-month report prepared by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industry and Security on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001, and continued on August 14, 2002, August 7, 2003, and August 6, 2004 to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting a report on the status of consular training with respect to travel or identity documents, pursuant to Section 7201(d) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2155(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment in the Government of the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DDTC 063-06); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the October 12, 2006 — December 20, 2006 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq under Section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-338); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to Section 620(q) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, waiving restrictions on assistance to the Democratic Republic of Congo resulting from the country's default on certain U.S. loans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

10. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

11. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

12. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

13. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

14. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Va-

cancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

15. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

16. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

17. A letter from the Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General and management's report for the period ending September 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

18. A letter from the Chairman and General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General of the National Labor Relations Board for the period April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

19. A letter from the Secretary, Postal Rate Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

20. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting list of reports pursuant to clause 2, Rule II of the Rules of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Rule II, clause 2(b), of the Rules of the House; (H. Doc. No. 110-4); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2005 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3766(c) and 3789e; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

22. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Final Rules for Nondiscrimination and Wellness Programs in Health Coverage in the Group Market (RIN: 0938-AI08) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

23. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2007-5, pursuant to Section 574(d) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Program Appropriations Act of 2006, Pub. L. 109-102; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 109TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION AND FOLLOWING PUBLI- CATION OF THE FINAL EDITION OF THE CON- GRESSIONAL RECORD OF THE 109TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON.
CURT WELDON, MEMBER OF CON-
GRESS, AFTER SINE DIE AD-
JOURNMENT

DECEMBER 14, 2006.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that a grand jury subpoena for documents, issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and addressed to "Custodian of Records, Office of Congressman Wayne Curtis Weldon," has been delivered to my congressional office. Because the "Office of Congressman Wayne Curtis Weldon" is not a legal entity, I have treated the subpoena as directed to me and have designated a member of my staff as my Custodian of Records for purposes of gathering documents that are potentially responsive to the subpoena.

After I consult with counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII of the Rules of the House.

Respectfully,

CURT WELDON.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE
ON WAYS AND MEANS AFTER
SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 2, 2007.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 11142(c)(1)(B) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109-59), I appoint the following people to serve on the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission:

1. Zack Scrivner, Councilman, City of Bakersfield, Contact information: 1501 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, CA 93301, (661) 304-4065.

2. Dr. Adrian Moore, Vice President of Research, Reason Foundation, Contact information: 3415 S. Sepulveda Blvd., Suite 400, Los Angeles, CA 90034 (310) 391-2245.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF
MEMBER OF THE HON. CHRIS
CHOCOLA, MEMBER OF CON-
GRESS, AFTER SINE DIE AD-
JOURNMENT

DECEMBER 20, 2006.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the House

of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California.

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

Sincerely,

REBECCA KUHN.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESI-
DENT AFTER SINE DIE AD-
JOURNMENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on January 3, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 482. To provide for a land exchange involving Federal lands in the Lincoln National Forest in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

H.R. 486. To provide for a land exchange involving private land and Bureau of Land Management land in the vicinity of Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, for the purpose of removing private land from the required safety zone surrounding munitions storage bunkers at Holloman Air Force Base.

H.R. 1245. To provide for programs to increase the awareness and knowledge of women and health care providers with respect to gynecologic cancers.

H.R. 4588. To reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under the Water Resources Research Act of 1984.

H.R. 4709. To amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen protections for law enforcement officers and the public by providing criminal penalties for the fraudulent acquisition or unauthorized disclosure of phone records.

H.R. 4997. To extend for 2 years the authority to grant waivers of the foreign country residence requirement with respect to certain international medical graduates.

H.R. 5483. To increase the disability earning limitation under the Railroad Retirement Act and to index the amount of allowable earnings consistent with increases in the substantial gainful activity dollar amount under the Social Security Act.

H.R. 5946. To amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to authorize activities to promote improved monitoring and compliance for high seas fisheries, or fisheries governed by international fishery management agreements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5948. To reauthorize the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004.

H.R. 6060. To authorize certain activities by the Department of State, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6164. To amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the authorities of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6338. To amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent and repress the misuse of the Red Crescent distinctive emblem and the Third Protocol (Red Crystal) distinctive emblem.

H.R. 6345. To make a conforming amendment to the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to examinations of certain insured depository institutions, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLU-
TIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESI-
DENT AFTER SINE DIE AD-
JOURNMENT

The President, after sine die adjournment of the second session, 109th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLU-
TIONS SIGNED BY THE PRESI-
DENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE

December 21, 2006:

H.R. 1492. An act to provide for the preservation of the historic confinement sites where Japanese Americans were detained during World War II, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3248. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program to assist family caregivers in accessing affordable and high-quality respite care, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5076. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2007 and 2008, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6342. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to expand eligibility for the Survivors' and Dependents' Educational Assistance program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6429. An act to treat payments by charitable organizations with respect to certain firefighters as exempt payments.

December 22, 2006:

H.J. Res. 101. Joint Resolution appointing the day for the convening of the first session of the One Hundred Tenth Congress.

December 29, 2006:

H.R. 5782. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for enhanced safety and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, to provide for enhanced reliability in the transportation of the Nation's energy products by pipeline, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6344. An act to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE
PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE AD-
JOURNMENT

The President, after sine die adjournment of the second session, 109th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

December 21, 2006:

S. 2370. An act to promote the development of democratic institutions in areas under the administrative control of the Palestinian Authority, and for other purposes.

December 22, 2006:

S. 214. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States on the order with Mexico and other appropriate entities in conducting a hydrogeologic characterization, mapping, and modeling program for priority transboundary aquifers, and for other purposes.

S. 362. An act to establish a program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the United States Coast Guard to help identify, determine sources of, assess, reduce, and prevent marine debris and its adverse impacts on the marine environment and navigation safety, in coordination with non-Federal entities, and for other purposes.

S. 707. An act to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity.

S. 895. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a rural water supply program in the Reclamation States to provide a clean, safe, affordable, and reliable water supply to rural residents.

S. 1096. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate portions of the Musconetcong River in the State of New Jersey as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

S. 1378. An act to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to provide appropriation authorization and improve the operations of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

S. 1529. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the city of Yuma, Arizona.

S. 1608. An act to enhance Federal Trade Commission enforcement against illegal spam, spyware, and cross-border fraud and deception, and for other purposes.

S. 2125. An act to promote relief, security, and democracy in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

S. 2150. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Bureau of Land Management Land to the city of Eugene, Oregon.

S. 2205. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain parcels of land acquired for the Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal features of the initial stage of the Oahe Unit, James Division, South Dakota, to the Commission on Schools and Public Lands and the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks of the State of South Dakota for the purpose of mitigating lost wildlife habitat, on the condition that the current preferential leaseholders shall have an option to purchase the parcels from the Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 2653. An act to direct the Federal Communications Commission to make efforts to reduce telephone rates for Armed Forces personnel deployed overseas.

S. 2735. An act to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to reauthorize the national dam safety program, and for other purposes.

S. 3421. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal certain limitations on attorney representation of claimants for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to expand eligibility for the Survivors' and Dependents' Educational Assistance Program, to otherwise improve veterans' benefits, memorial affairs, and health-care programs, to enhance information security programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 3546. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to serious adverse event reporting for dietary supplements and nonprescription drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 3821. An act to authorize certain athletes to be admitted temporarily into the United States to compete or perform in an athletic league, competition, or performance.

S. 4042. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit disruptions of funerals of members or former members of the Air Force.

S. 4091. An act to provide authority for restoration of the Social Security Trust Funds from the effects of a clerical error, and for other purposes.

S. 4092. An act to clarify certain land use in Jefferson County, Colorado.

S. 4093. An Act to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to extend a suspension of limitation on the period for which certain borrowers are eligible for guaranteed assistance.