United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 2007 No. 41

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HILDA L. SOLIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

At the beginning of another day, we pray, Lord God, that divine providence guide this Nation and all nations, and every believer, each in his or her own way.

Help each of us, Lord, to accept the path to holiness upon which You draw us by Your word whispered in our hearts.

In Your Spirit, enable us to accomplish Your holy will by the detailed performance of everyday duties and routine tasks. Help us to do excellent work that will give You glory and satisfy our sense of purpose.

Strengthen us when it is difficult to accept what we cannot avoid and endure with love and resignation the things that could cause us to grow weary or become disgusted.

In truth, we do not see the whole picture or how we are already united in Your unconditional plan, so we must trust. We must place all our trust in You, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain five 1-minute speeches on each side.

DIFFERENCES IN STRATEGY BETWEEN ADMINISTRATION AND DEMOCRATS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. There has been a lot of news on Iraq and the differing strategy between Congress and the President. Let's be clear about where the differences lie.

The administration wants more time after 4 long years in Iraq; Democrats say it's time for a conclusion to the open-ended commitment. The administration wants 25,000 more troops for Iraq; Democrats are calling for the troops to be fully trained and equipped. The administration wants more money; Democrats are demanding Iraqis be held accountable for Iraq's future.

The administration policy has us policing a civil war; Democrats want to focus on al Qaeda in Afghanistan. The administration has failed our veterans on the health care they earned; Democrats are for making sure that the veterans get the health care they deserve.

As Yogi Berra once said, ''When you come to a fork in the road, take it.'' Madam Speaker, the President wants and is asking for more of the same; Democrats are calling for a new direction.

PRAISING THE SOUTH CAROLINA MILITARY MUSEUM

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on February 6, the South Carolina Military Museum officially opened adjacent to the Bluff Road Armory. Five hundred guests gathered at the grand opening, where Adjutant General Stan Spears dedicated the museum in honor of all men and women who have served in the National Guard.

In 1981, the South Carolina National Guard Museum and State Weapons Collection opened in Sumter, South Carolina. Seventeen years later, the museum was renamed and moved to Columbia. Professionally organized by director and curator Ewell G. Buddy Sturgis, the museum seeks to preserve historically significant properties, to provide educational services, and to enhance esprit de corps among men and women serving in the South Carolina military.

Two years ago, Ross E. Beard, Jr., from Camden, South Carolina, loaned the museum a vast weapons collection dating from the 1500s. Mr. Beard has been collecting rare artifacts since he was 10 years old and is revered among

Printed on recycled paper.

weapons collectors. He is a true inspiration to our troops who serve to protect our freedoms.

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

IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING THE STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for fully funding the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, also known as SCAAP, at its authorized level for fiscal year 2008 at $950 million.

This program, which reimburses State and local governments for the cost of incarcerating illegal immigrants, is vital to border States such as Arizona, where we disproportionately pay a higher amount than our fair share of incarceration.

Underfunding SCAAP places a significant cost burden on our local law enforcement, stretching their resources and hampering their ability to protect our communities.

All of the counties in my district, Pima, Cochise, Pinal and Santa Cruz, are reimbursed less than 10 percent of the amount of incarcerating illegal immigrants. This places an unfair cost burden on our local communities. Given the importance of homeland security and law enforcement, it is absolutely essential that we receive full funding for SCAAP. I believe that Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle would agree that reimbursement should be a Federal priority.

OPPOSE THE WAR FUNDING PROPOSAL

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is right and pass a clean supplemental.

The bill unveiled yesterday would tie our military leaders' hands at the very time they need our support the most. Some want to set a date certain. The reality is the only certain part of this plan is that President Bush has threatened to veto the bill, and critical funding for our troops would be needlessly delayed.

This plan is dangerous, and I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose this war funding proposal. Even Members of the majority party are reacting negatively to the proposal, as well they should.

Everyone agrees that we must make progress in Iraq. We also agree the Iraqi Government must step up and improve the situation. What the Republicans are going to stand against is tying the funds our soldiers need to do their jobs to benchmarks thought up by special interest groups.

Our men and women in uniform deserve the best, and a haphazard approach is not it. We can do better. We must do better.

BETTER TREATMENT FOR OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, in my district, which stretches along the coast line from West Palm Beach to Fort Lauderdale, we have a number of veterans who have served in wars for this country, ranging from World War II to Iraq and Afghanistan. These veterans have been served well in most cases by clinics in our district, such as the VA Hospital and other outpatient facilities in Fort Lauderdale. But like many places around the country, these facilities have their share of problems as well, largely due to a lack of adequate Federal funding. These facilities are not always able to see and treat the veterans as quickly as they would like to, and of course we all know what is going on at Walter Reed, mold seeping from the walls and ceilings, rats and roaches running freely. These conditions are fit for no one.

This is no way to treat our men and women in uniform who have sacrificed their families, their jobs, their lives, everything to serve our country. We must change the way we are treating our veterans when they return home, and that starts with providing critical funding for health care services and infrastructure needs. To ask them to sacrifice so much for us, only to find when they come home they are treated inadequately on so many fronts is nothing less than immoral.

BORDER PROTECTORS UNDER PHYSICAL ATTACK

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, more news from the second front: the border war with Mexico continues.

According to Reuters and NewsMax, illegals and drug cartels are increasing the tax on U.S. border protectors by the use of rocks, firearms, and even Molotov cocktails. Here is what Webb County, Texas Sheriff Rick Flores in Laredo says: ''The attacks against us are becoming more brazen. Drug cartels are telling their people to go down fighting and do whatever is necessary to get those drugs through.'' He says, ''Mexicans fire weapons from across the border at our law enforcement agents.'' In Arizona, illegals injure border agents by pelting them with large rocks and Molotov cocktails almost on a daily basis, according to one border agent.

And where are the two governments? Well, it seems Mexico could care less what happens to American border agents since it encourages illegal entry, and our own U.S. Government takes the side of drug smugglers and illegals if border protectors allegedly use force to stop this invasion. Meanwhile, some in Washington fiddle the silly song of tolerance, amnesty and ignorance.

And that's just the way it is.

DEMOCRATS PROVIDING NEEDED OVERSIGHT OF BUSH ADMINISTRATION FAILURES

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, accountability has returned to Washington after a 6-year absence.

This week alone, the new Democratic Congress has provided critical oversight of the administration's unacceptable neglect of our wounded soldiers. At a hearing earlier this week, some of my Republican colleagues said they have known about some of the treatment for several years, but they didn't realize it was this bad. And that is what oversight hearings are for. If you know there is a problem, you haul the Pentagon up to Capitol Hill to get answers.

The old Republican Congress simply ignored these problems. That is not happening in the Democratic Congress. This week, we held four different oversight hearings so that we can find solutions quickly to ensure that what happened at Walter Reed never happens again.

This Democratic House has also held its first hearing this week on the scandal at the U.S. Attorney's Office, where politics once again trumps competence in the Bush administration. Eight U.S. attorneys were fired so the Bush administration could pad the resumes of other attorneys.

The days of incompetence without any accountability are over here in Washington. Real oversight has returned.

SCOOTER LIBBY

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, no town likes a scandal, real or invented, more than Washington, DC, and the latest news involving Scooter Libby has the Beltway crowd abuzz.

Madam Speaker, if Scooter Libby broke the law, he should be held to account. But with all the attention being paid to this scandal, I can't help but think of the double standard that seems to be at play here. Scooter Libby is being prosecuted for the exact same offense that ensnared former President Bill Clinton, lying under oath, perjury and obstruction of justice. But the same people today who are calling for Libby's head were insisting back then

that Bill Clinton's offense was no big deal. And the hypocrisy doesn't end there. Where was the liberal outrage when Sandy Berger was caught destroying classified documents and received a slap on the wrist? What about sweetheart land deals or refrigerated cash?

Madam Speaker, the American ideal is equal justice under the law. Let's enforce the law, and let's do so equally, regardless of politics.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 720, WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 229 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 229

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 720) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report 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. All points of order against such further amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 0915

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 229 provides for the consideration of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the substitute reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, modified by the manager's amendment in the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended.

The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The amendments may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report 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. All points of order against the amendments, except for clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI, are waived. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

And I am pleased to point out, Madam Speaker, that under this structured rule, the six amendments made in order are split equally, three Republican and three Democratic.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 720 reauthorizes an important part of the landmark Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act protects our neighborhoods and water bodies from water pollution. Clean water is vital to the health of our citizens and to our country.

The bill before us today reauthorizes the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund by providing $14 billion over the next 5 years to local agencies to fight water pollution.

We have come a long way in this country. We have the technology and the engineering experience to prevent water pollution. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates a huge shortfall in funds available for wastewater improvements across the country. This shortfall is significant because, without considerable improvements to the wastewater treatment infrastructure, much of the progress made in cleaning up the Nation's rivers, creeks and streams and bays since the passage of the Clean Water Act is at risk.

Clean water is a top priority for the families in my district and throughout the Nation. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership over the past few Congresses has failed to support this part of the Clean Water Act. Although legislation was introduced in the Congress then, it never made it to the House floor.

President Bush and the White House also proposed slashing this Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund in his latest budget proposal. But, nevertheless, we are hopeful today that a bipartisan vote in support of this measure will send a signal to the White House that clean and healthy water is absolutely vital to our communities. In fact, in my hometown of Tampa, Florida, the Clean Water Act Loan Funds for wastewater improvements have vastly improved the water quality of Tampa Bay. The expansion in wastewater treatment significantly improved the quality of water running into beautiful Tampa Bay.

In past years, Tampa received over $54 million for wastewater treatment plant expansion and thereby improved water quality. It has also played a role in significantly improving the water in our rivers, bays, creeks and streams as we are able to control the pollutants that run off into these vital water bodies.

This is the same story across the country for the improved health of our communities, on the Chesapeake Bay, the Great Lakes and other water bodies throughout our country. Check with your local governments and your neighbors who live around and who are mindful of the quality of the water in our lakes, rivers and bays in your hometown.

Appearing before our Rules Committee, House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman JIM OBERSTAR said it best: "This is not just a good bill. It is a necessary one. The good health of our communities depends upon it."

And as a former county commissioner, I can tell you that the vast majority of costs in cleaning our water falls upon our local communities. And if we don't act now, we will be shifting a greater cost to future generations.

So I urge the Congress, Madam Speaker, to enact this rule and this important legislation to keep our communities, rivers, lakes and bays clean and, most importantly, to improve the health of our children, seniors, and all citizens.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this modified closed rule and to the underlying legislation. I also rise, regrettably, to report to the American people that, for the second week in a row, the Democrat leadership is bringing legislation to the House floor that benefits big labor bosses at someone else's expense.

Last week, American workers were the losers in the Democrat-controlled House when the majority leadership forced through legislation that would provide for unprecedented intimidation of employees by union bosses under a fundamentally anti-democratic process known as card check.

This week, the Democrat leadership has set its sights on one of their favorite targets, the American taxpayer. But the other losers in this bargain are far more shocking. They include local communities across the United States, small and minority-owned businesses, and the environment.

H.R. 720 would provide for an unprecedented expansion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund or SRF. When the SRF was established, it applied Davis-Bacon only to the Federal portion of a Clean Water project. But today, in order to help big labor bosses pad their dwindling ranks, they would apply these same provisions to all non-Federal funds, such as loan repayments, State bond revenues, interest and State-matching funds.

Since the SRF program expired in 1995, no SRF project has been subject to Davis-Bacon. But today the Democrat Party wants to change that and to stack the deck in favor of big labor bosses whose ranks have dwindled to 12 percent in 2006 from their high of 35 percent in the 1950s.

I insert into the RECORD a letter from my colleague from Florida, JOHN MICA, to Rules Committee Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and Ranking Member DREIER detailing the specifics of this unprecedented expansion.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2007.

Hon. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER,
Chairwoman, Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVID DREIER,
Ranking Republican Member, Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN SLAUGHTER AND RANKING MEMBER DREIER: I appreciated the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Rules today concerning H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007. I am writing to clarify the point I made during the hearing this afternoon that this bill includes an unprecedented expansion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund (SRF).

When the Clean Water SRF was established it applied Davis-Bacon to amounts equal to the federal capitalization grant, also commonly referred to as the ''first round''. As such, states were not required to apply Davis-Bacon to all other available funding sources states used for such projects. Non-federal money, such as loan repayments, state bond revenues, interest, and the state match, were therefore exempt from 1987 to 1995 when the SRF program expired. Since that time, no SRF project has been subject to Davis-Bacon.

H.R. 720 proposes to expand Davis-Bacon beyond federal capitalization grants to all non-federal money, and represents an unprecedented expansion of Davis-Bacon application to the SRF for water and sewer projects. Chairman Oberstar correctly stated that State Infrastructure Banks program, reauthorized under SAFETEA–LU, contains a similar expanded version of Davis Bacon as that in H.R. 720. As I stated earlier today, the expansion of Davis-Bacon is unprecedented for the SRF program.

Again, this unnecessary and wasteful provision requiring the application of prevailing wage rates to SRF projects will only slow the construction and limit the number of projects for much needed wastewater treatment plants in communities large and small across America.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Ranking Republican Member.

The practical effect of attempting to apply this Depression Era wage subsidy law and determining the prevailing wages for Federal construction projects is startling. The National School Boards Association found that more than 60 percent of its respondents confirmed that Davis-Bacon laws were responsible for increasing the cost of construction projects by over 20 percent.

This claim is backed up by Congress's own Congressional Budget Office, which issued a report in 2001 stating that repealing Davis-Bacon or raising the threshold for projects it covers ''would allow appropriators to reduce funds spent on Federal construction.''

The CBO has also estimated that if Congress were to repeal Davis-Bacon outright, it would save the Federal Government $9.5 billion over the period between 2002 and 2011.

This Davis-Bacon expansion also tramples all over the rights of 18 States that have chosen not to have a State prevailing wage law because its associated inflated construction costs mean that limited State and local budgets cannot meet the priorities of their taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I will repeat that. Because its associated inflation constructions cost mean that limited State and local budgets cannot meet the priorities of their taxpayers.

These States ought not to be saddled with this outdated Federal law against the will of their voters, which serves as an unfunded mandate by siphoning off scarce resources that would otherwise be spent on schools, hospitals, prisons, roads and other vital projects.

In the Rules Committee yesterday evening, we heard testimony from a number of our colleagues, particularly Dr. CHARLES BOUSTANY and RICHARD BAKER of Louisiana, who explained the practical impact of this legislation on their State, and might I add, a State that is in need of a lot of Federal money as a result of Katrina that occurred several years ago.

Quite simply, both Mr. BAKER and Mr. BOUSTANY made it very clear to the committee that today's legislation would have devastating effects on their State's ability to rebuild its clean water efforts and provide for much-needed environmental cleanup after the extremely costly devastation caused by Hurricanes Rita and Katrina.

Mr. Speaker, after last week, I am really not surprised by the lengths to which the Democrat leadership is willing to go to satisfy labor bosses. I am disappointed, however, by the targets that they are ready and willing to harm in accomplishing this narrow objective.

I ask every Member of this House to join with me in opposing this rule and the underlying legislation. The choice that we are being asked to make is very, very simple: If you support fiscal responsibility, small business, States' rights, rural communities, women- and minority-owned businesses, and the environment, you will join with me in opposing this rule.

If, however, instead, you support environmental harm, market distortion, wasteful Federal spending, and stacking the deck in favor of labor bosses, I wholeheartedly encourage you to vote for this legislation.

I do understand that the minority party may not be able to stop this rule from going forward, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to thank the Democrat leadership for putting this legislation and the crystal clear choice that it represents on the floor today so that voters are able to see what every single Member of this body supports.

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

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

I thank my colleague and I note that my colleague, unable to criticize the heart of this legislation, which is reauthorization of an important part of the Clean Water Act, instead reverts to attacking a portion of this legislation that is vital to workers across America, the Davis-Bacon provisions.

The Davis-Bacon Act prevents lower-cost out-of-State contractors from having an unfair ability to compete for local publicly funded construction, which protects local interests and construction workers.

Unfortunately, it has become all too familiar from the other side of the aisle to attack workers across America. They blocked the minimum wage until this new Congress was elected. We have a White House that has favored outsourcing of jobs over time.

But now, through this legislation, we are able to reaffirm again that it is our policy, in fact, it is Congress's longstanding continuing tradition of applying prevailing wage requirements to federally funded construction projects. Studies have shown that by attracting more experienced, better-trained workers, that wage requirements lead to higher productivity and they reduce overall costs, which offset any higher wages.

□ 0930

The Davis-Bacon Act protects communities by ensuring that wage determination also for individual counties is based solely on the local workforce costs. Oftentimes, this means that projects come in under budget and on time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her words, except I would like to let her know, I know she was not in the body last year, but this body did pass a minimum wage bill last year. It should be noted that the bill included exactly what the Democrat leadership wanted, and we took their bill exactly as it was for minimum wage. The problem that the Democrat leadership had was that it was a balanced approach, and that is the reason why it did not move forward in the other body and why the President never got it.

Mr. Speaker, what the Republicans did was to take the Democrat bill on minimum wage and add to that a balanced provision which would help small businesses who are bearing the burden of most of the brunt of the minimum wage and allow them the opportunity to offset those changes so that we can continue growing the free market economy. Small business is the engine of our economy.

It is also worth noting, since the gentlewoman brought it up, that this body this year did pass a minimum wage without those equalizing factors or benefits to small business, and that is why it got stuck in the other body and why this body is having to come back to correct it to make it a more balanced view, the same kind of balanced view that the Republicans took last year in order to pass the minimum wage.

I know the gentlewoman was not here last year, but those are the facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. He has been very eloquent on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I rise in opposition to this rule. I am deeply disappointed in the Rules Committee and its actions yesterday by limiting the number of amendments that we could have taken to the floor.

We all recognize that there is a gap, or a shortfall, in the funding that exists to help deal with our water infrastructure, and this is most pointedly affecting our small rural and disadvantaged communities; but I have to say the actions of the Rules Committee and the majority on the Rules Committee really disappoint me, because what we have seen now is politics trumping practical policy.

Sure, we don't agree on Davis-Bacon, and having an up-and-down vote is fine, but that is a political vote. We are all frozen in our positions. But we could have taken a chance to protect our small and disadvantaged communities by creating some exemptions.

I had hoped to offer two amendments to this bill yesterday, and they were not ruled in order for the bill. One would have exempted small, disadvantaged communities as defined by law from Davis-Bacon big labor provisions in the bill. This would have given our small communities a chance to access these funds. What good are the funds if the communities can't get to them?

The gentlelady across the aisle here says, talk to local leaders. I can tell you, I have spoken to local leaders, Democrat and Republican alike, those who favor labor and those who don't, in my communities across my district, which is largely rural; and they have uniformly told me that these Davis-Bacon provisions and this State revolving loan fund will really put a burden on our small communities. It will inflate the costs by 20 to 25 percent.

So on the one hand we are saying, yes, let's create the revolving loan fund; let's fund it. On the other hand, we are telling our small communities, no, you can't have the money, because you can't afford it. You can't afford the match. You can't afford to access this money.

Our small and rural communities are the ones that are most often in need of adequate waste water infrastructure. I have visited every community in my district.

Mr. Speaker, this is a huge need, and I want to support this underlying bill; but we could have acted responsibly. We could have created exemptions that help our small and rural and disadvantaged communities. But, no, we have chosen to play politics instead of dealing with good, practical policy.

My amendments would have put the power back in the hands of local leaders. But, no, the Federal Government, the Federal Government is the one that has to dictate and mandate all. Once again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to empower Big Labor at the expense of small disadvantaged communities and local leaders.

I have to say I am deeply disappointed. There is plenty of evidence. The CBO, as my colleague mentioned earlier, has noted that repealing Davis-Bacon, raising the threshold for projects it covers, would allow appropriators to reduce Federal funds and therefore we could get more bang for the buck. The Department of Labor, after nearly 50 years, has not developed an effective program to issue and maintain current and accurate wage determinations. It may be impractical to ever do so. There are many problems with this. We could have acted responsibly, but, no, we have chosen to play politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule. We could have done better by the American public in putting together a bill that would create the State revolving loan funds and allow our communities to access them. But, no, we have chosen to play politics.

I urge defeat of this rule and defeat of the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee we had an opportunity to receive a number of amendments and have feedback from Members who were talking about these important water projects, and I found one amendment yesterday that was presented very interesting. It was rejected by the Democrats, but it says this:

''This amendment quadruples the current penalty for dumping sewage into the Great Lakes to $100,000 per violation per day. The amendment also establishes a Great Lakes Clean-Up Fund within the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, and directs the sewage dumping penalties into this new fund to be spent on wastewater treatment options.'' Here is the interesting part: ''These provisions would become effective January 1, 2027.''

Mr. Speaker, a colleague brought forth an amendment as a result of a discussion with a major mayor of a city on the Great Lakes. I have heard all sorts of conversations about how important clean water is. Yet the Great Lakes, which is an area of about 20 million people that need this clean water, wake up today to find out that someone was willing to come forward with an idea which, even if enacted, doesn't take place until January 1, 2027.

No, we are not going to do that in the Rules Committee.

So on one side the Democrat majority talks about how great they are for all this clean water. But when it really comes down to it, still 20 million people are being denied this opportunity to start this clean water revolving fund and direct that sewage dumped into the Great Lakes would be cleaned up and have higher penalties. Utterly incredible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas for his leadership in this area and for yielding me some time to talk about this rule and a little more expansive subject.

I think what we are seeing today really demonstrates the difference between our side and our approach, the Republican approach to fiscal challenges, financial challenges, financial responsibility that we face in this Nation, and our friends on the majority side, on the Democrat side.

We have had some important bills this week that we have dealt with. We have also had an opportunity to be financially responsible, fiscally responsible and accountable to the American people. Our side has chosen to propose those measures of accountability. The

other side, the majority side, has chosen to ignore that. This is another example today.

I live outside of Atlanta. My district is the Sixth District of Georgia. It has remarkable challenges in the area of water and water quality. I appreciate the importance of assisting State and local governments in the area of clean water.

This is an important bill. It ought to be a priority of our Nation. What the majority party says, however, is that this may be a priority, but we are not going to treat it as a priority from a financial standpoint. We are going to throw money at it from a governmental standpoint and we are going to enact the kind of PAYGO proposal that the majority party loves so much, which is raise taxes and go on with the program. That is what this bill does.

This is an important bill. It authorizes $16 billion in discretionary spending. It creates two new programs and continues other existing programs. There is $375 million for the creation of new Federal grant programs at EPA and $1.5 billion for State grant pollution control programs. It reauthorizes $20 million annually for some expired pilot programs to provide technical assistance in the area of water works treatment projects, and it authorizes $14 billion to provide grants to States to pay for the construction of clean water projects. These are important, important programs.

How do we pay for it? How do we pay for it? Well, the majority Democrat Party proposes that we pay for it by increased taxes, which is their ''TAXGO'' policy that they have for their financial programs. TAXGO: they raise taxes, and they raise taxes because they somehow believe that when you raise taxes on businesses that it never reaches the American people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you and I both know, corporations don't pay taxes. What they do is they cover that by charging more for their product. The American people pay corporate taxes. The American people's taxes, the American people's costs are increased when corporate taxes are increased. It is just like the other side, the majority side, believes that the money that comes to the Federal Government is the government's money. It is not the people's money; it is the government's money. And that is this clear definition that we have seen this week.

So I offered an amendment to this bill that said this ought to be a priority of our Nation. But we ought to state that it is a priority by saying that there are other measures in the Federal Government program that we ought not cover because this ought to take that priority. A true PAYGO, a true pay-as-you-go proposal.

The Rules Committee decided no, they didn't want to do it that way. They wanted to raise taxes on the American people. So their TAXGO policy is in full place right here with this rule that doesn't even allow, doesn't even allow the Members of the House of Representatives to even make a statement on whether they think we ought to cover this with current money.

So the TAXGO policy is in place by our good friends on the majority side, on the Democrat side. This rule proves it. What has happened this week on the floor of the House proves it, as they have voted down real pay-as-you-go amendments to two of the previous bills.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I think this really points out the clear and distinct difference from a financial standpoint in this House of Representatives. I am told, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee doesn't even allow for a recorded vote anymore on these, so you can't even tell who is supportive of the rule and who isn't supportive of the rule. But as I understand it by those who were there, every single Democrat opposed my amendment, which means that every single Democrat, including the new Democrats on the Rules Committee, support a tax-and-go policy, a tax-and-spend policy.

This rule is a demonstration of that. This rule approves that. This rule proves that the majority party is not interested in financial responsibility and financial accountability, because they were given the opportunity to say, yes, we believe that we ought to identify priorities and pay for them at the Federal level by making certain that we are not increasing taxes and increasing the amount of money that hardworking Americans have to send to the Federal Government.

□ 0945

So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this rule. This is another evidence of the undemocratic side of the majority party that says, no, we ought not have a full and open debate which was promised to the American people. We ought not have a full and open debate on how we are going to pay for government programs.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be responsible, to be financially responsible, to allow for the appropriate discussion, debate and voting on measures so the American people know who their friends are from a taxing standpoint. I believe it is the Republican side of the aisle. I would hope my Democrat friends would join us in that endeavor, and urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and bring an appropriate rule, bring a rule that allows us to debate the issues in an open and honest way and then have the vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to notify the gentlewoman I will now yield myself the balance of my time, and then yield back my time and allow the gentlewoman to close.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the statement of the administration policy on this bill.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, March 8, 2007.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 720—WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT OF 2007 (REP. OBERSTAR (D) MN AND 32 OTHERS)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 720, which authorizes excessive Federal funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) and mandates the application of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements ''to the construction of treatment works carried out in whole or in part'' with SRF funding. For the reasons described below, if H.R. 720 were presented to the President in its current form his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

The bill would expand Davis-Bacon Act coverage to a program that has not been subject to any Davis-Bacon requirements since 1994—first by reinstating coverage for Federally-funded clean water state revolving fund projects, and second by expanding Davis-Bacon Act coverage to non-Federal clean water projects, including for the first time ever, projects financed by funds contributed solely by States and moneys repaid to the state revolving fund. This provision will increase project costs and impose new administrative burdens on States. Furthermore, it is contrary to the Administration's long-standing policy of opposing any statutory attempt to expand or contract the applicability of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements.

In addition, the bill's total authorization of $14 billion for the SRF during fiscal years 2008–2011 represents on average a more than 250 percent increase over recent appropriation levels and is unrealistic in the current fiscal environment. This excessive authorization will distort market signals by discouraging utilities and their consumers from moving toward full-cost pricing, as they have elsewhere. Instead, this bill may encourage municipalities to delay undertaking needed infrastructure projects to wait for Federal subsidies, potentially diminishing reliability and increasing the eventual costs to the public.

To provide additional opportunities to communities for financing needed wastewater infrastructure, Congress should enact the Administration's Water Enterprise Bond proposal, which would provide an exception to the unified annual State volume cap on tax-exempt qualified private activity bonds for wastewater and drinking water projects. To ensure the long-term financial health and solvency of these drinking water and wastewater systems, communities using these bonds must have demonstrated a process that will move toward full-cost pricing for services within five years of issuing the Private Activity Bonds. Consequently, this proposal will attract more private capital to meet the infrastructure needs of these sectors, help water and wastewater systems become self-financing, and minimize the need for future subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, part of what the President has said very clearly to Congress today is two things: number one, that this Davis-Bacon expansion will cost an incredible amount of money to local water districts that seek bonds and funding that go to the marketplace to get that money to match the Federal money; and that the President believes that by expanding Davis-Bacon arbitrarily, it will mean that the cost of all these projects will go up exponentially and make it far more difficult for local communities to get the funding they

need because it is more money than what should be paid reasonably for the projects to be done.

Secondly, the President makes a point which I think is very true, and that is by almost doubling the amount of money that is in this fund, America is now going to start looking to Washington to take care of these projects. Over my years in this body, we have seen over and over again the requests from the Democrats to let's go build more schools in this country—with Federal money. Oh, yes, with Davis-Bacon; but more importantly, it is a message to people back home, let's let Washington build our schools.

Republicans have said, the day we start doing that, there will be no more schools built by local people. Everybody will look to Washington.

The President is saying today, by this bill, people back home are going to start looking to Washington to take care of their water system needs. That is dangerous, and I think that is a problem.

Mr. Speaker, the choice that we are being asked to make is very clear. If you support fiscal responsibility, small business, States' right, rural communities, women- and minority-owned businesses and the environment, then you would want to oppose this rule and the underlying legislation.

However, I admit that the Democrats are going to win today, and we are going to lose; but instead, what that is going to mean is it is going to be environmental harm, market distortion, wasteful Federal spending and stacking the deck in favor of labor bosses. That is who is going to win today.

I include for the RECORD a letter to Speaker PELOSI and to the Republican leadership, JOHN BOEHNER, signed by the National Association of Minority Contractors, the National Association of Women in Construction, the National Alliance for Working and Employee Rights, and the Women Construction Owners and Executives who make very clear their opposition for the reasons why we have talked about today: Excessive overspending and far-reaching expansion of Davis-Bacon that will mean that many of these communities who need the money the most will find that on up to 20 percent of their projects, the needs of their people cannot be met because of bloated spending that is contained within this bill. We want to make it very clear that we oppose this legislation.

MARCH 7, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER BOEHNER: As the U.S. House of Representatives prepares to vote on the ''Water Quality Financing Act of 2007'', H.R. 720, we would like to recognize the important role of the federal government in addressing our nation's water infrastructure needs but strongly disagree with including egregious, precedent-setting expansions of the federal Davis-Bacon Act to non-federal funds contained in the legislation.

In order to obtain the highest construction value for the taxpayers' dollar on these critical projects, it is imperative that this legislation not include any federal Davis-Bacon Act provisions. During past consideration of this legislation, debate has been crippled by harmful Davis-Bacon Act expansions and we implore you to let a clean bill, absent of Davis-Bacon provisions, pass through the U.S. House of Representatives in order to bring much needed water infrastructure to the American people.

We perceive any application of the Davis-Bacon Act into this legislation as expansion. Section 602(b)(6) of the Clean Water Act of 1987 clearly states that Davis-Bacon requirements on such loans were to sunset in FY 1995. Since October 1, 1994, the clean water state revolving funds have operated efficiently without Davis-Bacon requirements.

The Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO sued to impose Davis-Bacon on CWSRF after the sunset date. In a letter dated October 29, 1998, the EPA took issue with every argument made by the building trades. In fact, the EPA stated that even without section 513 in section 602(b)(6), the EPA ''would reasonably have concluded that the CWA's Davis-Bacon Act provisions did not apply in the SRF program at all''.

On June 22, 2000, the EPA, under the Clinton Administration, reversed its previous statements and issued a ''settlement agreement'' with organized labor to repeal the statutory sunset date of October 1, 1994, and expand Davis-Bacon to CWSRF for programs after July 1, 2001. Clearly, this ''settlement agreement,'' which contradicted the earlier arguments made by the EPA itself, was a statutory violation of the Clean Water Act. If this legislation passes in current form it would undoubtedly be subject to litigation if enforced.

Given that Davis-Bacon requirements were sunset in 1995 and have not since applied, nor would such requirements apply unless expressly provided for by Congress, any re-application of Davis-Bacon to CWSRF would clearly be expansion of this flawed Act.

Lastly, a series of audits by outside agencies as well as the Department of Labor's (DOL) own Office of Inspector General (OIG) have revealed substantial inaccuracies in Davis-Bacon Act wage determinations and suggested that they are vulnerable to fraud. In addition, DOL's OIG released three reports highly critical of the wage determination program. In fact, one of the reports found one or more errors in 100 percent of the wage surveys they reviewed.

We, the undersigned organizations, are vehemently opposed to any re-application of Davis-Bacon requirements to this loan program and ask you to please vote against the ''Water Quality Financing Act of 2007'', H.R. 720, due to the harmful expansion of the Davis-Bacon Act contained within.

Respectfully submitted,

Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. (ABC); Chuck Muth, President, Citizen Outreach Project; Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Grover Norquist, Americans for Tax Reform (ATR); Independent Electrical Contractors, Inc. (IEC); Miller & Long Concrete Construction; National Association of Minority Contractors; National Association of Women in Construction; Tim Phillips, President, Americans for Prosperity; Ryan Ellis, Alliance for Worker Freedom; United States Chamber of Commerce; Will Fine, Executive Director, National Alliance for Worker and Employer Rights; Women Construction Owners and Executives.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he wouldn't mind, prior to my closing, that we allow the distinguished gentleman from the Rules Committee to speak. He arrived as we were completing our dialogue, and I would like to yield him 2 minutes.

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

Ms. CASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. I do recognize that from time to time as we do these rules that people do come down. The gentleman who is asking to speak is a member of the Rules Committee, and based upon that request, I consent and agree, and I welcome the gentleman.

Ms. CASTOR. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for his courtesy and also thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership on the Rules Committee and for her spectacular handling of this rule today before us. I appreciate all of her insights and advocacy on behalf of clean water and environmental issues. I want to make clear for the record that this entire House should be grateful for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. It is a fair rule. There are three Democratic amendments and three Republican amendments. They cover the many issues brought before the Rules Committee last night.

I want to take a moment to address one issue, and that is the issue of Davis-Bacon. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) said that the Democrats are going to win and the Republicans are going to lose on this vote. Well, let me say I would recharacterize it. I think the American people and the American workers are going to win if we keep the Davis-Bacon provisions.

I know many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't like Davis-Bacon and who don't believe that people should be paid the prevailing wage, who don't believe that the workers of this country should be paid a livable wage.

Well, the majority in this Congress today believes the opposite. I bet many people on the gentleman's side of the aisle believe as well. Workers in this country are working longer hours and harder than ever before, and they can't make ends meet. We shouldn't have a rush to the bottom when it comes to the wages of the workers in this country. We need to stand firm and stand tall for the workers of this country to ensure that they get paid a livable wage so they can support their families, so they have health care and pension benefits. That is what this debate is about.

So, today, my colleagues who don't like Davis-Bacon will have a choice.

They have an amendment in order that can rip Davis-Bacon out of this bill. They can eliminate Davis-Bacon. They can eliminate the prevailing wage. They can eliminate a livable wage for workers. Or you can stand with the majority in this Congress for workers, for the prevailing wage, for Davis-Bacon, for a livable wage; and that is the right thing to do.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Would the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim 2 minutes of my time as a result of us yielding back our time because we did not anticipate any additional speakers.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the distinguished gentleman from the Rules Committee: Yes, it is political with regard to Davis-Bacon, strip it or leave it, but what about exemptions? Why couldn't we entertain exemptions for small, disadvantaged communities? What is the fear on your side in not allowing that to come to a floor debate?

I simply ask the question, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

It is this gentleman's opinion that what the gentleman is trying to do is to chip away at Davis-Bacon, chip away at workers' rights and chip away at the prevailing wage and chip away at making sure that workers get a livable wage, and this gentleman is very much opposed to that.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Reclaiming my time, I would say that if small, disadvantaged communities cannot access the funds to repair their infrastructure, it is going to hurt the worker, and it is going to hurt the disadvantaged small community.

I would say there is a practical way to move through this with regard to policy rather than simply playing politics.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we think we are trying to make a point here today that there were some strong reservations that should have been taken into account by the Rules Committee. We are not trying to chip away at minimum wage. We tried last year to pass a new minimum wage.

What we are trying to do is get work done that is in the best interest of not only Americans who need these projects to complete things that have been done to their communities as a result of damage but also to move forward with more efficiency.

We support spending money for clean water. We don't support bloated projects that are against the market-based abilities that communities have.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we don't delay any longer and that we take action on this rule and this legislation that reauthorizes an important part of the Clean Water Act.

I understand where some of the debate is going to occur today, and I understand that a sizable number of Members on the other side of the aisle oppose the Davis-Bacon requirements for fair wages across the country. But the Rules Committee has made in order an amendment on Davis-Bacon, and Members in this body will have an opportunity to debate and vote on that issue. It is important, however, as we enter that debate, that we recognize that Davis-Bacon ensures a higher-quality work product and ensures that the work is done right the first time as higher-paid workers are the best trained and most experienced.

I urge Members to defeat that amendment and continue in the new direction that is being charted by this new Democratic Congress where we stand up for the hard-working men and women across this great country.

It is too important to delay any longer this reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. It is imperative that Congress now pass the Water Quality Financing Act, H.R. 720, which will provide critically needed funds for clean water infrastructure. It will protect the public health, the environment and our quality of life. It will restore the viability of the Federal, State and local partnership to meet the goals of the Clean Water Act. And ultimately, if we take action today, we will protect and improve the health of our citizens across America.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 179, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—229

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
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
English (PA)
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—179

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)

Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Bachus
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cardoza
Davis, Jo Ann
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Hunter
Kline (MN)
Larson (CT)
Marchant
Millender-McDonald
Moore (WI)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Pearce
Souder
Whitfield
Young (AK)

□ 1037

Mr. GRAVES changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, DELAHUNT, ADERHOLT, and TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 132, I was on a visit to Walter Reed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

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

There was no objection.

WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 229 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 720.

□ 1037

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 720) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes, with Ms. SOLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself 4½ minutes and rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

It has been a long time coming to this point. We have labored within the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for at least 11 years, maybe just a few months longer than that, to bring forth a bill to replenish the State revolving loan funds so that municipalities can continue the work of aggressively expanding their capacity to handle wastewater, treat that wastewater, return it to the receiving waters in good quality.

We have been delayed over the last 6 Congresses, not by unwillingness within our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, but because of external factors within the House. Now that those external factors have been removed, we are bringing this bill to the floor with good and sustained bipartisan support. I appreciate very much the support of Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER scheduling this legislation early on in the session; and I particularly appreciate the participation and cooperation of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), our ranking member, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources for the long participation that we have had and the splendid agreement and working relationship we had between our staffs on the Democratic and Republican sides, with one notable exception that will be debated at length here and which we debated extensively in subcommittee and full committee.

I especially want to express my great appreciation to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON). For years now, she has worked as our ranking member on the Water Resources Subcommittee, learned the issues, mastered the subject matter, and is now Chair of the Water Resources Subcommittee and has played a leading role in bringing this legislation to the floor.

The bill started out as $20 billion to replenish State revolving loan funds; but due to concerns by the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office, we scaled the legislation back to a $14 billion bill, paying for it through an additional revenue source, as within the authority of this committee. The CBO has said that municipalities in raising municipal bonds that are tax exempt will cause a loss in revenue to the Treasury, and, therefore, the revenue in this bill has to be offset by another source. We have done that in a bipartisan agreement, and this bill is at $14 billion, fully paid for. We will not have the debate that we have had on two other bills that were extraneous to the subject matter because we have covered this issue.

Unfortunately, the administration has steadily reduced funding for the State revolving loan fund over the past several years, and in the budget request for 2008 has a $200 million reduction, down to $687.5 million. That is totally unacceptable.

There was a time when we were investing $6 billion a year in Federal funds, matched by State and local dollars, to build sewage treatment facilities, raise them to tertiary treatment, removing nutrients, adding oxygen, returning clean water to the receiving waters. We are not doing that any longer. We are not keeping pace with the pressure on the Nation's water and wastewater systems nor our sewage treatment systems.

The only debate that we really have is, What shall be the wages paid to those who work on building these facilities? And I listened with great interest and concern to the debate on the rule. The manager of the rule said that cities will start looking to Washington for these projects to take care of their water system needs. That is almost the same language that Dwight Eisenhower used in 1960 to veto the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments when he said: Pollution is a uniquely local blight. Federal involvement will only impede local efforts at cleanup.

That was wrong then, it is wrong now, it was wrong when Richard Nixon vetoed the Clean Water Act of 1972.

We have had a partnership of State and local government. They have invested billions of dollars at the local level. We need to continue that partnership into the future. This bill will do that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, at this time I would yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of this Committee on Transportation, Mr. MICA.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairwoman and Members of the House, normally I would be supportive of this legislation. I have tried to work in a bipartisan manner with Mr. OBERSTAR and other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle.

The underlying bill is basically a good bill. It does provide funding assistance to State revolving funds. However, the bill as reported out of the committee, I voted against it. I will vote against it again if it contains a Davis-Bacon provision. We will have an opportunity with an amendment offered by Mr. BAKER and Mr. KING that would repeal the provision that is put in the bill as it came from the committee.

Currently, 18 States have no prevailing wage law. My State, Florida, and 17 other States will be dramatically impacted. And, actually, what will happen is the opposite of what we will want to have happen: instead of having more money, we will have less money for these important projects.

This is an unprecedented expansion of Davis-Bacon requirements as they relate to the Clean Water Act. In fact, this is a mandate, and I call it ''The Mother of All Unfunded Mandates,'' which is in fact sort of an earmark to Big Labor interests and a payback to Big Labor. It is unfortunate that, again, those that will suffer are the States and local governments and the intent of this legislation, which is to provide wastewater funds.

And, finally, I hate to say it, but I have a statement from the administration. The President will veto the legislation if it contains the Davis-Bacon provisions.

So I urge Members to support an amendment by Mr. BAKER and Mr. KING to strike that language from this legislation, and let's pass legislation without this onerous provision.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, the Chair of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

□ 1045

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, thanks to the chairman of our committee.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

This essential legislation reauthorizes the Federal grant program for capitalizing State revolving funds at $14 billion over the next 4 years, while providing States with additional flexibility in the types of projects they finance.

The bill also provides States with increased flexibility in the financing packages they can offer to cities and local communities, including principal forgiveness, negative interest loans, or whatever other financing mechanism might be necessary to assist communities in meeting their water quality infrastructure goals.

The flexibility afforded by this bill will go a long way in helping many of our communities that are least able to afford necessary improvements to their water infrastructure systems.

This legislation also encourages communities to consider innovative and alternative technologies for addressing ongoing water quality concerns, including the so-called ''green infrastructure,'' and provides financial incentives for implementing these technologies that may result in greater long-term environmental benefits.

In my State, few Federal programs have proven as effective as the Texas Clean Water State Revolving Fund program in realizing congressional goals for all citizens. The key to its success has been the partnership between the Texas and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency working together in blending State and Federal resources to provide sustainable funding sources.

This funding source provides a significant financial incentive for communities to construct, rehabilitate, and enhance wastewater systems that support the goals of the Clean Water Act.

Since its inception in 1987, the State revolving fund has successfully awarded communities approximately $4.3 billion in low-interest loans to finance 472 water infrastructure projects across the State.

These projects, which serve approximately one-half of the Texas population and treat about 2.1 billion gallons per day of wastewater, provide direct environmental and public health benefits by protecting our water resources through the reduction of pollutants entering the water.

The projects are made economically viable because Texas customers realize a direct cost savings by assessing the State revolving funds at rates below market rates.

Madam Chairman, it has been 20 years since Congress last authorized appropriations for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, and almost 10 years since the Committee on Transportation Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources first investigated the growing need for it.

Fortunately, we have overcome one hurdle that has prevented this legislation from coming to the floor over the past 8 years, and I applaud the leadership of the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. OBERSTAR, as well as the committee staff for their good works in moving this legislation out of Committee and on to the House floor.

Now, Madam Chairman, it is past time for this Congress to complete its task in sending this legislation to the President.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support this legislation; it's time we make our domestic infrastructure programs a priority again.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, at this time I claim 2 minutes.

Madam Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the gentlelady and to the Chair for their diligent work in this area. Certainly, it is an arena in which there is a clear and established, well identified need for which there are too few resources available. It is also a problem which will require many, many years of dedicated work to ensure the delivery of a safe water infrastructure in the years ahead.

I, regretfully, have observed that the debate which will occur over the establishment of Davis-Bacon in this legislation is the one point around which great controversy has emerged.

In my own State, I can speak with authority as to our circumstance. Pursuant to the devastation of Katrina and Rita, we find our communities struggling to get back on their feet, and our infrastructure has been badly damaged. Water systems, pumping stations, sewage systems have been destroyed; and it will take, unfortunately, years for many communities to attain the status that they once had prior to the storms' impact.

It is clear to us that, although the American people and this Congress have been very generous to our State in making resources available, those resources are going to be stretched to their maximum extent possible; and yet we still have incredible needs that will yet be unmet. For this reason, we feel, at least in the view of our own State's interest, that the application of the Davis-Bacon requirement, artificially increasing the cost of construction of these important infrastructure projects, will only ensure that we are years longer in achieving the necessary recovery.

To state it quite simply, to spend more and accomplish less is not something we in Louisiana are comfortable in pursuing. For that reason, I join with my ranking Member, Mr. MICA, in expressing grave concerns over the inclusion of Davis-Bacon.

In the normal operative circumstance, when funds are made available from the State revolving account to a State for a particular project, Davis-Bacon has applied to that first-round funding. This bill will now make Davis-Bacon provisions extend to all subsequent utilizations of those funds, and that is the expansion to which we strongly object.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, the chairman of the committee, who has done such an extraordinary job for decades now in taking care of the environment and particularly providing for clean water and sewer treatment for our country, so critical to our public health and to the health of our country.

I want to, at the outset, however, make an observation, that I am not surprised, very frankly, I tell my friends on the other side of the aisle, that they are concerned about Davis-Bacon provisions in this bill. After all, of course, most of those who have risen voted against raising the minimum wage in this country from $5.15 to $7.25 over a 2½-year period.

If you don't believe in raising the minimum wage from $5.15, it is not surprising to me that you are not for paying a prevailing wage to workers on public projects.

I have observed in the past, of course, how much cheaper projects would be if we didn't pay our laborers at all, and we just forced them to work. But hopefully we will not pursue, ever, a policy like that.

I want to commend the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota, for all of his hard work and leadership on this important legislation reauthorizing the Clean Water State Revolving Fund for the first time in 13 years.

It is interesting that our friends on this side of the aisle have been in charge of this Congress and bringing legislation to the floor for the last 12 years. So since they took charge, they have not reauthorized this program; again, not because of the observations, as has been pointed out, they didn't think we needed to have a clean water program, but because they didn't want to pay prevailing wages.

I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for his leadership, and I want to thank my dear friend, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for her very important leadership as well.

As you know, we have passed two other bills this week reauthorizing sewer overflow control grants, H.R. 569 and H.R. 700, related to combined sewer overflow grants to States for aging sewers. We know that is a problem throughout this country. That handles storm water and sewage water, and H.R. 700, which is a pilot project for getting clean water to rural communities. We know that we focus on urban communities, but it is very important for us to also make sure that our rural communities have clean water.

I believe that this bill, as has been indicated, has bipartisan support, notwithstanding the difference on prevailing wage.

Madam Chairman, the fact is a clean safe water supply is vital in communities, both large and small, rural and urban, all across this Nation. We are not talking about a luxury, a perk or a non-necessity. Clean water, safe water is absolutely indispensable to the good health of all Americans, as well as our way of life and our continued prosperity.

Just consider, my colleagues, that our Nation's farmers and fishermen and manufacturing and tourism industries rely on a clean water supply, and their activities contribute hundreds of billions of dollars to our economy every year.

Our Nation, as has been pointed out, now faces a clean water crisis. As the Environmental Protection Agency warned in a recent report, and I am quoting from the administration's Environmental Protection Agency: ''Without continued improvements in wastewater treatment infrastructure, future population growth will erode away many of the Clean Water Act achievements.''

And I want to congratulate Mr. BAKER and Mr. OBERSTAR for their leadership in trying to confront that crisis. One key reason for the clean water crisis is that much of the water infrastructure in our Nation is rapidly approaching or already exceeding its projected life.

So I am proud today, Madam Chairman, that the new House majority, with the support of many Republicans, will take an important step toward addressing our Nation's water needs by reauthorizing the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and authorizing $14 billion over the next 4 years to ensure safe water for our families and for our people. And I congratulate both sides of the aisle for working towards that objective.

The fund is the primary source of Federal funding for clean water, helping to provide low-interest loans to local communities for construction of wastewater treatment facilities and other water pollution abatement projects.

In fact, since 1987, when the fund became the major Federal source of clean-water funding, it has provided States with more than $50 billion for more than 18,600 low-interest loans to local communities.

The unfortunate truth is, the recent Congresses allowed the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to expire in 1994 and failed to reauthorize it because, as I have said, and as we have seen on the floor, the concern about Davis-Bacon, the concern about paying a prevailing wage, wages that I think are fair and appropriate for public projects.

In recent years, the former majority cut funding for the funds involved in this project by 34 percent, and the President has proposed cutting it even further.

Madam Chairman, it is a new day in this, the people's House. It is long past time for us to act on this important legislation.

The new House majority is absolutely committed, under the leadership of JIM OBERSTAR, who has been one of the giants on this issue, for, as I said, decades, not days, not weeks, not months, not years, but decades he has been in the leadership of this effort.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in a bipartisan way, to reauthorize this critically important piece of legislation.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, at this time I would like to extend to the gentleman from Florida, a valued member of the Committee on Transportation, the Honorable Congressman CONNIE MACK, 2 minutes.

Mr. MACK. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time, and I also want to say that I appreciate the way the committee has worked on a very important issue.

I think all of us understand and recognize that the Clean Water State Revolving Fund is so important to all of our communities. And let's face it, we work for the people back home.

But it is concerning to me that when you have such a positive piece of legislation that can have such a tremendous effect on people's lives back in our districts, that you would add the Davis-Bacon requirements into this.

A few minutes ago we heard from the majority leader that he finds it strange that over here you will have people voting against a minimum wage, and then voting against Davis-Bacon.

Well, it is kind of simple. We believe that, or at least I believe, that competition, the free market, should dictate these projects, not government; that government shouldn't be coming in saying this is how much you are going to pay your employees, or this is how much you are going to have to pay for projects.

And including the Davis-Bacon requirements into this only puts, it makes it so that States like mine have a hard time voting for a piece of legislation that will add, will bring the cost of the construction projects up.

At a time when our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about being fiscally responsible, what they are really committed to, as we heard earlier, their commitment is to raising taxes and spending more money.

□ 1100

I would like to see us, in the future, when we have such a good piece of legislation, one that almost everyone can support, that we do not get in the habit that it appears to be now of payback of some sort to labor and to the unions. It just isn't right. The American people deserve better.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

We are talking about a Federal mandate here. It is good policy. We need to protect our critical clean water resources. But this is a Federal mandate put on our local communities.

The Republicans, for 12 years, have failed to reauthorize this law and have consistently cut funding to our communities in the face of this unfunded Federal mandate. The backlog has grown from $300 to $500 billion over the next 20 years to maintain, rehab and, yes, do some new construction for population growth.

We have here a very aptly named ''SAP'' from the White House. The White House says $14 billion is excessive. Let's see, that is about 3 to 5 percent of the demonstrated need in this unfunded mandate on our communities, and the White House says, 3 to 5 percent, that's excessive. And then they go on with this ideological claptrap: ''It will distort market signals by discouraging utilities and their consumers from moving toward full cost pricing, and they will delay undertaking projects.'' My community is under consent agreements under law, under Federal law to do this. They can't delay. What a bunch of claptrap. They are trying to take care of Wall

Street here and not Main Street. Wall Street wants to be able to issue these bonds in the private sector. They don't want the government to help these communities. They can make a little bit of commission there.

And they want to drive down the wages of the workers. Why do you hate the middle class so much? Why don't you think people should earn a living wage? What claptrap. ''The market should set wages altogether. We shouldn't have a minimum wage.'' Come on, what planet are you people from? Who do you represent? Do you represent the special interests, or do you represent average and working families in this country?

Look at the communities in my district. Coburg, a thousand people; $95 debt retirement, plus user fees. Not exactly a wealthy community. Sweet Home, 7,500 people, a depressed timber community in the mountains, $220 a month if they don't get some help for their fees. Gardner, 340 people on the coast; $2.5 million for 340 people. And the White House says helping them would be excessive and it would distort the market.

Why do you hate the middle class and our communities so much? And guess what, businesses are going to suffer, too, if we don't make this investment.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, at this time, I would yield 2 minutes to the defender of the working man and hometown America, Congressman TIM MURPHY.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This week the House passed a number of bills which are important to my municipality in the 18th Congressional District in Pennsylvania. This Water Quality Financing Act, which will authorize $20 billion over the next 5 years for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, is an important bill. It offers increased flexibility for local communities to meet their water quality infrastructure goals.

We take for granted the quality of our water, but it was not always so. The life expectancy of Americans increased from age 47 in the early 1900's to a life expectancy of 75 by the end of the century. The number one reason was the public health benefits of clean water and efficient sewer systems.

Decades ago, Southwestern Pennsylvania's boroughs and townships built their sewer lines with combined sanitary and storm water in the same system. What made sense at the time is now an antiquated and overburdened system. Wherever there is significant rain, it leaves untreated sewage flowing into our rivers and streams, recreating a health hazard.

The EPA then mandated the communities must fix these problems, but now local communities are strapped with massive costs. In Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, alone repair costs exceed $3 billion. The towns then pass on the cost to homeowners. Many citizens are seniors on fixed incomes who simply cannot afford to fix the mistakes of the past and still pay for their bills today. Without funding, many of my towns just can't make it.

For years we have tried to help by providing annual funding assistance in a piecemeal manner. We need a comprehensive plan to provide a steady stream of funds to fix these problems, meet the standards to clean up our streams, support the public health and not pass on the whole burden of the inherited problem to current homeowners.

After working on this problem for years, both sides of the aisle have worked on this problem for years, I am pleased that we have some opportunities to offer some solutions; the solutions that I recognize are going to require some more crafting with the House and Senate.

I commend my colleagues who are going to work on this to recognize that we all need to work together because we are all concerned about working men and women. We are all concerned about people, without assigning them to any classes, and together we will work to solve these health problems of our water infrastructure in America.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, an original cosponsor of this bill, Mrs. TAUSCHER.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Chair, I want to thank the chairman and Subcommittee Chairwoman JOHNSON for the opportunity to speak, and for their leadership in support of the Water Quality Financing Act. And as has been said, this legislation will provide $14 billion to deserving communities and water agencies.

The State Revolving Fund continues to be one of the most efficient and practical Federal funding programs for water reconstruction and infrastructure projects in local communities.

I have been a long supporter of reauthorizing the Clean Water SRF and infusing much-needed funding into our Nation's clean water infrastructure. In the last four Congresses, I have joined with my colleague, former Congresswoman Sue Kelly, to offer legislation to reauthorize the SRF program. Unfortunately, the Republican-controlled Congress never acted on this important legislation.

Today's legislation finally gives us the opportunity to do the right thing. It is imperative that Congress continues our partnership with communities to fund Federal clean water mandates in the most cost efficient manner possible. As a loan fund and not a grant program, the Clean Water SRF promotes fiscal responsibility without denying communities the opportunity to refurbish, rehabilitate or rebuild new water infrastructure. Whether used for funding wastewater treatment or nonpoint source pollution control, the SRF is a useful tool in providing cleaner, safer water in our communities.

The EPA has identified billions of dollars in water infrastructure needs. It's time that we act responsibly and reauthorize this important program. As stewards of the Clean Water Act, we have the responsibility to provide for infrastructure necessary to ensure its proper implementation. Today's legislation gets us back on track.

Madam Chair, there will be much discussion about the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage language in this bill. In my view, the verdict is in. Protecting Davis-Bacon and the prevailing wage laws it supports are a national priority. This is evidenced by over half the States, including mine, California, passing their own prevailing wage laws. And importantly, Madam Chairman, it is clear a majority of the House supports Davis-Bacon.

I look forward to joining a bipartisan majority of the House today in taking a strong stand and rejecting any attempt to limit the application of Davis-Bacon protections.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 720.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to a gentleman who is a defender of the taxpayer's best interest, Congressman PENCE.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

Today the House is considering the Water Quality Financing Act introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota. And I wish to commend him for his ongoing leadership in this area of the law and the infrastructure needs of the American people.

The bill does do many good and important things, and I believe it is well intended. But I want to urge my colleagues to oppose this bill because I have great concerns about the cost, but also, most especially, about the expansion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirement to construction projects funded under this bill.

H.R. 720 authorizes $16 billion in discretionary spending over 5 years, new programs that contain a significant expansion of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. And therein applies the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage law.

Since 1995, the Davis-Bacon requirement was not applied to construction projects funded through these revolving funds; however, this bill would reinstitute this requirement. Many of the primary taxpayer watchdog organizations in America are opposing this bill on this basis alone, National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, just to name a few.

The Davis-Bacon law was signed into law in 1931 during the Great Depression in order to inflate labor rates for workers on government projects. But, Madam Chair, the Great Depression is over and the time for expanding the prevailing wage for projects like these is gone. An honest day's work should be met with an honest day's pay, not an artificial government-mandated

wage rate. Let's say yes to the sacred right of contract. Let's say yes to the best deal for the American people on public projects. Let's say no to the expansion of Davis-Bacon and to the projects under this legislation. I urge a ''no'' vote among my colleagues for that reason.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield myself 10 seconds to simply assure the gentleman from Indiana that the bill is fully paid for. And I appreciate his fiscal concerns, but the bill is fully paid for with offsets that the committee has identified and has reduced the cost of the bill from $20 billion to $14 billion and the time frame from 5 years to 4 years. And I appreciate the gentleman's kind words about my service.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And congratulations on a well thought of, well put forth piece of legislation, and I strongly support this legislation.

I want to address the Davis-Bacon issue I have heard so much about in the last few days. I represent one of the more rural, disadvantaged districts, and we should not be taking away Davis-Bacon. To take away Davis-Bacon because a district is small or rural or may be considered disadvantaged as some people say is just purely hogwash. Davis-Bacon is good for rural America. Davis-Bacon is good for urban America. Davis-Bacon is good for all Americans.

In my congressional district, which is comprised of mostly seniors and veterans and households with income around $38,000, my district can't afford not to have Davis-Bacon. My district needs to keep wages up, not lower our wages. There should be no retreat, no surrender on Davis-Bacon. We should stop this madness. We come here, and it is always like a race to the bottom: Who can do it for cheaper? Who can do it for lower? Who are we affecting? The men and women who I represent and all the men and women who built this country. We should pay them a decent wage so they can afford a decent standard of living. Take health care. If you are going to try and do health care in this country, you better have $48,000 a year minimum income because the insurance premiums are $12,000 to $14,000. Davis-Bacon allows you a fair wage so you can afford health insurance so you can provide for your family.

When we take a look at this, Davis-Bacon provides nothing more than quality work for decent pay. We have got to stop the race to the bottom, do not drive down wages. There should be no retreat, no surrender. Support Davis-Bacon. Support this bill, H.R. 720. I compliment the chairman; it is a great piece of legislation.

I have been here now for a while. We are finally going to put money back into the water system, to our wastewater treatment systems to clean up our environment, to clean up public health so our people can have a safe quality of life, but they can't do it without an adequate income. Support this legislation. Reject the Baker-King shallow argument about rural America needs a special exception in order to afford it. Rural America supports this legislation. We cannot afford to walk away from Davis-Bacon. We must have Davis-Bacon in this legislation.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to Congressman KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding, and for his leadership and his hard and diligent work in committee.

I also compliment the chairman from Minnesota who has a gracious approach to this and generally a reasonable approach to this issue. But this Davis-Bacon issue is something where I meet a philosophical divide. I don't know if there is another Member of this Congress who has live lived under Davis-Bacon, earned Davis-Bacon wages and paid Davis-Bacon wages, but I can tell you I am one who has done both. And it goes back through 28 years of the construction business; 1,400 and some consecutive weeks of tracking wages and paying the thing called ''prevailing wage'' and knowing prevailing wage is not prevailing wage. It is always union scale. And the reason for that is because no one reports the prevailing wage for fear they will be organized to be become a union and they will have to pay a union scale.

I have difficulty with this because I hire my people year round. We make sure that they get a good living wage for the full year. We provide health insurance. We provide retirement benefits. And when you pay people a union scale, then you can only plug them on a machine for the hours of running that machine. You can't afford to have them grease it or haul it or fix it.

□ 1115

So I know employers that will work 16 hours a day in order to keep the machines supported so their union scale man can climb in the seat of it. This is a distortion of the free enterprise system.

I will argue also that this bill has an earmark in it, and this earmark is the mark called Davis-Bacon wages. Now, earmarks go back to when a pig is born you notch his ear so you can track his genetics through the marketing system. Well, this is an earmark into the first generation of money that goes into the revolving fund. Then once that money is in there, it comes back around again and again with a Davis-Bacon earmark in it, and I know Midwesterners really appreciate this argument, but the next generation of pigs, you at least got to earmark him when he is born.

This one automatically earmarks every generation of money that rolls through this revolving fund now until the end of perpetuity, and that, Madam Chairman, is a bridge too far. We are not just labeling this Davis-Bacon wage scale. It is Davis-Bacon wage scale in perpetuity.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act.

In my home of St. Louis, we have one of the oldest wastewater infrastructure systems in the Nation, some dating back to the Civil War. Our crumbling and overused sewer systems are an environmental and economic burden and they frequently threaten the health of the Mississippi River, one of our national treasures. During heavy rain storms, as many as 200 sewers can overflow.

H.R. 720 reaffirms our commitment to continue the progress of the 1972 Clean Water Act and ensures that generations to come will enjoy clean and safe water supplies.

By including Davis-Bacon protections in this bill, our communities will be further assisted by ensuring that our constituents who build these projects will be paid no less than prevailing wage. At a time when thousands of jobs are outsourced from our communities, these Davis-Bacon protections serve as a strong example of homesourcing. Instead of allowing outsiders to undercut the wages of our constituents, Davis-Bacon keeps these fair wages in our communities.

I commend Chair OBERSTAR and Chairwoman JOHNSON for their leadership and look forward to passing this bill in a bipartisan way.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill because of an abundantly flawed provision it contains. As the ranking member on the committee with jurisdiction over the Davis-Bacon Act, I am particularly concerned about the Davis-Bacon mandate in the bill before us today. I have these two basic concerns for two basic reasons: they represent both bad policy and bad process.

First on process: the Education and Labor Committee, again, the committee with jurisdiction over Davis-Bacon, never formally considered the bill's Davis-Bacon provision, not in a hearing, not in a markup, not in any procedure whatsoever. Rather, a simple exchange of letters with the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee rendered our committee colleagues powerless to weigh the impact of these provisions on the projects themselves, on local economies, and, indeed, on the American taxpayers.

The fact that Davis-Bacon wages rates have not applied to projects funded through the Clean Water Revolving Fund since 1995, a decision made by the

Clinton administration I might add, demonstrates that the change before us is not a small one and it is certainly not one that should be made without appropriate consideration by the committee of jurisdiction.

The second reason for my opposition to the provisions is much more basic. It is just bad policy. By inflating labor rates, Davis-Bacon typically increases the costs of Federal projects by anywhere from 5 to 38 percent. And who ends up paying for all this? That is right, the American taxpayers.

Furthermore, the costs of Davis-Bacon are particularly burdensome for small businesses. Literally, this mandate can saddle private companies with millions of dollars of excess administrative work every year, and because of economies of scale, small, locally owned businesses rarely if ever have the resources to comply with this Federal mandate. As a result, large companies are more often awarded government contracts, even for small projects.

Federal law should not have a built-in bias against small businesses, and I believe this assertion is reflected by President Bush's veto threat.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure because it is bad policy and bad process.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN).

Mr. KAGEN. Madam Chairman, I support H.R. 720 because it will renew our commitment to a positive change in a new direction by investing in our Nation's substantial water infrastructure needs. To me, it is all about our health. It is about clean water and the success of our economy.

As a physician, I am particularly concerned with the health risks directly related to contaminated drinking water and am pleased this Congress understands the need to invest in wastewater infrastructure needs. The EPA predicts that without significant investment and upgrades in our water pollution system, this pollution will continue excessively. By investing in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, we will ensure the communities receive the financing they require for their wastewater treatment projects.

In northeast Wisconsin, the Clean Water Fund program has helped Brown and Outagamie Counties invest and develop and rehabilitate wastewater and sewer treatment plants. The projects funded in my district alone are indicative of the demand across the Nation for this bill. By encouraging long-term planning for our Nation's clean water infrastructure, we will reduce overall maintenance costs and create more sustainable systems, even as we create higher-wage jobs back home in Wisconsin where they belong.

Finally, I am particularly pleased the Davis-Bacon Act requirements provision will prevail and that the wages of Davis-Bacon will be upheld and local prevailing wages will take place.

This bill will be great for our health, our economy, and our environment. I encourage all of us on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yea.''

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me that time.

I just wanted to clear up a couple of statements that have been made and misconceptions that have been made.

First of all, from the other side, we did hear that this in fact is a Federal mandate, and I did refer in my opening remarks that this is in fact the mother of all unfunded mandates, because it does in an unprecedented fashion with the Davis-Bacon provision that is included in this bill expand the provisions of Davis-Bacon in, again, a fashion that has never been done before in this program. Mr. KING spoke a little bit about this.

I think we all ought to clean up our water and have the best wastewater treatment possible. We do want to fund this program, but we want to do it in a responsible fashion.

But, again, what is unprecedented here, and the Members of the House of Representatives from some 18 States, let me read those States, Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, the Representatives from those States will have to go back over this weekend and next week and tell their constituents that they voted for this unfunded mandate, this unprecedented mandate on the use of their State revolving funds.

Now, if we are just talking about imposing this on Federal money, that is one thing. But the unprecedented part about this is they are imposing this, first of all, on repayments. It has never been done before. On interest into the State revolving loan fund, they are going to impose this, and also on the State match.

So what happens here is we put money in with good intention, you put more money in, and you get less in return, and we impose this mandate. We have tried not to impose mandates on our local governments.

So that is our objection to this, and that is the administration's objection to this.

We have no objection to providing assistance and a partnership with our local governments and State revolving wastewater treatment activities. That is a good thing. But what we are doing here is a bad thing. It is setting a precedent and imposing an unfunded mandate on our local governments, which we shouldn't be doing even with their money, their repayments, their interest and their match. It is setting a horrible precedent.

So I would like to be for this bill. I would like to vote for this legislation. But I can't support it if we don't adopt the Baker-King amendment that takes this provision out.

To those of you who come from those States, and I am from one of them, Florida, I can't go back and say I have done this to you when I am trying to do something for you.

With those comments, I do want to clarify the unprecedented mandate that this is imposing. It is a big earmark for big union bosses. Our folks at the State and local levels are going to have to pay the price. I don't want them to have to pay that price.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Republican leader on the committee, Mr. MICA. Mr. DEFAZIO was referring to a mandate upon cities to improve their sewage treatment facilities, not to a mandate in this act.

Secondly, in our committee report, the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, says H.R. 720 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on State, local, or Tribal governments. So I can only assume the gentleman is making a statement of hyperbole, rather than a fact.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. I appreciate his leadership and that of the chairwoman, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. I salute the committee, which has done more on water resources in the last 12 weeks than we have seen the previous Republican leadership do on water resources in the last 12 years.

One of the reasons that we have had a roadblock dealing with these critical water resources has been the Republicans' pathological aversion to Davis-Bacon protections. Sometimes when I hear some of my conservative friends on the other side of the aisle fulminating about Davis-Bacon, I want them to go back and look at the history.

Davis-Bacon is named for the Republican sponsors of the legislation in the Hoover administration. It is not some sort of Democratic plot. In my State, in Oregon, we have adopted a ''little Davis-Bacon Act'' that was signed into law under a Republican Governor, former Senator Mark Hatfield. When the ideologues put it to the test, tried to repeal the protections, it was overwhelmingly supported by Oregonians almost two to one, and I would note that it passed in every Oregon county, big city or rural areas.

What we have seen is that Davis-Bacon protections level the playing field for bidding, so we are not going to have shoddy public works with inadequately trained and equipped workers. We have watched over time where the

amount of a public contract for construction for labor has actually declined as a percentage. So if they were ever concerned, they should have been concerned long ago when the Republicans introduced it in the Hoover administration.

I would hope, Madam Chairman, that this President does not continue holding water resources hostage by threatening a veto. For heaven's sake, vote Davis-Bacon up or down, but don't penalize American communities by shortchanging water resources.

□ 1130

Mr. BAKER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important to understand the operative nature of the State Revolving Fund and the results of the legislation before us on that operation of the fund.

If a community in Florida, the ranking member's State, which has no prevailing Davis-Bacon requirement, borrows money from the revolving fund, there is a match associated with that which is State dollars. There is also interest that accrues on that loan. When the State repays the loan, the State repays the interest, that comes back into the revolving loan account.

Each year, as the Federal funds are made available, assume $500 million would be made available of Federal resources for the revolving fund account, only that $500 million under current rule would be subject to Davis-Bacon application. All of the repayment made by the State of Florida, including the interest, would be exempt from the applicability of a Davis-Bacon requirement.

''For the first time,'' and I read from the statement of administration policy, the White House statement on the matter, ''For the first time ever, projects financed by funds contributed solely by States and moneys repaid to the State Revolving Fund will be subject to Davis-Bacon requirements.''

So let there be no mistake about this, this is not merely voting to sustain Davis-Bacon as we currently know it. This is to expand the requirement for State-generated funds into States that have no Davis-Bacon requirement at the State level, and it will diminish those States' abilities to meet their identified water infrastructure needs. That is why this debate is occurring. It is not just about whether big business or big labor or the beneficiaries of some legislative initiative. This is about the real world in back home America, and are we going to provide the resources to help small communities get their water systems in decent and safe operating condition? We all agree that is a worthwhile goal.

The question is: How do we want to achieve it?

Do we want to constrain a free market system with arbitrary Washington rules that artificially drive up prices and give taxpayers less? Most of us think that is not advisable.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chairman, I thank you for the strong leadership that you have provided on this legislation.

I would like to talk to you briefly about the needs of colonias. As you know, many colonias exist around the borders in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California, only lacking the basic infrastructure that most Americans take for granted. Often these communities do not have paved roads, hospitals or even utilities. And when you look at the negative impact on the health of its residents, one of the greatest challenges we have is many colonias don't have access to water and sewer services.

As you know, many colonias do not have sewer systems, forcing residents to rely on often inadequate waste water disposal methods such as small and outdated septic tanks. And even if colonias had adequate sewer systems, the border area lacks sufficient facilities to treat the waste water that we have.

What I ask, Madam Chairman, I want to work with you and with Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON and other members of the committee to make sure that we pay special consideration to the needs of the colonias as you go into conference for H.R. 720 and as your committee reviews future legislation.

I thank you for your strong leadership on the colonias issue, Madam Chairman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds to assure the gentleman that this bill will go a long way towards helping States target additional support to the colonias, as well as other disadvantaged communities throughout the country.

We will soon bring up, within the next 2 weeks I hope, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 under the leadership of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON). In the past, we have had language to authorize the corps to help provide water and waste water infrastructure for the colonias.

We will work with the gentleman to provide such language in the future.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairwoman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana, my colleague, for yielding.

Let me just say, we all recognize that there is a funding gap here, and there are many, many needs throughout our Nation with regard to repairing our water infrastructure. But on the other hand, I think it is wrong to play politics with this.

When I heard we were going to bring forward a bill to deal with our State Revolving Loan Funds, I was very happy about it. I said, yes, this is something that is very much needed in Louisiana and certainly needed for small rural, disadvantaged communities throughout our Nation.

Yet, what we have got now is a situation with the Davis-Bacon provisions inserted into this bill which is going to create significant problems.

I know we are all frozen politically on this issue, Davis-Bacon or no Davis-Bacon, depending upon which philosophical stripe you wear. But let me just say, we could have done something better coming out of committee with this bill if we would have created exemptions for poor, disadvantaged, small communities throughout the rural United States.

My fear is, with the bill as it stands, it is going to put our communities at a point where they can't access these funds.

Now our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about protecting the American worker and making sure that we are taking care of this big funding gap we have with regard to our aging water infrastructure. But on the one hand, if we create the State Revolving Loan Fund, and on the other hand, we make it unaffordable for our small and disadvantaged communities to access these funds, what good have we done?

I think we need to put aside politics and let's talk about practical policy here. Earlier this week I met with the president of our Police Jury Association, which is the equivalent of county commissioners. He told me that he was excited that we were looking at these funds for water. But when I mentioned the fact that we have Davis-Bacon provisions in the bill, he was very despondent. And he said to me, basically, that this is going to stifle our ability to repair our water infrastructure.

He estimated that it is going to add a 20–25 percent additional cost for sewer treatment facilities in his parish, Evangeline Parish, in rural Louisiana.

The bottom line is, we shouldn't be talking about inside-the-Beltway rhetoric. We need to listen to what real leaders in the real world are telling us. I would say, if Members on the other side, if you talk to those rural community leaders and find out what they need and how we can bridge this gap, you will find out that it is not by putting in Davis-Bacon provisions that will weight this bill down.

I believe Congress has a responsibility to address this growing need, but at the same time, we need to do it in a responsible way that is going to work and not something that is going to be just more political tit for tat, back and forth.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill because of the underlying provisions, the Davis-Bacon provisions, which are going to hurt small, disadvantaged communities. And ultimately, it is going to hurt the American worker.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chairwoman, two points. The revolving fund has meant so much to the district I represent. The 12-town drain system before was an open sewer, and with the revolving fund help, we were able to address and attack the problem.

My second point is this: It is interesting that those who come here complaining about the Davis-Bacon provision have been in a party that has sat on its hands on this issue year after year and have come from a party whose President has suggested cutting the revolving fund by $396 million.

You should have acted long ago to make the revolving fund more meaningful, and so don't use the prevailing wage issue as a reason to oppose this when you have failed to step up to the plate. We are stepping up to the plate here. More money and under circumstances that provide people a chance to have a decent way of life. I urge support of this bill.

I rise in strong support of the Water Quality Financing Act. The bill before the House calls for a significant and needed increase in the annual Federal contribution to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program. This may not be a well known program, but it has been absolutely critical to water quality improvements in my district, and in many other communities around the country.

The Clean Water Revolving Fund is the only major Federal program that helps localities build, repair, and improve their sewer infrastructure. Over the years, the Revolving Fund has provided more than a billion dollars to my home State of Michigan for low-interest loans for water infrastructure projects.

A billion dollars sounds like a lot of money, but it is literally just a drop in the bucket compared to the need. In southeast Michigan alone, maintaining and improving our aging sewer systems will cost between $14 and $26 billion over the next 30 years.

Let me tell you what the Clean Water Revolving Fund has meant to my district. In the early 1990s, the Clinton River that runs through my district in Oakland and Macomb Counties was little more than an open sewer. In particular, there was one, large combined sewer system called 12 Towns that spilled hundreds of millions of gallons of partially treated sewage into the Clinton River each year. This contributed to a nearly dead river and closed beaches downstream in Lake St. Clair. It was a major concern to both Oakland and Macomb counties.

In the late 1990s, the communities undertook an expensive renovation project at 12 Towns that has greatly reduced the sewer overflows. The communities bore the full expense for this project, which cost well over $100 million, but the low interest rates provided by the Revolving Fund saved the communities tens of millions of dollars in interest costs. The result is that the Clinton River is making a comeback. Water quality is improving.

Twelve Towns is not an isolated example. The Revolving Fund has also helped many other communities in my district with critical water quality improvements. We could not have accomplished the progress that has been made to clean up the Clinton River and Lake St. Clair without the Revolving Fund's help.

The Federal Government has to do more—not less—to help communities shoulder the burden of addressing critical water infrastructure needs. We should have increased the funding for the Revolving Fund long before this; instead, in recent years the Bush Administration and Congress has cut the program again and again. Just last month, the President's budget proposed a $396 million cut to the Revolving Fund. This takes the effort to clean up the Great Lakes in exactly the wrong direction.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for this important legislation. We should vote for the bill today and—just as importantly—provide the funding for the Clean Water Revolving Fund when we take up the EPA appropriations bill later this year.

Mr. BAKER. I have a speaker on his way, and so I would like to I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007. I urge swift passage of this matter.

Chairman OBERSTAR, thank you, thank you, thank you for addressing the issues of western America. Over the past 2 years, I have visited with folks from across the Third Congressional District of Colorado. Water is one of the issues that greatly affects every constituent in the arid southwest. My constituents are concerned about their water quality and supply, the aging infrastructure, and are concerned that their health is at risk.

Fast-growing rural areas are experiencing trouble with infrastructure demands, especially waste water treatment facilities. With revolving loan money on the decline, small rural communities have been struggling to address major infrastructure needs. This issue crosses lines of environment, health and human safety, growth and economic development.

Many of us view H.R. 720 as a long overdue measure to ensure that the Federal Government invests in waste water infrastructure. This legislation will not only ensure that we have undated waste water infrastructures; it will also reduce the burden of construction and maintenance costs on local towns and communities.

Now is the time for us to start investing in the infrastructure that will safeguard our water quality for future generations.

Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you. And thank you for understanding the struggles that rural America has. I don't understand our opposition on the other side and their opposition to prevailing wage and to a livable wage.

I would urge my colleagues to support investment in clean water infrastructure and passage of this bill.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member.

And the gentleman from Minnesota, I compliment you on your efforts here. It is important that we meet America's water needs all across the country.

I do have some reservations, however. My family owns a small construction company, and that is about the worst business you can be in in a State like Michigan where the economy is struggling. And they hire some union employees, not because the law tells them they have to do that but because they happen to find that their union subcontractors are the best ones to complete their job.

But what you have done in this bill is not for a prevailing wage and empowering people to make more money, you have stopped a whole segment of our society from even competing to get these jobs. There are hundreds and hundreds of regs and comments on how you compute Davis-Bacon. If you were going to go back and say, we will rework this thing so the average American understands what it is, we might be with you.

But the problem is, they can't afford consultants and lawyers. They can't hire people full time just to figure out the regulations so that they might be able to compete to fill out the application to compete for the bid. They are small, and there are a lot of small businesses.

What you are saying to the 80 percent of the entrepreneurs across America who are small business owners who are generating 80 percent of the growth in our economy, 80 percent: You don't qualify. We're sorry. Go get yourself a lawyer and a fancy accountant and spend a lot of money you don't have, and maybe you will have an opportunity to get a job if you can figure out the hundreds of pages of regulations and comments to comply with Davis-Bacon.

So it is not that you are going to get more on these projects, and I think your intentions are absolutely right, and I want to be with you because it is the right thing to do. But the problem is, it is not just going to cost more, you are going to get less. So the more money you put in means it is going to cost more, but we will get less pipe in the ground than if we had allowed a free market and the small entrepreneurs, who are creating jobs in America, to even have the chance to compete. Rules and regulations, taxation and litigation never met with prosperity. It has slowed us down, and it has slowed the small guy, the little guy, the people that you claim you want to support, from even competing.

I would hope that we could get over our differences on this particular issue and set it aside. We know that we want money to go to water infrastructure in rural America. Let's let them do that. Let's take this out. Let's let the little guy compete. Let's let that small entrepreneur who is working 7 days a week and doesn't know if they are

going to have enough money to pay the light bill, let alone take a salary this particular month in places like Michigan, let them compete. Let's take this divisive piece out of it. It won't change what you are wanting to do. That is the thing.

If you take this out, small America wins. Let's do that and stand together and be for water infrastructure around the United States.

□ 1145

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and my classmate of 1974.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank him and all of the members of this committee for their work on the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

This a very important piece of legislation, as so many of my colleagues have already testified to. We desperately need, in communities all across the country, the upgrade and the repairing of our Nation's wastewater infrastructure. There is not a congressional district in the country where we are not behind the curve on this effort.

I also rise because this legislation does continue the prevailing wage laws of this Nation, the Davis-Bacon law, which guarantees hardworking Americans, those who are working in Federal construction projects, will be paid a livable wage.

Today, we see report after report, economic study after economic study that talks about the precarious state of the American middle class, about how families are struggling to maintain their status in the middle class. It is one of the imperatives of this new Congress, of the Democratic majority, to grow and to strengthen the middle class; and, clearly, the wages that people pay will play a great part in that.

We should not have Federal dollars, Federal contracts and Federal projects, whether they are in conjunction with locales or not, undermining those livable wages. These wages are incredibly important to the American middle-class family.

We see now that the hardworking Americans and middle class, with the greatest productivity gains in recent history, are sharing the very smallest part of that increase in productivity than at any time in recent history.

It is imperative that we have today Davis-Bacon protections in this law. It is imperative that we have the Davis-Bacon protections for middle-class families in the country.

We know middle-class families now are constantly confronting the risk of what is happening to their pensions: Will they be funded? Will they be terminated? Will they be frozen? What is their ability to put away money in a 401(k) plan? What is their ability to purchase health care? How much more of the cost of that health care is going to be shifted from the employer to the employee? How much more of that are they going to be able to afford?

Maintaining good wages for good quality work is important to these families. It is important to these projects, and it is important to this Nation.

I commend the chairman for reporting this bill to the floor with these provisions in it, to ensure that we continue to grow and strengthen the middle class in this country.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. For over 75 years Davis-Bacon has guaranteed that hard-working Americans working on federal construction projects will be paid a livable wage. I am pleased that the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007 includes Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provisions and requires that prevailing wage rules be applied to all projects financed in whole or in part through State Revolving Fund programs (SRFs). I vehemently oppose any and all efforts that are intended to strip the prevailing wage provision and undermine the long-standing tradition of Davis-Bacon.

The Water Quality Financing Act of 2007 will be one of approximately 70 Federal laws that include a Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision. Throughout these laws Davis-Bacon has infused fairness into Federal contract work; and it has protected contractors and workers from unjust treatment and unfair competition.

As more and more families struggle to pay the bills, it is critical now more than ever that we ensure hard-working Americans earn a livable wage.

On a bipartisan basis Congress has historically stood together in support of Davis-Bacon, recognizing the obligation that we have to ensure that Americans are paid a livable wage and to ensure the government does not operate to undermine those wages. As we consider H.R. 720 today we again have a moral obligation to stand up and set the example for how workers should be treated and the standard by which they should be compensated.

GOVERNMENT PROJECTS BENEFIT FROM A PREVAILING WAGE PROVISION

The Water Quality Financing Act of 2007 addresses the critical need that we have to build, upgrade and repair this nation's waste water infrastructure. Davis-Bacon ensures that we hire the best people to do this important work.

Requiring that employers pay the local prevailing wage encourages them to hire qualified and highly skilled workers. This in turn results in a higher quality of work and higher productivity; it leads to less waste; it reduces the need for supervision; and fewer mistakes are made which require corrective action.

The fact is that Davis-Bacon helps ensure that projects are completed on time and in the long-term require less rehabilitation and repair. Thanks to decent work standards, these projects don't suffer staggering delays and taxpayers do not have to shoulder additional and unintended costs produced by the delays or a substandard work product.

DAVIS-BACON HELPS LOCAL BUSINESSES

Davis-Bacon furthers the viability of local businesses who want to compete for government contracts. The Act protects local employers from cutthroat competition that results from fly-by-night firms who try to undercut local wages and working conditions and who unfairly compete with local contractors.

PREVAILING WAGES

It's important to remember what a prevailing wage is. A prevailing wage is defined as the weighted average of all the wage rates paid to laborers or mechanics in the same classification in the same locality. It is literally the wage that prevails in the local market. The government, when making contracts, should respect those prevailing rates. The government should not be in the business of using taxpayer funds to drive down wages in a locality.

DEFEATING PRESIDENT BUSH'S REPEAL OF DAVIS-BACON

We've seen efforts to undermine the nation's wage laws time and time again and defeated them time and time again. Two years ago Congress successfully defeated President Bush's attempts to repeal Davis-Bacon during the rebuilding of the Gulf Coast after Hurricane Katrina. At a time when the victims of the hurricane had lost everything—their homes, their belongings, even family members—some political forces thought it would be a good idea to also cut their wages. In a bipartisan effort, Congress stood together and convinced the President to abandon his efforts; in doing so we ensured that those rebuilding the Gulf would be justly compensated for their hard work. I'm proud of the fact that support for Davis-Bacon has always been on a bipartisan basis—and I expect such bipartisan support for this fundamental worker protection will prevail again today.

Madam Chairman, it is time for us to once again stand up for the rights and the dignity of workers across this country. Let's continue the tradition that began over 75 years ago—support the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provisions contained within the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I only have one remaining speaker. May I inquire if the gentleman has multiple speakers remaining.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBERSTAR. And the gentleman has only one speaker remaining?

Mr. BAKER. Correct, sir.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE).

Mr. HARE. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

When I met with local economic development administration officials in Moline, Illinois, over the February recess, reauthorizing and ensuring adequate funding for the State revolving loan fund was stated as the number one need that these administrators had in assisting the rural communities in my district. We all know that the ability to process and treat wastewater, as

well as provide clean water to a community, is the biggest challenge to economic development. In an area hard hit by offshoring and outsourcing of jobs, this assistance is critical to the 17th Congressional District of Illinois.

The Clean Water Revolving Fund is a top priority of the Democrats, and it authorizes $14 billion for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities and other water pollution abatement projects.

In addition, this bill renews the requirement that contractors and subcontractors on wastewater treatment projects constructed with assistance from the State revolving funds be paid at least the prevailing local wage rate, as determined under the Davis-Bacon Act. By guaranteeing payment of the prevailing local wage rate, Davis-Bacon provides a better standard of living.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Water Quality Financing Act to address your constituents' clean water needs and to uphold these important labor standards.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Water Quality Financing Act, an act that is essential for our country.

For the past 4 years, the water quality needs of our Nation's communities and my constituents have been neglected. Rural communities along the Texas-Mexican border in my district do not have the resources or the financial capacity to renovate existing water treatment plans and to construct sewage management systems.

These are basic issues in our country where people are still having difficulty getting access to potable water.

I have already heard from the small cities of Sabinal, Clint, Fort Stockton, Presidio, and Fort Hancock, Texas, all of which are in desperate need of assistance with their wastewater management. These and many other communities stand to benefit significantly from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.

This legislation will authorize a significant increase in funding for the fund, allowing these communities, like those in my district and throughout this country, to secure loans and begin work on the water improvement programs that are needed for our citizens.

I ask you to support this specific legislation that allows these individuals to be able to get access to good, potable water.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, let me thank the chairman for his leadership and the chairwoman of the subcommittee, Eddie Bernice Johnson, for her leadership.

Texas, under the President's budget, lost $18 million, and with the restoration of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund of $14 billion, we will see now the possibility of the restoration of $49,413,000, a total that we had in the 2007 funding level and going up.

I know what it is like to deal with communities that do not have clean water. Bordersville in Houston, Texas, now has the opportunity to engage and use these dollars to build this community and develop clean water. The EPA recognizes that we have had difficulty across America and water crises and bad water.

This bill makes a good statement. It also makes the positive statement on prevailing wages. There simply is no excuse to not give people a living wage, and that is what prevailing wages are all about.

I want to thank my colleagues for recognizing that water is the source of life and the importance of making sure that the 34 percent cut by this Republican Congress in years past now needs to be amended and fixed. Today we fix it.

I rise in support of H.R. 720, and I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the "Water Quality Financing Act of 2007," which authorizes $14 billion over four years for the clean water State Revolving Fund (SRF) for fiscal years 2008 through 2011. This bill will go a long way toward restoring the $18 million cut in Texas share of the SRF.

Under the SRF program, the Environmental Protection Agency provides grants to States, and the States provide matching funds to establish a low-cost loan program to enable communities to upgrade wastewater treatment systems.

Madam Chairman, the Administration has not sought reauthorization for the revolving fund, preferring to turn the revolving fund into a self-sustaining loan program that is replenished by interest payments made on loans.

H.R. 720 reauthorizes the program at an annual funding level of $4 billion per year, well above the level of $1 billion contained in the fiscal year 2007 appropriations bill for EPA currently working its way through Congress.

The bill would extend repayment periods for revolving fund loans up to 30 years, require a State to use part of its funding to provide subsidies for disadvantaged communities, and authorize $75 million annually in technical assistance to rural and small wastewater treatment projects.

H.R. 720 also directs the Government Accountability Office to study potential revenue sources to set up a Clean Water Trust Fund and encourage communities to consider "green infrastructure" such as the use of rain gardens to collect storm water runoff. The bill also uses water quality benefits and a watershed approach as the criteria to prioritize which projects receive funding.

Madam Chairman, it is no exaggeration to state that the Clean Water Act is the Nation's most successful environmental law. But the continued high quality of the Nation's water supplies is imperiled because over the past six years the Congress has not invested enough funding to replace or repair the aging and deteriorating wastewater infrastructure.

The State revolving fund's steady source of Federal funding ran out when reauthorization expired in 1994. Since then, Congress has been unable to get any bills affecting the fund through the House or the Senate because of disputes over Davis-Bacon Act requirements that local prevailing wages be paid on projects receiving Federal funds. Instead, Congress has been appropriated funds for the SRF on an annual basis, but at declining levels. The lack of a steady, dependable source of funding has had a detrimental effect on the ability of water management agencies to repair, build, and upgrade the Nation's water quality infrastructure. It puts at risk the Nation's clean water.

Madam Chairman, according to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO), there is a "funding gap" of $300 billion to $500 billion over 20 years between what is needed and what is actually spent on our water quality infrastructure. Without a Federal recommitment to clean water, the costs of maintaining existing and aging infrastructure further stressed by ever increasing population and industrial demands, as well as new and costly Clean Water Act requirements must be borne at the local level.

Madam Chairman, the needs of municipalities, counties, and towns have simply outgrown the funding levels of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF). The SRF program has been under siege since 2004, plummeting from $1.35 billion in 2004 to less than $700 million proposed for 2007. A dedicated source of Federal funding must be identified to assure adequate and continued financial assistance to municipalities to meet the goals of the Federal water quality program. H.R. 720 takes a major step in this direction and provides a significant down payment on the investment that must be made to ensure the quality of the Nation's water supply.

Madam Chairman, I support the objectives of establishing a Clean Water Trust fund. Such a dedicated trust fund for clean water will ensure that infrastructure modernization and maintenance remains a priority and will secure the long-term viability of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF), while also adding a significant grant component to help communities fully achieve the goals of the Clean Water Act.

I also support expanded eligibility under the SRF for water conservation measures. This would enable consumers to make more efficient use of treated water, including incentives for the modification, retirement, replacement of customer-owned water-using equipment, appliances, plumbing fixtures, and landscape materials. Saving water through improved efficiency can lessen the need to withdraw ground or surface water supplies for municipal or industrial demands. Strategic use of water conservation not only helps save the Nation's water resources but also can help extend the value and life of both water supply and wastewater treatment infrastructure, extending the beneficial investment of public funds.

Finally, Madam Chairman, I strongly support the Davis-Bacon provisions in H.R. 720 requiring that workers on projects funded through the SRF not be paid less than the prevailing wage. By guaranteeing payment of the prevailing local wage rate, Davis-Bacon provides

a better standard of living and economic security for these workers.

Madam Chairman, Davis-Bacon ''prevailing wage'' standards are set by scientific surveys of actual wages paid in local communities. Accordingly, Davis-Bacon wages in lower-cost areas such as rural communities and small towns are closely tied to existing local wages and therefore ensure a reasonable wage comparable to those earned by other workers in that community. Obviously, the prevailing wage rates in higher-cost areas such as major urban centers are higher because the average wage and cost-of-living are higher. Moreover, in 1981, the implementing regulations for Davis-Bacon were specifically amended to prohibit the Department of Labor from using wage data collected in urban areas to make a prevailing wage determination in a nearby rural county.

Madam Chairman, I will strongly oppose any amendments by the minority to eliminate, weaken, or alter the Davis-Bacon provisions within this legislation. These are the latest in a long history of Republican attacks on the Davis-Bacon Act and the protections it provides to workers. Not only have three Republican presidents temporarily suspended the Act, but many of Republican colleagues have sought to repeal it altogether.

For all of these reasons, I strongly support H.R. 720 and urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for its adoption by the House. I also call upon my colleagues to oppose any amendments to weaken this critical legislation that will address the real needs of the American people.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I wish to express sincere and deep appreciation to the gentlewoman who is the Chair of the Water Resources Subcommittee and, of course, to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBERSTAR. In thinking back over my tenure on the committee, it really is hard to remember a time when there has been significant partisan difference. It truly is one of the committees of the House that works in a unified way and produces a consistent, unified voice.

We share the vision that America's infrastructure is the key to our Nation's economic future and that where infrastructure is damaged or inadequate, economies lag behind, employment is high, and circumstances are not good. So we really are joined here together in an effort to do what we believe is right and best for communities we represent.

In this one instance, we find ourselves on the opposite side of a policy which has, over time, divided this Congress, the requirement by government to tell those engaged in a business endeavor what you should pay your employees in meeting essential public need.

It is clear to me that in my home State, the economic dislocations because of the tragic storms is immense and widespread and felt deeply and unfortunately will be likely felt for many years to come. We all know that there aren't sufficient resources to solve every problem in every community and certainly not even in our own State. Despite the generosity of the American people and this Congress, there will be billions of dollars of unmet need.

The question, as we go to Dr. Boustany's district in southwest Louisiana to a small, small rural parish in Cameron, where there isn't even a municipality, where after the storm's terrible surge went across the land, you could stand on the northern edge of the parish and look all the way to the gulf coast and not see a structure standing. We don't have enough money to build it all back. We can't even tell people even when we are likely to build it back, but we are going to send some money, now in the form of a State revolving fund intended for the restructuring and rebuilding of critical water infrastructure.

What are we going to do with that $10? Are we going to artificially increase the cost of that project just to make it more difficult for rural Cameron parish to recover? I don't think we really want or intend to do that, but that is the consequence of this provision in this bill. It makes recovery more difficult. It will take recovery longer. It will cost more to build less.

We all pride ourselves in America on our strong free enterprise beliefs. Let's turn free enterprise loose. Let's let Louisiana rebuild. Let's do it in the most efficient and expeditious way possible. Let's strike Davis-Bacon provisions from this bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time, which should be about a minute.

Again, I express my great appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the ranking member on the full committee, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), who I have the greatest respect for, and I recall his distinguished and authoritative presentation during the committee tour post-Katrina at Baton Rouge where the gentleman had a mastery of the facts of the issues at hand, and we stood in solidarity and we do stand in solidarity on this legislation.

We have one difference of opinion. That is why we have a legislative body and a process through which to work these issues out, and as the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, said very thoughtfully many years ago, something like 60 years ago, We can agree to disagree without being disagreeable, and that is the manner in which I hope we will continue to conduct issues before our committee.

I just think back to the time when I worked, when I was in college working in construction jobs, and I was working as a truck driver and cement puddler for 50 cents below what was a union wage, below what was a standard wage, because this wasn't a unionized job, and I don't want to see that happen to anybody.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I submit the following exchange of letters between Mr. RANGEL, Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and me.

MARCH 6, 2007.

Hon. JAMES OBERSTAR,
Chairman, Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: I am writing regarding H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007, which is scheduled for floor action later this week.

As you know, H.R 720 raises revenue by increasing vessel tonnage duties, an authority which falls within the jurisdiction ofthe Committee on Ways and Means. In addition, H.R. 720 violates clause 5(a) of Rule XXI, which restricts bills and amendments from carrying taxes and tariffs not reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

In order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill, and will not oppose H.R. 720 being given a waiver of Rule XXI. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation in the future.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confining this understanding with respect to H.R. 720, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the record.

Sincerely,

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman.

MARCH 8, 2007.

Hon. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RANGEL: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the consideration of H.R. 720, ''the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007''. Your support for this legislation and your assistance in ensuring its timely consideration are greatly appreciated.

I agree that section 601 of H.R. 720, as reported, is of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Ways and Means. I acknowledge that, by foregoing a sequential referral, your Committee is not relinquishing its jurisdiction and I will fully support your request to be represented in a House-Senate conference on those provisions over which the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction in H.R. 720.

I value your cooperation and look forward to working with you as we move ahead with this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.,
Chairman.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chairman, I sadly rise today to oppose this Important legislation. Unfortunately, in a kickback to Unions, the Majority has decided to include in this legislation provisions that will drive up the cost of state water projects and are particularly harmful to small rural communities.

As a New Mexican, I know the critical role water plays in economic expansion and the daily need of our citizens. We in New Mexico struggle to find good clean water for our communities. The reauthorization of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund Program is an important step to meeting the needs of my communities.

Communities in my district like Columbus, New Mexico, a small community of 1700 people which has no clean running water in its community, is desperate for assistance from a

program like the one we will authorize today. Sadly, the majority has decided that this poor community should have foisted upon it Federal Davis-Bacon requirements which were never intended to be applied to non-Federal funds. Instead of helping communities get clean water projects the majority has decided to inflate the cost of these projects with unnecessary provisions that will result in fewer clean water projects, fewer jobs and less clean water.

I don't understand how the inclusion of these provisions that inflate costs will benefit the small rural communities who can barely afford clean water projects in the first place. Sadly, those provisions prevent me from supporting this otherwise good legislation.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Chairman, I rise today to support the Baker amendment and to oppose the underlying bill, H.R. 720.

I had hoped to support this legislation, which would allow States and municipalities to build water treatment plants and other necessary infrastructure.

Unfortunately, our friends in the Democratic majority have taken away the rights of States and municipalities by forcing them to comply with Federal Davis-Bacon requirements, which waste taxpayer dollars by inflating construction costs.

My state of Florida does not have a state prevailing wage law. This legislation would force small, rural communities in my district and throughout Florida to pay vastly inflated Federal prevailing wages to build these critical infrastructure projects. Studies have shown that Davis-Bacon inflates the cost of construction by up to 38 percent in rural areas.

I cannot support imposing the antiquated Davis-Bacon requirements on my local communities—wasting their hard-earned tax dollars on inflated construction costs. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation, and yes to the Baker Amendment.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the "Water Quality Financing Act of 2007." As we all know, H.R. 720 will reauthorize the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and provide $14 billion in funding for the program over the next four years. The bill provides technical assistance to rural and small municipalities for the purpose of assisting them in the planning, developing, and acquisition of financing for wastewater infrastructure assistance. The bill also provides technical assistance and training for rural and small publicly owned treatment works and decentralized wastewater treatment systems to enable such treatment works and systems to protect water quality and achieve and maintain compliance with the bill's requirements. Equally important, the bill will disseminate information to rural and small municipalities and municipalities that meet the affordability criteria established under section 603(i)(2) by the State in which the municipality is located with respect to planning, design, construction, and operation of publicly owned treatment works and decentralized wastewater treatment systems.

With 20 percent of the country's population living in rural communities, it's critical that we address their infrastructure needs including access to clean water, working sewers, electricity, and other necessities. For more than a decade, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund has been integral to State's and localities in their effort to deal with critical clean water infrastructure needs.

As a community, our progress must be judged not by the status of our most fortunate members of society, but by that of our most challenged members. That is why I am committed to fighting for the resources needed to ensure a better standard of living for all Colonia residents, why I voted in favor of H.R. 720, and why I co-founded and currently am Chairman of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus. I founded the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus to advocate for legislation and policy changes that: expand the availability of safe and affordable housing—both for purchase and for rental—in Rural America; eliminate substandard housing in Rural America; and especially to address the infrastructure needs of Rural America, including providing access to clean water, working sewers, electricity, and other necessities. This bill is an important step toward meeting the goals of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

There are more than 350,000 people who struggle in the unacceptable living conditions of the Colonias every day. Many Colonias do not have sewer systems. Instead, residents must rely on alternative, often inadequate wastewater disposal methods. Surveys of Colonias in El Paso and the Rio Grande Valley show that 50.7 percent of the households use septic tanks, 36.4 percent use cesspools, 7.4 percent use outhouses, and 5.5 percent use other means to dispose of wastewater. Septic tank systems, which in some circumstances may provide adequate wastewater disposal, often pose problems because they are too small or improperly installed and can overflow.

Even if the colonias had adequate sewer systems, the border area lacks sufficient facilities to treat wastewater. According to a summary report by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), wastewater treatment capacity along the U.S.-Mexico border has been inadequate for the past decade. In many places, there are no treatment facilities at all. Consequently, border communities often discharge untreated or inadequately treated wastewater into rivers, canals and arroyos (a creek or stream), which then flow into the Gulf of Mexico. In the Nuevo Laredo/Laredo area alone, 27 million gallons of untreated waste-water are discharged directly into the Rio Grande each day, contributing to ecological and aesthetic degradation, economic loss and threats to public health. Securing potable water also presents a challenge to Colonia residents. Many must buy water by the bucket or drum to meet their daily needs or use wells that may be contaminated.

According to The Colonias Factbook, a Texas Department of Human Services survey of living conditions in rural areas of South and West Texas border counties, 23.7 percent of the households did not have treated water in the house. Because of this, the survey found, untreated water was used by 12.8 percent of households to wash dishes, 13.1 percent to wash clothes, 12.3 percent to bathe and 4.9 percent to cook.

A 1995 Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) study estimates that 428 colonias with about 81,000 people are in need of potable water facilities, and 1,195 colonias with about 232,000 people need wastewater treatment facilities. The TWDB estimates it would cost more than $424 million to build the water and wastewater facilities needed in the 23 counties surveyed.

In my district, these issues are increased by the low-incomes and housing quality problems suffered by my constituents. According to the 2000 Census, the median income for persons living in the 15th district was $26,840. There are more than 7,500 households that lack complete plumbing facilities. Crowding is a problem as more than 15 percent of all occupied housing units are crowded (i.e., more than one person per room).

The battle to improve every Colonia in South Texas will require enormous resources and support from program partners, community residents, and especially the Federal Government. This is a battle we must win, and I know we will win. The problems in the Colonias are not just the Colonias' problems, but they are the State's problems they are the Nation's problems—and they are our problems.

Passage of today's legislation will go a long way toward improving the quality of life of residents of the Colonias and towards attaining the goals of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

Rest assured that I will continue to fight for legislation, regulations and programs that understand the needs of Colonia and all rural residents. I will fight to fund programs that educate Colonia residents and empower them with the tools needed to live not for today, but for every day.

Where there is a will, there is a way. And as we say in my district and around the world—Si Se Puede!

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007. This bill is the third water bill brought to the floor this week. These three bills are filled with excessive spending, propose no way to pay for the increased spending, create duplicative bureaucracies, and impose requirements leading to inefficiencies that will lead taxpayers to getting less work for each Federal dollar spent. H.R. 720 is fiscally irresponsible.

The fact is, Madam Chairman, we already have a program in operation designed to help State and local communities with water and sewer projects—The State Revolving Fund (SRF). The SRF is a fiscally responsible program that provides Federal assistance through loans and other cost-sharing arrangements to help States assist municipalities with high priority projects. I support the SRF and believe it strikes an appropriate balance between Federal and State responsibility with respect to improving water systems in communities across the country. While today's bill authorizes SRF funding, the Congressional Budget Office has determined that in total the bill will actually suck about $49 million over 5 years away from the SRF to be used in two new and less effective grant programs created in H.R. 720. Unlike SRF funds, these no-strings-attached grants do not have to be repaid and, in my estimation, will encourage States and municipalities to rely too heavily on Federal funding for improving their communities.

Unfortunately, creating more government bureaucracy and undermining an existing loan program is not even the worst of this bill. H.R. 720 also amounts to a kickback to special interest labor unions. This bill imposes on States costly Davis-Bacon labor rules. Democrats are telling the American taxpayers that inserting special provisions for their political base is more important than fiscal responsibility. Under Davis-Bacon, any project funded

through this bill will cost American taxpayers a 15 percent surcharge. This mandate effectively reduces the number of projects that can be completed under H.R. 720 by 15 percent. Adding a 15 percent surcharge will only serve to delay projects addressing water supply shortages and sewage treatment problems. The Davis-Bacon provision also discriminates against smaller—often minority owned—businesses that don't have the means to comply with its owner requirements.

Finally, Madam Chairman, H.R. 720 raises taxes—$256 million over 5 years.

In short, today's bill is an excellent case study for the new Democratic Majority's priorities: More expensive bureaucracy, a kickback to labor at taxpayers' expense, creation of duplicative government programs, and a hidden tax increase on ordinary Americans.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 720.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of the Water Quality Financing Act, H.R. 720, and I commend Chairman OBERSTAR for working so hard to bring it to the floor today.

This bill reauthorizes the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, a necessary program providing low-interest loans to communities for construction of wastewater treatment facilities and other water projects.

H.R. 720 authorizes $14 billion over the next 4 years for the fund, which will go a long way toward helping America's cities and towns fix their wastewater infrastructure.

This is a critical program. Since it was created in 1987, the fund has partnered with local and State governments to drastically improve America's water quality.

As a result of dramatic improvements in wastewater infrastructure due in part to this fund, discharges of waste into the environment have decreased by one-half since the early 1970's.

In my home State of New Jersey, the fund has been enormously helpful. New Jersey was granted almost $2 billion during fiscal years 1987 through 2005, almost all of which was used for wastewater treatment projects. This much-needed funding has been instrumental in helping my State keep its water clean and its citizens safe and healthy.

The fact is: This bill is long overdue.

We know all too well that progress cannot be achieved on the cheap. If we want clean water for ourselves and future generations, we must invest in it.

The longer we wait, the more degraded our systems get.

I urge my colleagues to vote. "yes" on this bill today.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to express my support for H.R. 720 and my strong opposition to the amendment that seeks to remove Davis-Bacon wage protections from the bill. Addressing the Nation's urgent wastewater infrastructure needs by strengthening and recapitalizing the Clean Water State Revolving Fund is critically important. Retaining the requirement that workers be paid the local prevailing wage will help ensure that these projects yield the greatest benefit to the communities they are meant to help.

Davis-Bacon not only guarantees that workers receive a fair wage; it helps ensure the quality of the work because it removes the incentive for hiring less qualified workers for a job. Paying prevailing wages also means that businesses and workers in the community where the work is taking place have a fair shot at getting the job and are less likely to be undercut by contractors who bid lower but then cut corners. A well-built project at a fair price should be our goal—not the cheapest possible job where workers' qualifications and quality of work may be compromised.

I want to congratulate Chairman OBERSTAR on moving this critical bill through the committee and to the floor in such a timely fashion. I am very proud to be a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and to be able to tell my constituents that help in upgrading our wastewater systems is on the way.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Chairman, I am here today because one of our most precious natural resources is under siege. As the world's largest freshwater system, the Great Lakes provide food, recreation, and drinking water for nearly 40 million people. Yet with each day, our water grows more contaminated with sewage discharged from municipalities along the lakes.

Nearly 24 billion gallons of sewage are dumped into the Great Lakes each year. While cities like Milwaukee have begun to reduce the amounts of sewage they discharge, not enough is being done to terminate this harmful practice. Detroit, for example, dumps 13.2 billion gallons of sewage per year into the lakes. This has a devastating effect on the region's tourism sector. Studies estimate an economic loss of roughly $8,000 per day as a result of closing a Lake Michigan beach due to pollution. In 2005, sewage discharges contributed to the nearly 3,000 Great Lakes' beach closures, an increase of 5 percent over the previous year. In my own district, there were 150 beach closures in just 92 days of summer in 2004. This is unacceptable.

For years, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund has helped to fund billions of dollars worth of water quality projects, but Federal funding for this program is declining. The Environmental Protection Agency and the Government Accountability Office estimated a $500 billion shortfall in clean water infrastructure investment over the next two decades. The important legislation in front of us would increase the authorization for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, which is imperative if we want to escape this massive shortfall. I had proposed an amendment establishing an added financing mechanism while also adding significant incentive for States and cities to eliminate their pollution into the Great Lakes.

The Kirk amendment would have set a date certain, 2027, to end sewage dumping directly into the Great Lakes by increasing fines for dumping to $100,000 per violation, per day. The next 20 years would allow municipalities to upgrade their sewage system and ensure a level playing field for all communities along the Great Lakes. This would not affect any current dumping restrictions or regulation. The amendment further would have established a Great Lakes clean-up fund within the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, to which all sewage dumping penalties would be directed. Funds would be used to spur projects to improve wastewater discharges and protect the water quality of our lakes with a special focus on greener options such as habitat protection and wetland restoration.

This amendment would have also required both cities and the EPA to publicly report dumping levels of sewage a year after enactment. Currently there is no uniform standard for public disclosure of wastewater violations. It is imperative that we understand the extent of the problem we are facing, and that education begins with public disclosure of all dumping into the Great Lakes.

With the growing populations living along the American and Canadian shores of the Great Lakes, it is appropriate to set a date that gives cities the time to make needed changes to their infrastructure to prohibit sewage dumping in the Great Lakes. We must preserve Great Lakes beaches, maintain the region's economic growth and protect the nation's largest supply of drinking water.

Madam Chairman, I support this bill in its current form. It would have been a better bill had the congressional leadership allowed the Kirk amendment to be considered. I do not understand why the House Democratic Leadership opposes setting a deadline to ban sewage dumping in Lake Michigan and other Great Lakes. By blocking my amendment, the congressional leadership missed a key opportunity to protect our environment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007 because it restores much-needed funding for our Nation's wastewater infrastructure, and establishes a mechanism to finally bring Arizona its fair share of Federal funds.

For nearly three decades, the Federal Government has short-changed Arizona on wastewater infrastructure. Instead of allocating funds based on needs it has inequitably and inexplicably continued to use 1970 Census data as a part of its allocation formula.

Since 1970, our State has more than tripled in population. As a result, we have become the victims of an alarming disparity.

Arizona currently ranks 10th in need, and 20th in population, but only 38th in receipt of Federal funding for Clean Water State Revolving Funds.

On a per capita basis, Arizona ranks 53rd. We are dead-last. Even the territories do better then we do. This is unfair, and needs to change.

Fortunately, H.R. 720 will begin that process. It lays the groundwork for a transition away from the current, inequitable, allocation formula, and toward a new formula based on need.

Of course, the House is not the last word on this. The Senate will have its say as well. Fortunately, our state has a great champion in our distinguished Senator JON KYL. He has been a leader on this issue, and many other water issues, and I know he will fight to ensure that Arizona gets what it deserves as this bill works its way through the Senate. And when, I hope, this bill goes to conference, I look forward to working with Senator KYL, for the good of our State.

Before I conclude, I want to express my gratitude to our chairman, JAMES OBERSTAR. His mastery of transportation issues is exceeded only by his fairness, his willingness to listen, and his incredible ability to bring people together. It has been an honor to work with him on this bill, and I look forward to working with him as it continues its way through Congress.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 720, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007. After 12 long years of little to no legislation supporting the environment, I am happy to stand up today to support a week of great environmental bills.

In celebration of Clean Environment Week in this House, the Democratic majority has brought forward three bills that will be good for the environment, good for the economy, and good for the people of New York and the rest of the Nation.

This bill, H.R. 720, will reauthorize the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund. The goal of this bill is to provide money to local governments in order for cities and towns across the country to improve and renovate their clean water infrastructure. The communities that will be using this money are extremely supportive of this bill.

The Clean Water Fund is essential to help States and municipalities make critical upgrades to their water infrastructure systems. In turn, these investments ensure clean water and foster economic development.

One of the most successful environmental programs in our Nation's history was the Clean Water Act of 1972. In the 35 years that it has been in existence, the Clean Water Act has helped to ensure that the water we drink as well as the bodies of water that we enjoy in nature will be clean and safe for use.

H.R. 720 will allow us to continue receiving the benefits of the Clean Water Act. It authorizes up to $20 billion over the next 5 years to keep our water and our environment clean.

Another bill we supported this week is H.R. 569, legislation to boost sewer overflow controls. This bill will authorize $1.8 billion over 5 years to prevent combined sewer overflow. Sewer overflow affects over 750 municipalities across the country.

During a heavy rainstorm, inadequate sewer facilities and infrastructure can easily overflow, causing major health concerns as well as an environmental mess. Madam Chairman, nobody here wants to see what happens when a sewer overflows into bodies of water around our neighborhoods. Yet Congress has done nothing to combat this problem over the past decade, despite a desperate need for action.

The total cost for fixing combined sewer systems across the country has been estimated to be about $50 billion. We cannot expect small towns and local governments to be able to pay for this renovation by themselves. And this problem is not lessening. Every year, we see antiquated sewer systems backing up and outdated infrastructure crumbling. The problem is getting worse, and the longer we wait, the more we will have to pay to fix it.

Combined sewer backups are likely to occur in 37 States and the District of Columbia. My home State of New York is one of the 37 States affected. The 17th District of New York straddles the Hudson River, which can flood under heavy rain conditions. Madam Chairman, I for one do not want to wait until we have sewers backing up in our own backyard before we take action. We have waited long enough, and passing H.R. 569 was a good first step in fixing these aging sewer systems.

For all these reasons, I support H.R. 720, and I would encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 110–36, is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

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

H.R. 720

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act may be cited as the ''Water Quality Financing Act of 2007''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Amendment of Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

TITLE I—TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE

Sec. 101. Technical assistance.
Sec. 102. State management assistance.
Sec. 103. Watershed pilot projects.

TITLE II—CONSTRUCTION OF TREATMENT WORKS

Sec. 201. Sewage collection systems.
Sec. 202. Treatment works defined.
Sec. 203. Policy on cost effectiveness.

TITLE III—STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING FUNDS

Sec. 301. General authority for capitalization grants.
Sec. 302. Capitalization grant agreements.
Sec. 303. Water pollution control revolving loan funds.
Sec. 304. Allotment of funds.
Sec. 305. Intended use plan.
Sec. 306. Annual reports.
Sec. 307. Technical assistance.
Sec. 308. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Definition of treatment works.
Sec. 402. Funding for Indian programs.

TITLE V—STUDIES

Sec. 501. Study of long-term, sustainable, clean water funding.
Sec. 502. Feasibility study of supplemental and alternative clean water funding mechanisms.

TITLE VI—TONNAGE DUTIES

Sec. 601. Tonnage duties.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

TITLE I—TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 101. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL AND SMALL TREATMENT WORKS.—Section 104(b) (33 U.S.C. 1254(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) make grants to nonprofit organizations—

''(A) to provide technical assistance to rural and small municipalities for the purpose of assisting, in consultation with the State in which the assistance is provided, such municipalities in the planning, developing, and acquisition of financing for eligible projects described in section 603(c);

''(B) to provide technical assistance and training for rural and small publicly owned treatment works and decentralized wastewater treatment systems to enable such treatment works and systems to protect water quality and achieve and maintain compliance with the requirements of this Act; and

''(C) to disseminate information to rural and small municipalities and municipalities that meet the affordability criteria established under section 603(i)(2) by the State in which the municipality is located with respect to planning, design, construction, and operation of publicly owned treatment works and decentralized wastewater treatment systems.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 104(u) (33 U.S.C. 1254(u)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and (6)'' and inserting ''(6)''; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''; and (7) not to exceed $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012 for carrying out subsections (b)(3) and (b)(8), except that not less than 20 percent of the amounts appropriated pursuant to this paragraph in a fiscal year shall be used for carrying out subsection (b)(8)''.

(c) SMALL FLOWS CLEARINGHOUSE.—Section 104(q)(4) (33 U.S.C. 1254(q)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking ''$1,000,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000''; and

(2) in the second sentence by striking ''1986'' and inserting ''2009''.

(d) COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING GRANTS.—Section 104 (33 U.S.C. 1254(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(w) COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING GRANTS.—The Administrator shall establish procedures that, to the maximum extent practicable, promote competition and openness in the award of grants to nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations under this section.''.

SEC. 102. STATE MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE.

Section 106(a) (33 U.S.C. 1256(a)) is amended—

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

(2) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2007, and $300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012;''.

SEC. 103. WATERSHED PILOT PROJECTS.

(a) PILOT PROJECTS.—Section 122 (33 U.S.C. 1274) is amended—

*(1) in the section heading by striking ''**WET WEATHER**''; and*

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''wet weather discharge'';

(B) in paragraph (2) by striking ''in reducing such pollutants'' and all that follows before the period at the end and inserting ''to manage, reduce, treat, or reuse municipal stormwater, including low-impact development technologies''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) WATERSHED PARTNERSHIPS.—Efforts of municipalities and property owners to demonstrate cooperative ways to address nonpoint sources of pollution to reduce adverse impacts on water quality.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 122(c)(1) is amended by striking ''for fiscal year 2004'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2012''.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 122(d) is amended by striking ''5 years'' and inserting ''10 years''.

TITLE II—CONSTRUCTION OF TREATMENT WORKS

SEC. 201. SEWAGE COLLECTION SYSTEMS.

Section 211 (33 U.S.C. 1291) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and all that follows through ''(a) No'' and inserting the following:

"SEC. 211. SEWAGE COLLECTION SYSTEMS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—No'';

(2) in subsection (b) by inserting ''POPULATION DENSITY.—'' after ''(b)''; and

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(1) REPLACEMENT AND MAJOR REHABILITATION.—Notwithstanding the requirement of subsection (a)(1) concerning the existence of a collection system as a condition of eligibility, a project for replacement or major rehabilitation of a collection system existing on January 1, 2007, shall be eligible for a grant under this title if the project otherwise meets the requirements of subsection (a)(1) and meets the requirement of paragraph (3).

''(2) NEW SYSTEMS.—Notwithstanding the requirement of subsection (a)(2) concerning the existence of a community as a condition of eligibility, a project for a new collection system to serve a community existing on January 1, 2007, shall be eligible for a grant under this title if the project otherwise meets the requirements of subsection (a)(2) and meets the requirement of paragraph (3).

''(3) REQUIREMENT.—A project meets the requirement of this paragraph if the purpose of the project is to accomplish the objectives, goals, and policies of this Act by addressing an adverse environmental condition existing on the date of enactment of this paragraph.''.

SEC. 202. TREATMENT WORKS DEFINED.

Section 212(2)(A) (33 U.S.C. 1292(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''any works, including site'';

(2) by striking ''is used for ultimate'' and inserting ''will be used for ultimate''; and

(3) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and acquisition of other lands, and interests in lands, which are necessary for construction''.

SEC. 203. POLICY ON COST EFFECTIVENESS.

Section 218(a) (33 U.S.C. 1298(a)) is amended by striking ''combination of devices and systems'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''treatment works that meets the requirements of this Act. The system may include water efficiency measures and devices.''.

TITLE III—STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING FUNDS

SEC. 301. GENERAL AUTHORITY FOR CAPITALIZATION GRANTS.

Section 601(a) (33 U.S.C. 1381(a)) is amended by striking ''for providing assistance'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''to accomplish the objectives, goals, and policies of this Act by providing assistance for projects and activities identified in section 603(c).''.

SEC. 302. CAPITALIZATION GRANT AGREEMENTS.

(a) REPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE ASSETS.—Section 602(b)(9) (33 U.S.C. 1382(b)(9)) is amended by striking ''standards'' and inserting ''standards, including standards relating to the reporting of infrastructure assets''.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 602(b) (33 U.S.C. 1382(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (9);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(11) the State will establish, maintain, invest, and credit the fund with repayments, such that the fund balance will be available in perpetuity for providing financial assistance in accordance with this title;

''(12) any fees charged by the State to recipients of assistance will be used for the purpose of financing the cost of administering the fund or financing projects or activities eligible for assistance from the fund;

''(13) beginning in fiscal year 2009, the State will include as a condition of providing assistance to a municipality or intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency that the recipient of such assistance certify, in a manner determined by the Governor of the State, that the recipient—

''(A) has studied and evaluated the cost and effectiveness of innovative and alternative processes, materials, techniques, and technologies for carrying out the proposed project or activity for which assistance is sought under this title, and has selected, to the extent practicable, a project or activity that may result in greater environmental benefits or equivalent environmental benefits when compared to standard processes, materials, techniques, and technologies and more efficiently uses energy and natural and financial resources; and

''(B) has considered, to the maximum extent practical and as determined appropriate by the recipient, the costs and effectiveness of other design, management, and financing approaches for carrying out a project or activity for which assistance is sought under this title, taking into account the cost of operating and maintaining the project or activity over its life, as well as the cost of constructing the project or activity;

''(14) the State will use at least 15 percent of the amount of each capitalization grant received by the State under this title after September 30, 2007, to provide assistance to municipalities of fewer than 10,000 individuals that meet the affordability criteria established by the State under section 603(i)(2) for activities included on the State's priority list established under section 603(g), to the extent that there are sufficient applications for such assistance;

''(15) treatment works eligible under section 603(c)(1) which will be constructed in whole or in part with funds made available under section 205(m) or by a State water pollution control revolving fund under this title, or both, will meet the requirements of, or otherwise be treated (as determined by the Governor of the State) under sections 204(b)(1), 211, 218, and 511(c)(1) in the same manner as treatment works constructed with assistance under title II of this Act;

''(16) a contract to be carried out using funds directly made available by a capitalization grant under this title for program management, construction management, feasibility studies, preliminary engineering, design, engineering, surveying, mapping, or architectural related services shall be negotiated in the same manner as a contract for architectural and engineering services is negotiated under chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code, or an equivalent State qualifications-based requirement (as determined by the Governor of the State); and

''(17) the requirements of section 513 will apply to the construction of treatment works carried out in whole or in part with assistance made available by a State water pollution control revolving fund as authorized under this title, or with assistance made available under section 205(m), or both, in the same manner as treatment works for which grants are made under this Act.''.

SEC. 303. WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS.

(a) PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—Section 603(c) (33 U.S.C. 1383(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—The amounts of funds available to each State water pollution control revolving fund shall be used only for providing financial assistance—

''(1) to any municipality or intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency for construction of publicly owned treatment works;

''(2) for the implementation of a management program established under section 319;

''(3) for development and implementation of a conservation and management plan under section 320;

''(4) for the implementation of lake protection programs and projects under section 314;

''(5) for repair or replacement of decentralized wastewater treatment systems that treat domestic sewage;

''(6) for measures to manage, reduce, treat, or reuse municipal stormwater;

''(7) to any municipality or intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency for measures to reduce the demand for publicly owned treatment works capacity through water conservation, efficiency, or reuse;

''(8) for measures to increase the security of publicly owned treatment works; and

''(9) for the development and implementation of watershed projects meeting the criteria set forth in section 122.''.

(b) EXTENDED REPAYMENT PERIOD.—Section 603(d)(1) (33 U.S.C. 1383(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''20 years'' and inserting ''the lesser of 30 years or the design life of the project to be financed with the proceeds of the loan''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''not later than 20 years after project completion'' and inserting ''upon the expiration of the term of the loan''.

(c) FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY PLAN.—Section 603(d)(1) (33 U.S.C. 1383(d)(1)) is further amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (D); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) for any portion of a treatment works proposed for repair, replacement, or expansion, and eligible for assistance under section 603(c)(1), the recipient of a loan will develop and implement a fiscal sustainability plan that includes—

''(i) an inventory of critical assets that are a part of that portion of the treatment works;

''(ii) an evaluation of the condition and performance of inventoried assets or asset groupings; and

''(iii) a plan for maintaining, repairing, and, as necessary, replacing that portion of the treatment works and a plan for funding such activities;''.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 603(d)(7) (33 U.S.C. 1383(d)(7)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', $400,000 per year, or ⅕ percent per year of the current valuation of the fund, whichever amount is greatest, plus the amount of any fees collected by the State for such purpose regardless of the source''.

(e) TECHNICAL AND PLANNING ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL SYSTEMS.—Section 603(d) (33 U.S.C. 1383(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) to provide owners and operators of treatment works that serve a population of 10,000 or fewer with technical and planning assistance and assistance in financial management, user fee analysis, budgeting, capital improvement planning, facility operation and maintenance, equipment replacement, repair schedules, and other activities to improve wastewater treatment plant management and operations; except that such amounts shall not exceed 2 percent of grant awards to such fund under this title.''.

(f) ADDITIONAL SUBSIDIZATION.—Section 603 (33 U.S.C. 1383) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) ADDITIONAL SUBSIDIZATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which a State provides assistance to a municipality or intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency under subsection (d), the State may provide additional subsidization, including forgiveness of principal and negative interest loans—

''(A) to benefit a municipality that—

''(i) meets the State's affordability criteria established under paragraph (2); or

''(ii) does not meet the State's affordability criteria if the recipient—

''(I) seeks additional subsidization to benefit individual ratepayers in the residential user rate class;

''(II) demonstrates to the State that such ratepayers will experience a significant hardship from the increase in rates necessary to finance the project or activity for which assistance is sought; and

''(III) ensures, as part of an assistance agreement between the State and the recipient, that the additional subsidization provided under this paragraph is directed through a user charge rate system (or other appropriate method) to such ratepayers; or

''(B) to implement an innovative or alternative process, material, technique, or technology (including low-impact technologies nonstructural protection of surface waters, a new or improved method of waste treatment, and nutrient pollutant trading) that may result in greater environmental benefits, or equivalent environmental benefits at reduced cost, when compared to a standard process, material, technique, or technology.

''(2) AFFORDABILITY CRITERIA.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—On or before September 30, 2008, and after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, a State shall establish affordability criteria to assist in identifying municipalities that would experience a significant hardship raising the revenue necessary to finance a project or activity eligible for assistance under section 603(c)(1) if additional subsidization is not provided. Such criteria shall be based on income data, population trends, and other data determined relevant by the State.

''(B) EXISTING CRITERIA.—If a State has previously established, after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, affordability criteria that meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), the State may use the criteria for the purposes of this subsection. For purposes of this Act, any such criteria shall be treated as affordability criteria established under this paragraph.

''(C) INFORMATION TO ASSIST STATES.—The Administrator may publish information to assist States in establishing affordability criteria under subparagraph (A).

''(3) PRIORITY.—A State may give priority to a recipient for a project or activity eligible for funding under section 603(c)(1) if the recipient meets the State's affordability criteria.

''(4) SET-ASIDE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In any fiscal year in which the Administrator has available for obligation more than $1,000,000,000 for the purposes of this title, a State shall provide additional subsidization under this subsection in the amount specified in subparagraph (B) to eligible entities described in paragraph (1) for projects and activities identified in the State's intended use plan prepared under section 606(c) to the extent that there are sufficient applications for such assistance.

''(B) AMOUNT.—In a fiscal year described in subparagraph (A), a State shall set aside for purposes of subparagraph (A) an amount not less than 25 percent of the difference between—

''(i) the total amount that would have been allotted to the State under section 604 for such fiscal year if the amount available to the Administrator for obligation under this title for such fiscal year had been equal to $1,000,000,000; and

''(ii) the total amount allotted to the State under section 604 for such fiscal year.

''(5) LIMITATION.—The total amount of additional subsidization provided under this subsection by a State may not exceed 30 percent of the total amount of capitalization grants received by the State under this title in fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2007.''.

SEC. 304. ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 604(a) (33 U.S.C. 1384(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) ALLOTMENTS.—

''(1) FISCAL YEARS 2008 AND 2009.—Sums appropriated to carry out this title for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009 shall be allotted by the Administrator in accordance with the formula used to allot sums appropriated to carry out this title for fiscal year 2007.

''(2) FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND THEREAFTER.—Sums appropriated to carry out this title for fiscal year 2010 and each fiscal year thereafter shall be allotted by the Administrator as follows:

''(A) Amounts that do not exceed $1,350,000,000 shall be allotted in accordance with the formula described in paragraph (1).

''(B) Amounts that exceed $1,350,000,000 shall be allotted in accordance with the formula developed by the Administrator under subsection (d).''.

(b) PLANNING ASSISTANCE.—Section 604(b) (33 U.S.C. 1384(b)) is amended by striking ''1 percent'' and inserting ''2 percent''.

(c) FORMULA.—Section 604 (33 U.S.C. 1384) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) FORMULA BASED ON WATER QUALITY NEEDS.—Not later than September 30, 2009, and after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, the Administrator shall publish an allotment formula based on water quality needs in accordance with the most recent survey of needs developed by the Administrator under section 516(b).''.

SEC. 305. INTENDED USE PLAN.

(a) INTEGRATED PRIORITY LIST.—Section 603(g) (33 U.S.C. 1383(g)) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) PRIORITY LIST.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2009 and each fiscal year thereafter, a State shall establish or update a list of projects and activities for which assistance is sought from the State's water pollution control revolving fund. Such projects and activities shall be listed in priority order based on the methodology established under paragraph (2). The State may provide financial assistance from the State's water pollution control revolving fund only with respect to a project or activity included on such list. In the case of projects and activities eligible for assistance under section 603(c)(2), the State may include a category or subcategory of nonpoint sources of pollution on such list in lieu of a specific project or activity.

''(2) METHODOLOGY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and after providing notice and opportunity for public comment, each State (acting through the State's water quality management agency and other appropriate agencies of the State) shall establish a methodology for developing a priority list under paragraph (1).

''(B) PRIORITY FOR PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES THAT ACHIEVE GREATEST WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.—In developing the methodology, the State shall seek to achieve the greatest degree of water quality improvement, taking into consideration the requirements of section 602(b)(5) and section 603(i)(3) and whether such water quality improvements would be realized without assistance under this title.

''(C) CONSIDERATIONS IN SELECTING PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.—In determining which projects and activities will achieve the greatest degree of water quality improvement, the State shall consider—

''(i) information developed by the State under sections 303(d) and 305(b);

''(ii) the State's continuing planning process developed under section 303(e);

''(iii) the State's management program developed under section 319; and

''(iv) conservation and management plans developed under section 320.

''(D) NONPOINT SOURCES.—For categories or subcategories of nonpoint sources of pollution that a State may include on its priority list under paragraph (1), the State may consider the cumulative water quality improvements associated with projects or activities in such categories or subcategories.

''(E) EXISTING METHODOLOGIES.—If a State has previously developed, after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, a methodology that meets the requirements of this paragraph, the State may use the methodology for the purposes of this subsection.''.

(b) INTENDED USE PLAN.—Section 606(c) (33 U.S.C. 1386(c)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''each State shall annually prepare'' and inserting ''each State (acting through the State's water quality management agency and other appropriate agencies of the State) shall annually prepare and publish'';

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) the State's priority list developed under section 603(g);'';

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''and (6)'' and inserting ''(6), (15), and (17)''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end;

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

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) if the State does not fund projects and activities in the order of the priority established under section 603(g), an explanation of why such a change in order is appropriate.''.

(c) TRANSITIONAL PROVISION.—Before completion of a priority list based on a methodology established under section 603(g) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as amended by this section), a State shall continue to comply with the requirements of sections 603(g) and 606(c) of such Act, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 306. ANNUAL REPORTS.

Section 606(d) (33 U.S.C. 1386(d)) is amended by inserting ''the eligible purpose under section 603(c) for which the assistance is provided,'' after ''loan amounts,''.

SEC. 307. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Title VI (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 607 as section 608; and

(2) by inserting after section 606 the following:

''SEC. 607. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

''(a) SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall assist the States in establishing simplified procedures for treatment works to obtain assistance under this title.

''(b) PUBLICATION OF MANUAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this section, and after providing notice and opportunity for public comment, the Administrator shall publish a manual to assist treatment works in obtaining assistance under this title and publish in the Federal Register notice of the availability of the manual.

''(c) COMPLIANCE CRITERIA.—At the request of any State, the Administrator, after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, shall assist in the development of criteria for a State to determine compliance with the conditions of funding assistance established under sections 602(b)(13) and 603(d)(1)(E).''.

SEC. 308. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 608 (as redesignated by section 307 of this Act) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

''(1) $2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

''(2) $3,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2009;

''(3) $4,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2010; and

''(4) $5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. DEFINITION OF TREATMENT WORKS.

Section 502 (33 U.S.C. 1362) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(25) TREATMENT WORKS.—The term 'treatment works' has the meaning given that term in section 212.''.

SEC. 402. FUNDING FOR INDIAN PROGRAMS.

Section 518(c) (33 U.S.C. 1377) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Administrator'' and inserting the following:

''(1) FISCAL YEARS 1987–2006.—The Administrator'';

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(A) by inserting ''and ending before October 1, 2006,'' after ''1986,''; and

(B) by striking the second sentence; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND THEREAFTER.—For fiscal year 2007 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Administrator shall reserve, before allotments to the States under section 604(a), not less than 0.5 percent and not more than 1.5 percent of the funds made available to carry out title VI.

''(3) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds reserved under this subsection shall be available only for grants for projects and activities eligible for assistance under section 603(c) to serve—

''(A) Indian tribes;

''(B) former Indian reservations in Oklahoma (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior); and

''(C) Native villages (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602)).''.

TITLE V—STUDIES

SEC. 501. STUDY OF LONG-TERM, SUSTAINABLE, CLEAN WATER FUNDING.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall commence a study of the funding mechanisms and funding sources available to establish a Clean Water Trust Fund.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an analysis of potential revenue sources that can be efficiently collected, are broad based, are related to water quality, and that support the annual funding levels authorized by the amendments made by this Act.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Comptroller General, at a minimum, shall consult with Federal, State, and local agencies, representatives of business and industry, representatives of entities operating publicly owned treatment works, and other interested groups.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2008, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

SEC. 502. FEASIBILITY STUDY OF SUPPLEMENTAL AND ALTERNATIVE CLEAN WATER FUNDING MECHANISMS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall commence a study of funding mechanisms and funding sources potentially available for wastewater infrastructure and other water pollution control activities under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(b) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an analysis of funding and investment mechanisms and revenue sources from other potential supplemental or alternative public or private sources that could be used to fund wastewater infrastructure and other water pollution control activities under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Comptroller General, at a minimum, shall consult with Federal, State, and local agencies, representatives of business, industry, and financial investment entities, representatives of entities operating treatment works, and other interested groups.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2008, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

TITLE VI—TONNAGE DUTIES

SEC. 601. TONNAGE DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 60301 of title 46, United State Code, is amended—

*(1) in the section heading by striking ''**taxes**'' and inserting ''**duties**'';*

(2) by amending subsections (a) and (b) to read as follows:

''(a) LOWER RATE.—

''(1) IMPOSITION OF DUTY.—A duty is imposed at the rate described in paragraph (2) at each entry in a port of the United States of—

''(A) a vessel entering from a foreign port or place in North America, Central America, the West Indies Islands, the Bahama Islands, the Bermuda Islands, or the coast of South America bordering the Caribbean Sea; or

''(B) a vessel returning to the same port or place in the United States from which it departed, and not entering the United States from another port or place, except—

''(i) a vessel of the United States;

''(ii) a recreational vessel (as defined in section 2101 of this title); or

''(iii) a barge.

''(2) RATE.—The rate referred to in paragraph (1) shall be—

''(A) 4.5 cents per ton (but not more than a total of 22.5 cents per ton per year) for fiscal years 2006 through 2007;

''(B) 9.0 cents per ton (but not more than a total of 45 cents per ton per year) for fiscal years 2008 through 2017; and

''(C) 2 cents per ton (but not more than a total of 10 cents per ton per year) for each fiscal year thereafter.

''(b) HIGHER RATE.—

''(1) IMPOSITION OF DUTY.—A duty is imposed at the rate described in paragraph (2) on a vessel at each entry in a port of the United States from a foreign port or place not named in subsection (a)(1).

''(2) RATE.—The rate referred to in paragraph (1) shall be—

''(A) 13.5 cents per ton (but not more than a total of 67.5 cents per ton per year) for fiscal years 2006 through 2007;

''(B) 27 cents per ton (but not more than a total of $1.35 per ton per year) for fiscal years 2008 through 2017, and

''(C) 6 cents per ton (but not more than a total of 30 cents per ton per year) for each fiscal year thereafter.''; and

(3) in subsection (c) by striking ''taxes'' and inserting ''duties''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such title is further amended—

(1) by striking the heading for subtitle VI and inserting the following:

''Subtitle VI—Clearance and Tonnage Duties'';

*(2) in the headings of sections in chapter 603, by striking ''**TAXES**'' each place it appears and inserting ''**DUTIES**'';*

(3) in the heading for subsection (a) of section 60303, by striking ''TAX'' and inserting ''DUTY'';

(4) in the text of sections in chapter 603, by striking ''taxes'' each place it appears and inserting ''duties''; and

(5) in the text of sections in chapter 603, by striking ''tax'' each place it appears and inserting ''duty''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Such title is further amended—

(1) in the title analysis by striking the item relating to subtitle VI and inserting the following:

''VI. CLEARANCE AND TONNAGE DUTIES ..... 60101'';

and

(2) in the analysis for chapter 603—

(A) by striking the items relating to sections 60301 and 60302 and inserting the following:

''60301. Regular tonnage duties.

''60302. Special tonnage duties.'';

and

(B) by striking the item relating to section 60304 and inserting the following:

''60304. Presidential suspension of tonnage duties and light money.''.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110–36.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. STUPAK:

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

SEC. 503. GREAT LAKES WATER QUALITY.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Government of Canada, shall conduct a study of the condition of wastewater treatment facilities located in the United States and Canada that discharge into the Great Lakes.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study, the Administrator shall—

(1) determine the effect that such treatment facilities have on Great Lakes water quality; and

(2) develop recommendations—

(A) to improve water quality monitoring by the operators of such treatment facilities;

(B) to establish a protocol for improved notification and information sharing between the United States and Canada; and

(C) to promote cooperation between the United States and Canada to prevent the discharge of untreated and undertreated waste into the Great Lakes.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Administrator shall consult with the International Joint Commission and Federal, State, and local governments.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study, together with the recommendations developed under subsection (b)(2).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order. I rise today to continue to protect the Great Lakes, as it is the source of drinking water for 45 million people and the recreational and economic livelihood of the region which depends heavily on a healthy Great Lakes.

There are a large number of wastewater facilities in both the United States and Canada that discharge treated and untreated sewer water into the Great Lakes. While these facilities do everything they can to prevent polluting the Great Lakes, there are times

when untreated or undertreated wastewater is released.

Once this pollution occurs, it can be difficult to determine that a wastewater treatment facility is the source, the effects of these discharges on the Great Lakes, and the steps needed to stop the pollution and clean up any damage.

□ 1200

For example, Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada, have faced tremendous problems with E. coli, coliform, and other bacteria in the water near a wastewater treatment facility in Ontario, Canada. These two cities are separated by the St. Mary's River, which connects Lake Superior to Lake Huron.

Under the direction of the EPA, the Chippewa County, Michigan, Health Department has undertaken significant monitoring of the St. Mary's River. The Ontario Ministry of Environment has also begun testing.

However, because there is disagreement about the source of the pollution, there is little to be done to correct the issue. Even though both sides are now beginning to monitor the river, a lack of communication and cooperation still presents a significant roadblock in accomplishing a solution.

My amendment would require the EPA, in consultation with the State Department and the Canadian government, to study wastewater treatment facilities that discharge into the Great Lakes. The study would include recommendations on ways to improve monitoring, information sharing and cooperation between the United States and Canada. The U.S. and Canada must work together to limit harmful wastewater discharges into the Great Lakes.

My amendment will allow the EPA to offer solutions to the notice, protocol and information sharing problems the U.S. and Canada face. By improving monitoring and communication, the U.S. and Canada can work together to solve problems created by wastewater treatment facilities discharging into the Great Lakes. The Congressional Budget Office has indicated there will not be any direct spending as a result of my amendment.

I wish to thank the staff of Transportation and Infrastructure Committee as well as the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee and my personal staff for their assistance in crafting this amendment. I look forward to continuing with them as this legislation moves forward.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I would yield time to the chairman of the full committee if he so chooses to claim time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman very much for his courtesy and if he would yield 3 minutes?

Mr. BAKER. Certainly.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman.

Twenty years ago, March 3, 1987, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Clinger, the Republican ranking member on the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, which I had the privilege of chairing, and I held a hearing on this very subject, on the U.S.-Canada Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. We observed the agreement was signed in 1972 and renewed in 1978.

It continues in perpetuity, but we observed, while progress has been made, while the Cuyahoga River no longer catches on fire, the bad news is that a great deal of that improvement is due to economic decline in the steel industry. Industries that formerly dumped waste are no longer operating.

Fish are able to survive, but now they are surviving with cancers. Some areas of the lakes where birds are deformed because of Toxiphene and Dieldrin. Mr. Clinger and I both observed the real test of our commitment is yet to come. Will we break out of the planning and research cycle, which we have failed to do in the case of acid rain, and begin to implement protective measures which would strengthen the laws and effective remedial programs.

Some of that has been accomplished in the ensuing years. The gentleman's proposal would move us further along during this Great Lakes week that we are celebrating on Capitol Hill with our colleagues throughout the Great Lakes States. The amendment would require the Administrator of EPA, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the governor of Canada, to identify problems with the wastewater infrastructure on both sides of the Great Lakes, develop recommendations for increased notification of overflows and increased cooperation. Those are all good and valid and important initiatives which we have pursued in a bipartisan effort within our committee for, as I said, over 20 years.

The gentleman's district is the bridge between the upper Lake Superior and the lower lakes. The St. Mary's River moves 130,000 cubic feet per second, and he is astutely vigilant over water quality.

I think accepting this amendment will move the purpose of intergovernmental cooperation further along, and I assure the gentlemen on both sides, I will work with the Committee on Foreign Affairs to fashion this bill, this language further as we go to conference with the other body.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I share the comments of our Chairman. I know of no opposition on our side, and I accordingly yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. STUPAK. Let me thank Mr. BAKER and Mr. OBERSTAR for their help in support of this amendment.

Madam Chairman, we do realize we have to make some minor modifications in this amendment, and I look forward to their continued help and support in that direction. I am always amazed at the knowledge of the chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR, as he went back 20 years to recite language.

He was absolutely right about the flow of the St. Mary's river, 130,000 cubic feet per second. I am always amazed at his knowledge of the Great Lakes and his support for the Great Lakes.

All this amendment is saying is that the U.S. and Canada must work together to prevent harmful discharges into the Great Lakes. My amendment will allow the EPA to offer solutions to notice, protocol and information sharing between our two countries in the face of monitoring, communicating and eventually working together to resolve the problems created by waste charge facilities which discharge treated and untreated water into our Great Lakes. Again, no direct spending will result as a result of my amendment or in the CBO, and I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007, I would like to thank my distinguished colleague, Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, JAMES OBERSTAR, and my friend from Michigan, BART STUPAK, for their work on the Great Lakes Water Quality amendment.

This amendment calls for a study to examine the effect that waste water treatment facilities feeding into the Great Lakes are having on the water quality of the largest fresh water system in the world. I want to commend my good friend from Michigan for raising this important issue. I believe, however, that a study of this kind can only be conducted in collaboration with the Department of State, the International Joint Commission, which is a joint U.S.-Canada border commission, and the Government of Canada itself. We must all recognize that this study cannot be completed without cooperation from our friends north of the border. I hope that as this legislation moves through the legislative process we will be able to examine the role that the International Joint Commission can play in I conducting this study and ensuring a bi-national environment open to the research needs of this examination.

I thank Representative STUPAK for bringing this important amendment to the bill. I also wish to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for agreeing to work with the Committee on Foreign Affairs as this legislation moves forward on these issues to ensure the most informative outcome for this important study.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BAKER

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110–36.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BAKER:

Page 12, line 9, insert ''and'' after the semicolon.

Page 12, line 20, strike the semicolon and all that follows before the first period on page 13, line 3.

Page 25, line 3, strike ''(6), (15), and (17)'' and insert ''(6) and (15)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, at this time I would yield 3 minutes to the cosponsor of the amendment, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for working so well together on this amendment.

Madam Chairman, really all this amendment does is it just stops the expansion of the Davis-Bacon, and it says we are not going to move this Davis-Bacon into a revolving fund. That is what the language that is in the underlying bill does, and this amendment simply strikes out the insertion that applies Davis-Bacon.

So what does that really mean is a question that Members need to evaluate when they are thinking about what kinds of services and what kind of work can we get done out there across America. I understand the intensity of the Louisianans here today. They have a lot at stake. That is why we brought this legislation.

In the $14 billion cumulative total that is part of this overall bill, I know, from hands-on experience being a contractor who has bid projects both ways, Davis-Bacon and merit shop, and my average number is a 20 percent increase; there are numbers out there higher and lower, but 20 percent, this bill wastes at least $2.8 billion. That could be projects. That could be projects that are going to help the people in this country.

That money is at least wasted, but then it goes into the revolving fund, and it pollutes the rest of those dollars that are in there. So if I do the calculation on this, we come up with a number, it will be about $280 billion over time; 20 percent of that is $56 billion. So we are not putting just $2.8 billion here into the waste bin; we are putting $56 billion perhaps into the waste bin, Madam Chair, and it keeps us from being able to get these taxpayers' resources into projects that can really help people, especially the people that so desperately need them.

I will tell you from my experience as a contractor who has worked and bid Davis-Bacon projects, I have gone into communities to bid these types of projects and had to do the bid according to the costs that are inflated into them, and had the community look at the overall bid, low bid. And I have been low bid, have had them reject my bid because it was too high; they couldn't afford it. They would pull the bid back, repackage the package without Davis-Bacon, and I could come in there cheaper, as did my competition, the community went without Federal dollars, as this inflated too much.

These communities went without Federal dollars because it was too expensive to use the Federal funding. That ought to tell us something. As they went back and they funded it out, they bonded it out themselves. They pulled it out of taxes. Sometimes they go back and raise private dollars because of the overall inflation that is imposed by this kind of policy. This is the one that goes in perpetuity.

You mark this revolving fund with this bill. And it isn't just these dollars, it is every single dollar that touches it from this day forward on into the future of the United States until some time comes that this Congress gets a grip, gets a hold of itself and decides we can't afford to be putting this on.

I would add also that as you have an employer and an employee, they agree what to work on. I listen to the gentleman, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, say it will keep them from making enough money to pay their health care. No, it is the other way around. It keeps us from hiring employees in year-round jobs where we provide, as the employer, the health care and retirement benefits because we can only afford to use them under these scales just for the job they have. It is inflationary. It is inefficient.

I would ask for a ''yes'' vote on the Baker-King amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

This is an issue on which there is a genuine disagreement on both sides of the aisle and within the committee, and a deeply felt view on each side.

I think it is instructive, however, to look at the history of Davis-Bacon, which originated, actually, in 1927, on Long Island, a district represented by Congressman Robert L. Bacon, Republican of New York, who said wages are fair, and there has been no difficulty in the buildings grades between employer and employee for quite some time. But he was upset when a contractor came to him who had bid on construction of a federally funded hospital on Long Island and noted that the contract was awarded to an Alabama firm that came into Long Island with low-wage workers, whom he housed in tents on the property and underbid local contractors.

He said, that's not right, you have to help us stop these underbidding contractors from coming in and taking away local jobs. He, Bacon, introduced legislation that did not inflate wages, as he said, artificially, but assured that government respects the existing local standard.

A few years, a year later, the Secretary of Labor, James Davis, supported that bill. By March 3, 1931, Davis had left labor, got elected to the Senate, and the two of them authored this legislation. It was signed into law March 3, 1931, by President Herbert Hoover.

Mr. BAKER. May I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes are remaining.

Mr. BAKER. I claim the remaining time.

I certainly respect the chairman's knowledge and views of these matters and appreciate that on 95 percent of the issues before the committee, we are generally in unanimity.

On this particular point, I would like to bring the issue to that of the individual who is trying to rebuild their home in the difficult area of south Louisiana. Materials are short, workmen are hard to find. Do we really want to tell an individual trying to rebuild their personal home, you are going to have to meet a government wage rate in order to build this house or else you cannot build it? This is about government injecting itself into a free market process, all for no apparent reason that is clear to me.

It will make the compliance of the rules for the rural and lower income communities much more difficult to achieve. Compliance with the Davis-Bacon provisions is a difficult and cumbersome task.

□ 1215

And where we have low-income communities, where resources are greatly limited, we are now going to require additional regulatory burden and a higher wage rate that is artificial to further inhibit the ability of that community rebuild. We wouldn't contemplate having that set of requirements on the individual trying to rebuild their own home, but yet we are going to force that set of standards on communities across this Nation, even where States have no Davis-Bacon provisions at the State level at all. And that I think is the most troublesome aspect of the implementation of the proposal as constructed. Eighteen States have chosen not to require a Davis-Bacon implementation, and yet we here in the Congress by virtue of the State revolving infrastructure fund are going to require those States now to comply with these new standards. I hope Members will carefully consider the consequences of this amendment and vote for the Baker-King amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the chair of the subcommittee, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I strongly oppose the Baker-King amendment. I am from a working family, and I stand

with the American workers. The amendment would strip the prevailing wages protection from the bill.

Since 1931, the Davis-Bacon Act has provided a living wage for American workers, and as the authors of the Davis-Bacon Act knew then and as we continue to know today, the greatest way to improve the quality of life for our Nation's workers is for the Nation as a whole to provide workers with an honest living for an honest day's work.

We save nothing when we give people little pay or we pay it through other sources, by more taxes, more welfare rolls. I would much rather have people working.

It has been well documented by this committee that every $1 billion invested in transportation and water infrastructure creates 40,000 jobs. As of today, 31 States have enacted their own prevailing wage laws of publicly funded construction projects. And you check this with me: Those States that are against it have more poor people than the ones that have it. In some of these States, prevailing wage laws result in even higher wages to workers than if the Federal Davis-Bacon were alone, in effect. Studies have shown that the prevailing wage protections offered by Davis-Bacon in fact attracts better workers with more experience and training who are more productive than the less experienced, less trained workers. So it really saves money in the long run.

We need not to interfere with the Davis-Bacon provision. I support this bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In 1930, as the Davis-Bacon language was being shaped and debated in the Senate and in the House, Senator Davis of Pennsylvania, a Republican, and Congressman Bacon of New York, a Republican, said: The essence is this. Is the government willing, for the sake of the lowest bidder, to break down all labor standards and have its work done by the cheapest labor that can be secured and shipped from State to State?

When the bill was taken up at the Senate, Robert LeFollette, chairman of the Committee on Manufacturers, the Republican chairman of the committee, noted that practices were not only disturbing to labor but disturbing to the business community as well and urged that this measure be speedily enacted. It does not require the government to establish new wage scales; it merely gives the government power to require its contractors to pay the prevailing wage scales in the vicinity of the building projects.

Now, the prevailing wage scale in the vicinity of building projects in Louisiana, for example, an average common laborer gets $7.86 an hour. That is the prevailing wage. I don't know how you save any more money by going lower than $7.86 an hour. The average well driller in Louisiana is paid $11.40 an hour. I don't know how you get much lower than that in order to save money.

This Davis-Bacon provision is prevailing, not union wage. If I could, I would support in law the union wage, but we are not doing that. It is the prevailing local wage. I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER).

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

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF NEW YORK

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 110–36.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. HALL of New York:

Page 23, line 9, strike ''and whether such'' and insert '', whether such''.

Page 23, line 11, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and whether the proposed projects and activities would address water quality impairments associated with existing treatment works''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today with my esteemed colleague from Oregon to offer an amendment that will help communities across the country pay for wastewater projects, protect their environment and preserve their open spaces by combating sprawl.

Today's action on the underlying bill comes not a moment too soon. Nationwide, there is over a $300 billion shortfall in funding for wastewater projects. In my district, we have $500 million in projects that can't get funding just because the dollars aren't there.

Communities in the Hudson Valley and elsewhere are also trapped in a battle to balance the booming population with the preservation of water resources and open spaces.

By requiring States to prioritize spending of revolving loan funds of moneys on existing projects, this amendment will help address both of these challenges by helping to bolster existing communities, instead of haphazardly subsidizing the building of new developments.

There is an old adage that says, ''Work smarter, not harder.'' For many of our rural and suburban and rural communities, the only way to accommodate growth without sacrificing precious open space is to build smarter, not wider. Targeting moneys to projects that will help existing communities provide expanded and improved water treatment will meet that test. Without a smart growth strategy, the loss of open spaces, runoff created by the change from soil to pavement and other impacts will wreak havoc on our environment.

If we don't take aggressive action to make smart growth the guiding principle of development, we will end up squandering our resources, jeopardizing our health, and damaging our economy.

The amendment will also do one thing that I think, quite frankly, the Federal Government should be doing more of, giving property taxpayers and municipalities much needed relief.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of New York. I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I must say I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with him on this amendment.

Madam Chair, it is a pleasure to see the people; I feel a little angst not being on the Transportation Committee, I must say, and I keep gravitating down to the floor because of the important work that is being done.

I deeply appreciate Congressman HALL's work in the water resource area. I know he comes from an area that is challenged in terms of water resources and environmental threats and has long been a leader before he came to Congress. I deeply appreciate his leadership in this regard, and I was pleased to partner with him on this amendment because it will strengthen the bill to target effectiveness and support where the needs are greatest. As Mr. HALL mentioned, there is a deep concern that we target the resources where they will make the most difference.

There is another adage that I would offer up, and that is, ''Fix it first.'' We are dealing with an aging water infrastructure problem that is hundreds of billions of dollars, national in scope. The work that the Transportation Infrastructure Committee has done already in the last 12 weeks is moving us forward on an aggressive agenda. But by being able to target this money in areas where the need is the greatest, not to add to the inventory that is already overloaded, I think is an important area of priority.

I look forward to the approval of this amendment, working with the gentleman, working with the committee, working with our other colleagues. We have massive problems around the country where we need to be focusing; and I note my friend and colleague from Louisiana there, we have got unfinished business there as well. And the extent to which we are able to work in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and in this Congress to be able to put the dollars where they will do the most good is important.

Being able to have thoughtful infrastructure investment in ways that reinforce smart growth, where it needs to be, where it will have the most impact, is an important principle. I am pleased that, with the adoption of this amendment, we will be able to enshrine it in this legislation, and I hope that it finds its way in the work that will come forward with this committee throughout the course of this Congress.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, this language reinforces or adds an additional provision to section 305(b) of the act before us today. Section 602(b) reaffirms the deadlines, goals and requirements of the Clean Water Act, fishable-swimmable water goals. Section 603 deals with the affordability. And we have already prioritized in the basic legislation targeting funds to lower income communities to ensure that they get their fair share. This language will just take that affordability language one step further and impose on States the requirement to give full, fair consideration to projects that deal with immediate needs rather than adding capacity before you consider adding capacity.

Mr. BAKER. Having no objection to the amendment, I yield back all time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PLATTS

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 110–36.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. PLATTS:

Page 12, line 7, insert ''204(a)(6),'' before ''204(b)(1),''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Chair, the adoption of this amendment would help to ensure sufficient competition among the designers and manufacturers of water and wastewater treatment equipment across the country. It is premised on the idea that small firms ought to have the same chance at bidding on a project as large firms. In addition, with there being a critical need to upgrade our water and sewer infrastructure, requiring States to ensure a full and open competition would likely reduce the cost of the program and help finance additional and much needed projects.

This amendment would simply provide that, ''No specification for bids shall be written in such a manner as to contain proprietary, exclusionary or discriminatory requirements other than those based upon performance, unless such requirements are necessary to test or demonstrate a specific thing or to provide for necessary interchangeability of parts and equipment.''

The amendment further provides that, ''When in the judgment of the grantee, it is impractical or uneconomical to make a clear and accurate description of the technical requirements, a 'brand name or equal' description may be used as a means to define the performance or other salient requirements of a procurement, and in doing so the grantee may not establish existence of any source other than the brand or source so named.''

□ 1230

The language found in this amendment is the same competition requirement that was applied to grants provided under title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. While not identical, it is also very similar to a competition requirement adopted by my home State of Pennsylvania for its revolving fund.

I appreciate the Rules Committee having made the amendment in order, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I rise to ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not in opposition to it.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would include an additional requirement on State revolving loans on authorities not previously part of the State Revolving Loan Fund Program. The provision of section 204(a)(6) of the Clean Water Act is a longstanding title II construction grants requirement. We don't have construction grants any more, since 1987, that does require ''full and open bid competition for the construction of publicly owned treatment works.''

The gentleman's amendment would prohibit financial assistance recipients from including bid specs that contain proprietary, exclusionary, discriminatory requirements, other than those based on performance.

I have asked the staff to review and I, myself, have reviewed the Federal acquisition regulations which are generic to the Federal Government. These requirements for full and open bid competition are in place. They do generically apply to provisions of the Clean Water Act.

However, I think it is appropriate and is not confusing, nor is it in opposition to the Federal acquisition regulations, to include the gentleman's amendment. Therefore, we accept the gentleman's amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's acceptance of the amendment and the work of his staff, as well as the ranking member of the full committee and the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee. And, again, I appreciate their consideration and acceptance of the amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. HIRONO

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 110–36.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Ms. HIRONO:

Page 6, line 21, strike the closing quotation marks and the final period.

Page 6, after line 21, insert the following:

''(4) INTEGRATED WATER RESOURCE PLAN.—The development of an integrated water resource plan for the coordinated management and protection of surface water, ground water, and stormwater resources on a watershed or subwatershed basis to meet the objectives, goals, and policies of this Act.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chair, my amendment will add another allowable use of funds under section 103, Watershed Pilot Projects, to assist communities in developing integrated water resource plans for the coordinated management and protection of surface water, ground water and storm water resources on a watershed or subwatershed basis. The amendment does not add to the cost of the bill; it simply provides another option for communities in use of the grants funds.

It is important that communities look at the inner relationship between each of these water systems when devising management and protection plans. Management of storm water can certainly have an impact on the quality of surface waters, and the quality of surface water has an effect on the quality and safety of ground water.

This approach is very much in line with Hawaiian traditions of land management. The traditional Hawaiian land management unit, the ahupua'a, goes from the top of the mountain to the sea. Ancient Hawaiians understood that what happened on the mountain would affect resources at lower elevations, in coastal areas, and even in the ocean. The watershed model of natural resource management is a modern equivalent of the Hawaiian ahupua'a system.

It is important that we move to a more holistic way of looking at how our water systems interact. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment to provide communities with an opportunity to develop such integrated plans.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition and therefore ask for unanimous consent for that purpose.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Can I ask the gentleman if he could yield me 1 minute.

Mr. BAKER. I would be happy to yield the chairman 1 minute.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I want to thank the gentlelady for her amendment which reinforces a longstanding practice of this committee to deal with water resource needs on a watershed basis.

This watershed pilot project eligibility will greatly advance the cause of clean water and water availability.

The U.S. Geological Survey observed most recently there are clear connections between surface water, ground water, and the precipitation events that reach these areas. In our area, precipitation is snow. In Hawaii and Louisiana, it is rain. And impact on these water resources, whether through unchecked sources of pollution, wastewater, can have significant effects on the sources of water.

So the gentlelady's amendment will give an additional tool for communities to perfect and strengthen their planning for the best use and management of existing water resources, and we are happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers. And having no objection, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chair, I yield back the rest of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 110–36.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. WHITFIELD:

At the end of title I, insert the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 104. POOL ELEVATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, beginning in the first July after the date of enactment of this Act, the Army Corps of Engineers, together with any other Federal agency that has the authority to change the pool elevation of Lake Barkley, Kentucky, shall establish and conduct a pilot program that, under normal weather conditions, extends the summer pool elevation of 359 feet on such lake from the current draw down date of July 1 until after the first Monday in September.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM DURATION.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the pilot program shall terminate on the first Monday in September two years after the pilot program begins.

(c) EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the first Monday in September two years after the pilot program begins, the Chief of Engineers of the Army Corps of Engineers shall evaluate the effectiveness of extending the pool elevation on Lake Barkley, Kentucky, under subsection (a) and report to the appropriate committees of Congress their findings, including any recommendations, regarding the extension of time for such lake elevation.

(d) CONTINUATION.—If the Army Corps of Engineers determines that the pilot program under this section is effective, the Corps shall continue the summer elevation of 359 feet on Lake Barkley, Kentucky, through the first Monday in September each year.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, I am offering this amendment today to simply create a 2-year pilot program to extend the summer pool at Lake Barkley, which is located in my district in western Kentucky.

Now, I would reiterate that this amendment does not do anything in a permanent nature, but simply asks for a 2-year pilot project.

Lake Barkley is one of those very shallow dams throughout the country. At the summer pool, the level is 359 feet.

Now, when Lake Barkley was created, in order to create it, a number of small communities in western Kentucky were flooded in the 1960s. And even today, despite the extensive use of this lake, old foundations, streets, highways and railroads are still visible in shallow areas in the lake. And when the Corps begins drawing down the summer pool, moving to the winter pool, they begin on July 1, right in the middle of summer season. As a result of that, it has created an unusually dangerous situation for recreational users of the lake, particularly boaters. And we have had significant and many serious accidents on this lake because of boats hitting tree stumps, old road beds and other obstructions. Just last August, a boating accident occurred, resulting in two fatalities, severely injuring three other people, which is just one example of how dangerous this early lowering of the lake can be.

In addition, recreation at the lake in the summer generates millions of dollars for a lot of small businessmen and women. And as I said, the fact that the Corps begins going to the winter pool in July, it does create significant issues for that area.

And so as I said, this amendment simply asks the Corps to extend that summer pool level of 359 feet from July until around Labor Day.

Now, it is my understanding that the chairman and other members of the committee, through information I received from staff, would prefer that I not offer this amendment today. And I am going to withdraw the amendment. But I would ask the chairman and the other members of the committee to please work with me. I would ask them to work with me to explore opportunities to address this problem in western Kentucky affecting Lake Barkley through either, one, considering my freestanding bill that establishes this 2-year project at the committee, or working with me maybe on the WRDA bill. Or I would not even object if the chairman wanted to consider this at the conference with the Senate.

But I am simply asking, and I will withdraw the amendment, and would ask the chairman and the members of the committee to work with me to try to address this unique problem affecting Lake Barkley.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Would the gentleman yield if he has time remaining?

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The gentleman, in years past, has been very participatory in the work of our committee. Notably, on railroad issues several years ago the gentleman took the lead on a very contentious issue, and we have greatly appreciated his contribution then and want to work with the gentleman.

The amendment would implement the change to the elevation pool before completion of the environmental assessment.

We have the Water Resources Development Act ready, I think, to move within 2 weeks or so. I would like to join with the gentleman in

ascertaining from the Corps the status of that environmental assessment and then determining, depending on where they stand with it, we could either dispense with the EIS and include the gentleman's provision in our WRDA bill, or if it is ready to go, if the EIS is completed, we will not have to take that action.

But I assure you, one way or another, we will find a way for the gentleman's, the language to be included in WRDA before we bring it to the House floor.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I genuinely appreciate that. As I said, we simply want to do this for a couple of years to gauge all aspects and the impacts of this action. I look forward to working with the chairman and other members of the committee to try to address the issue.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not in opposition to it.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

And, again, I want to reaffirm my colloquy with the gentleman, that we will work with him and with the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Florida on shaping appropriate language to include this study provision pilot project for the Lake Barkley initiative as we move forward with WRDA.

Madam Chair, as we come to the conclusion of this legislation, I want to express again my heartfelt appreciation to Ranking Member MICA, who has worked with us on all the measures, including how we would shape the debate on Davis-Bacon, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) who has been most forthcoming and accommodating. We have, again, reached agreement on major provisions on this legislation. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) who has devoted years of her service on the committee to this issue, is now the Chair.

But those who really bear the burden of the work are our staff: Ryan Seiger, Beth Goldstein, Rod Hall, Mike Brain on our side; John Anderson, Jonathan Pawlow, Geoff Bowman, Tim Lundquist on the Republican side, and our full committee staff, our brilliant leader, David Heymsfeld, our chief counsel, Ward McCarragher, Sharon Barkeloo, Jen Walsh, Erik Hansen, and on the minority side, Jim Coon, Charlie Ziegler, Fraser Verrusio and Jason Rosa.

□ 1245

We also greatly appreciate the work from Legislative Counsel's Office, Dave Mendelsohn and Curt Haensel. Dave Mendelsohn has been here almost as long as I have, and he is really good.

We have a superb staff. They have worked together diligently on this legislation. We owe them a deep and longstanding debt of gratitude for their superb work, especially Ryan Seiger, who stayed up many late hours at night fashioning all the responses to the many questions I have had on this legislation.

Madam Chairman, after a very thoughtful, productive, and constructive debate on the bill and the amendments thereto, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BAKER.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 280, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

AYES—140

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—280

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

Wilson (OH)	Wu	Yarmuth
Woolsey	Wynn	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—18

Bachus	Ellison	Millender-McDonald
Bono	Eshoo	Moore (WI)
Boren	Fortuño	Neugebauer
Calvert	Hunter	Nunes
Camp (MI)	Larson (CT)	Reynolds
Davis, David	Marchant	
Davis, Jo Ann		

□ 1313

Messrs. CHANDLER, ROTHMAN, AL GREEN of Texas, HINCHEY, OBEY and Ms. HOOLEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. EHLERS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 133, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LYNCH) having assumed the chair, Ms. SOLIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 720) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 229, she reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CANTOR

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

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

Mr. CANTOR. In its present form, yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cantor moves to recommit the bill H.R. 720 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report back the same forthwith with the following amendment:

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

TITLE VII—SECURE MARITIME AND VESSEL WORKFORCE

SEC. 701. PROHIBITION OF ISSUANCE OF TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CARDS TO CONVICTED FELONS.

No individual who has been issued a transportation worker identification card may board a maritime vessel if the individual has been convicted, or found not guilty by reason of insanity, in a civilian or military jurisdiction of any of the following felonies:

(1) Espionage or conspiracy to commit espionage.

(2) Sedition or conspiracy to commit sedition.

(3) Treason or conspiracy to commit treason.

(4) A crime listed in chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, a comparable State law, or conspiracy to commit such crime.

(5) A crime involving a transportation security incident. In this paragraph, a transportation security incident—

(A) is a security incident resulting in a significant loss of life, environmental damage, transportation system disruption, or economic disruption in a particular area (as defined in section 70101 of title 46, United States Code); and

(B) does not include a work stoppage or other nonviolent employee-related action, resulting from an employer-employee dispute.

(6) Improper transportation of a hazardous material under section 5124 of title 49, United States Code, or a comparable State law.

(7) Unlawful possession, use, sale, distribution, manufacture, purchase, receipt, transfer, shipping, transporting, import, export, storage of, or dealing in an explosive or incendiary device (as defined in section 232(5) of title 18, United States Code, explosive materials (as defined in section 841(c) of such title 18), or a destructive device (as defined in 921(a)(4) of such title 18).

(8) Murder.

(9) Conspiracy or attempt to commit any of the crimes described in paragraphs (5) through (8).

(10) A violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (18 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), or a comparable State law, if 1 of the predicate acts found by a jury or admitted by the defendant consists of 1 of the offenses listed in paragraphs (4) and (8).

Mr. CANTOR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I object to dispensing with the reading. We have only just now received this language and I insist on the reading of the language.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued reading the motion to recommit.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is designed to be a substantive enhancement to the underlying Secure Maritime and Vessel Workforce bill.

I think the other side has demonstrated on two occasions this week that they are inclined to work across the aisle and accept substantive improvements to the bill.

What this motion to recommit does, it is intended to protect our maritime workforce, our national security, and ultimately the ports that serve and provide commerce to our great Nation. The language of the motion to recommit ensures that individuals that have been convicted of felonies are not able to board maritime vessels using transportation security cards. Now these felonies includes espionage, treason, sedition, murder, racketeering, crimes dealing with explosives or incendiary devices. These are individuals convicted of these felonies that frankly have an underlying purpose to harm Americans.

Clearly, individuals convicted of these type of felony crimes pose a security risk to America and its citizens.

We need to keep our ports safe and secure, and to do that, we must keep our maritime vessels safe and secure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the motion, although I don't know whether I am in opposition at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to observe and I appreciate the gentleman's comment about our side accepting amendments from the minority, and we have done that mostly where there has been prior consultation and discussion. In this case, this language was not available to our majority members on the committee until just prior to when it was offered on the floor.

I inquire of the offeror his explanation on page 2, subsection (4), ''A crime listed in chapter 113B of title 18,'' what is that language? Can the gentleman read me the language of the U.S. Code?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I would ask the gentleman to repeat that again.

Mr. OBERSTAR. It is his amendment. On page 2 of the gentleman's amendment, ''(4) A crime listed in chapter 113B of title 18, U.S. Code,'' what does that refer to?

I have been able in just these few minutes to get chapter 113 but not B.

Mr. CANTOR. I would respond to the gentleman that the section cited on page 2, subsection (4), line 1 of the bill, is a section of the U.S. Code dealing with terrorism.

And again, the underlying——

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reclaiming my time, I want to know what the language is. The gentleman is offering an amendment. If he is serious about it, then he ought to have the language.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman again, this is a section of the U.S. Code that deals with acts of terrorism against the United States and its citizens.

The underlying purpose, again, of the motion to recommit is to ensure the safety of our——

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman has not been able to answer my question.

I was the author in our committee of the Port Security Act, along with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). We had carefully crafted language that set standards for security clearance for maritime workers. We did not have any reference to chapter 113B. The transportation security workers card has not yet been issued. The readers for that card have not yet been put in place by the Transportation Security Administration.

The standards, apart from this provision that the gentleman lists here, generally are covered in the background checks required in our Port Security Act for maritime workers.

But this is very vague language in number (4). It is specific to a provision of U.S. Code, but the gentleman cannot explain to me what it is.

And then ''(5), A crime involving a transportation security incident,'' dropping down to subsection ''(A) is a security incident resulting in a significant loss of life,'' we don't know where that language comes from.

Mr. Speaker, we should not amend the Port Security Act on 30 seconds notice. There may be very good and valid provisions of this motion to recommit that we might very well be in support of, but only in due course, only in a proper forum. To come up here 30 seconds before the motion is offered and lay on the body this language without having the backup for it I think is inappropriate, and I object to the process. I object to the procedure that has been followed, not perhaps to the substance of it.

Our committee is fully prepared to deal with this issue in due course and give it full and thorough consideration, but not here, not in this context.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I find it very difficult to understand how the gentleman can refer to an abuse of process on this side of the aisle. I hardly——

Mr. OBERSTAR. You should be very well accustomed to it; you did it for 12 years.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has yielded.

So what we are talking about here is the substantive——

Mr. OBERSTAR. Is the gentleman going to explain 113B?

Mr. CANTOR. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Read it. Read the language.

Mr. CANTOR. I would tell the gentleman, dealt with——

Mr. OBERSTAR. Read it.

I do not yield further. I do not yield further.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ISSA. Point of order. My understanding of the rules is that we cannot have Members speaking to each other. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is this colloquy was not allowed. Mr. Speaker, can we please admonish people to address the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a timely point of order, but it is correct that remarks should be addressed to the Chair and not in the second person.

All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 359, noes 56, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

AYES—359

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
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)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Obey
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—56

Abercrombie
Arcuri
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Clarke
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Davis (IL)
Dingell
Doggett
Emanuel
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Green, Gene
Hinchey
Hirono
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Napolitano
Oberstar
Olver
Pascrell
Payne
Rangel
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Slaughter
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Velázquez
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—18

Bachus
Berman
Boehner
Bono
Boren
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann

Eshoo
Hayes
Hunter
Larson (CT)
Marchant
Millender-McDonald
Moore (WI)
Neugebauer
Nunes

□ 1408

Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia, MEEKS of New York, GEORGE MILLER of California, SERRANO, TOWNS and Ms. VELAZQUEZ changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. CUELLAR, MCNULTY and PRICE of north carolina, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Messrs. WALZ of MINNESOTA, HARE and LANGEVIN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. FATTAH, BOSWELL, LEVIN, BERRY, LYNCH and SARBANES, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. POMEROY, BRALEY of Iowa, CARDOZA, NEAL of Massachusetts and WU, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, MITCHELL, ELLISON, COHEN, WELCH of Vermont, HOLDEN, SKELTON, VAN HOLLEN AND DOYLE, Ms. HARMAN, Messrs. LIPINSKI, COSTELLO, TIERNEY, KIND, LARSEN of Washington, ALLEN, PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, SESTAK, DELAHUNT, ROSS, CAPUANO, KILDEE, CARNAHAN, ISRAEL, MEEK of Florida, PASTOR, UDALL of New Mexico, SCOTT of Georgia, MARKEY, BACA, SCHIFF and RAHALL, Ms. CASTOR, Messrs. MCNERNEY, STUPAK, SIRES, GUTIERREZ, ORTIZ, CUMMINGS, MURPHY of Connecticut, HINOJOSA, OBEY, THOMPSON of California, GRIJALVA, KENNEDY, DICKS, RODRIGUEZ, REYES and ANDREWS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. ACKERMAN, RYAN of Ohio, HASTINGS of Florida, PALLONE, HOLT and MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SOLIS, Messrs. MOLLOHAN, FARR, HIGGINS and MICHAUD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CARSON, Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas, CLEAVER, BLUMENAUER, GONZALEZ, CLAY, RUPPERSBERGER, VISCLOSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COOPER and Mr. SHERMAN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 720, back to the House with an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

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

TITLE VII—SECURE MARITIME AND VESSEL WORKFORCE

SEC. 701. PROHIBITION OF ISSUANCE OF TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CARDS TO CONVICTED FELONS.

No individual who has been issued a transportation worker identification card may board a maritime vessel if the individual has been convicted, or found not guilty by reason of insanity, in a civilian or military jurisdiction of any of the following felonies:

(1) Espionage or conspiracy to commit espionage.

(2) Sedition or conspiracy to commit sedition.

(3) Treason or conspiracy to commit treason.

(4) A crime listed in chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, a comparable State law, or conspiracy to commit such crime.

(5) A crime involving a transportation security incident. In this paragraph, a transportation security incident—

(A) is a security incident resulting in a significant loss of life, environmental damage, transportation system disruption, or economic disruption in a particular area (as defined in section 70101 of title 46, United States Code); and

(B) does not include a work stoppage or other nonviolent employee-related action, resulting from an employer-employee dispute.

(6) Improper transportation of a hazardous material under section 5124 of title 49, United States Code, or a comparable State law.

(7) Unlawful possession, use, sale, distribution, manufacture, purchase, receipt, transfer, shipping, transporting, import, export, storage of, or dealing in an explosive or incendiary device (as defined in section 232(5) of title 18, United States Code, explosive materials (as defined in section 841(c) of such title 18), or a destructive device (as defined in 921(a)(4) of such title 18).

(8) Murder.

(9) Conspiracy or attempt to commit any of the crimes described in paragraphs (5) through (8).

(10) A violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (18 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), or a comparable State law, if 1 of the predicate acts found by a jury or admitted by the defendant consists of 1 of the offenses listed in paragraphs (4) and (8).

Mr. OBERSTAR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 303, nays 108, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—303

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
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
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp

Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—108

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Walberg
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—22

Bachus
Berman
Boehner
Bono
Boren
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Doggett
Emanuel
Eshoo
Feeney
Hayes
Hunter
Larson (CT)
Marchant
Millender-McDonald
Moore (WI)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Tancredo

□ 1418

Mr. ADERHOLT changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was not present to cast my votes on rollcall votes 133, 134, and 135 earlier today, March 9, 2007. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Baker Amendment—rollcall 133, "aye" on the Motion to Recommit—rollcall 134, and "nay" on Final Passage of H.R. 720—rollcall 135.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD and regret that I could not be present today, Friday, March 9, 2007, to vote on rollcall votes Nos. 132, 133, 134, and 135, due to a family medical matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall vote No. 132 on H. Res. 229, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 720—Water Quality Financing Act of 2007; "nay" on rollcall vote No. 133, on the amendment to H.R. 720, to strike the Davis-Bacon section of the bill; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 134, on a motion to recommit H.R. 720 with instructions; and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 135, on the final passage of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of Friday, March 9, 2007, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to cast a vote on a number of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall 132—"nay"; rollcall 133—"aye"; rollcall 134—"aye"; and rollcall 135—"nay."

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 202, 110th Congress, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming:

Mr. MARKEY, Massachusetts, Chairman
Mr. BLUMENAUER, Oregon
Mr. INSLEE, Washington
Mr. LARSON, Connecticut
Ms. SOLIS, California
Ms. HERSETH, South Dakota
Mr. CLEAVER, Missouri
Mr. HALL, New York
Mr. MCNERNEY, California
Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Wisconsin
Mr. SHADEGG, Arizona
Mr. WALDEN, Oregon
Mr. SULLIVAN, Oklahoma
Mrs. BLACKBURN, Tennessee
Mrs. MILLER, Michigan

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

Dear Madam Speaker, Given my pending appointment to the House Committee on Financial Services, I hereby tender my resignation from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Sincerely,

KENNY MARCHANT,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. CURTIS, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 342. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the ''Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 544. An act to designate the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the ''Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 584. An act to designate the Federal building located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwest in the District of Columbia as the ''Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building''.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101–509, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the re-appointment of Guy Rocha of Nevada to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the minority whip for yielding. On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour business and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. There will be no votes, Madam Speaker, on Monday before 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour business, and noon for legislative business. We will consider additional bills under suspension of the rules, and a complete list of those bills for the week will be announced by the close of business today.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. We will consider several important pieces of open government and accountability legislation from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee: H.R. 1309, the Freedom of Information Act and amendments; H.R. 1255, Presidential Records Act Amendments; H.R. 1254, Presidential Library Donation Reform Act; H.R. 985, Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act; and H.R. 1362, Accountability in Contracting Act.

Notwithstanding everybody is requesting to meet next Friday, we are not going to do that.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for sticking with his earlier decision on next Friday, in spite of what I am sure must have been the incredible pressure for us to be here next Friday; and we will try to get our work done.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Nobody in the House, other than yourself and Mr. BOEHNER, know that pressure more than I.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate the gentleman's view of that, and he is right. I do share it. I would ask the gentleman, on the supplemental that has been described in concept this week, when

would we expect to see language on the supplemental?

Mr. HOYER. The supplemental I expect to be marked up in committee. We have moved it one week, as the gentleman knows, as we have worked on trying to get language that is appropriate language from the perspective of the committee. And Mr. OBEY has been working very hard on that, as have others. I expect that to be marked up next week, and I expect the language to be available early next week.

Mr. BLUNT. And the gentleman then would expect it to be on the floor the following week?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. BLUNT. You expect it to be on the floor the following week?

Mr. HOYER. I believe that is the week of the 19th.

Mr. BLUNT. That would be the week of the 19th.

Mr. HOYER. Yes, sir. I expect the supplemental to be on the floor the week of the 19th, and then we are very hopeful that the budget will be on the floor the week of the 26th.

Mr. BLUNT. And as an appropriations bill, does the gentleman anticipate that we will have opportunities to amend that bill on the floor?

Mr. HOYER. We don't know that yet. We are discussing that. I don't know yet

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I would just say before I move to my next question, of course, this is, as we all know, an important and at the same time controversial piece of legislation, and we would hope for a full debate and an opportunity to have a chance to amend the bill on the floor.

The leader also announced, I believe, this week, maybe it was late last week, that we should anticipate seeing legislation on the floor within the month on allowing the Delegate from D.C. to vote on the floor. I wonder if the leader could tell us a little more about his idea on what this proposal would include.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the question. As you know, I feel very strongly that the representative of the District of Columbia should have full voting membership in the House of Representatives, as does the representative in parliament of, I believe, every other capital of every other democracy in the world, except for the District of Columbia.

I expect that legislation, and hope that legislation, will be on the floor before we adjourn for the Easter work period, which would probably mean the week of the 26th. The legislation is the legislation, as you know, that is sponsored by Mr. DAVIS, TOM DAVIS, the Republican former chairman of your campaign committee, but more importantly, the former chairman of the Government Reform Committee, and cosponsored by Mrs. NORTON, the representative of the District of Columbia.

I would expect that legislation to include, as the original legislation included, an additional Member from Utah and full voting rights being extended, and full membership as a full Member, both of the new Utah Representative, but also of the Representative of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLUNT. Does the gentleman know when that legislation was designed to take effect? After the next election? I am not familiar with the specifics of that legislation. Certainly I do know that Mr. DAVIS was the sponsor.

Mr. HOYER. The hearings I expect to be held next week, I believe. Hearings and markup, I think, will be next week, so I can't tell you exactly, obviously, because it hasn't been marked up yet. But it is my contemplation that there would be a special election in the case of the District of Columbia Representative, and in the case of the Utah Representative.

As we all know, the only way you can get to be a Member of this House is to be elected. There are no appointments to this, so that we would contemplate providing for a special election for both.

Mr. BLUNT. In our Constitution, as the gentleman knows, the District was established differently than most capitals and, I am sure, has developed in a different way than was anticipated at the time.

But when Presidential voting rights were extended to the District, the Constitution had to be amended to do that.

Would the gentleman anticipate that this would also require a constitutional amendment since the District is not part of any State?

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As you know, Mr. DAVIS is the author of this bill. He had extensive hearings on this bill, as you know, in the last Congress; reported this bill out in the last Congress. It was never brought to the floor, but it was reported out.

And as you know, it was Mr. DAVIS' and the committee's conclusion that this could be effected by legislation, as has been the admission of States to the Union, and the admission, therefore, of new voting Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Now, I don't represent that there is not another view as to whether or not you can do this statutorily or whether you need to do it constitutionally. But I can tell you, as you well know, that it was Mr. DAVIS' conclusion, the committee's conclusion, under his leadership when your party was in control of the House, and it was the conclusion of the committee that it could be done statutorily, and we are proceeding on that theory.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I would caution the gentleman on that theory. As high a regard as I have for Mr. DAVIS, and it is high, I have certainly never considered him to be the ultimate authority on the Constitution. And, of course, when you allow States to enter the Union, as the Constitution provides for, you have the requisite number of Members of the House and two Members of the Senate.

And the major question I am sure I will have during that debate and later will be exactly what State is Washington, D.C. part of, since the Constitution specifically says that Members of the House are selected by the various States.

I think there is a constitutional question here, and that is one of the reasons that, when we were in the majority, that Mr. DAVIS' bill didn't come to the floor. And I think there will be, should be, a constitutional remedy, if there is a remedy.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield before we go on to a different subject?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I would ask my friend, would the gentleman be for a constitutional amendment if such an amendment were brought to the floor?

Mr. BLUNT. I might be for whatever it took to return the voting rights for the Member of Congress to a State that is represented by two Senators which, of course, would be, I would assume, your State.

I don't know that I would be for an amendment that would allow somebody to be represented uniquely that doesn't have Senatorial representation, and, of course, you are assuming that it would be inside the Constitution. I do think that would be the way to do it.

And while the population of the District may allow it to have a population similar to the districts that are represented by the average Member in terms of population, the Constitution, to me, appears to be very explicit on the question of Representatives of a State.

Half of the original District of Columbia, as the gentleman knows, was returned to the State of Virginia in, I believe, the 1840s. They are represented by a Member of Congress, and maybe more than one, and they are represented by two Senators, the Senators from Virginia. That appears to me to be a remedy that would be well within the Constitution. But this proposal that Mr. DAVIS and others have made, I think, will have a significant constitutional hurdle to overcome.

The other question I would direct to the gentleman is on the budget itself. When does the majority expect that we will see a markup in committee of the budget resolution, and when would that resolution be on the floor?

Mr. HOYER. I would expect a markup, certainly this is the target for markup, the week of the 19th and on the floor the week of the 26th.

Mr. BLUNT. So you are anticipating, if I could refresh my mind here to the gentleman's comments, that both the supplemental appropriations bill and the budget will be marked up during the week of the 19th.

Mr. HOYER. No, I expect the supplemental to be marked up in committee next week.

Mr. BLUNT. Next week. And on the floor the week of the 19th.

Mr. HOYER. And on the floor the week of the 19th.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, it is a good thing I clarified that in my mind.

Mr. HOYER. So you would have on the week of the 19th the supplemental and on the week of the 26th the budget on the floor.

□ 1430

Mr. BLUNT. As I recall, that is exactly what the leader suggested, and now I have that straight in my mind, and those will be weeks that we would hope to have a full debate and important debate for the country.

I thank my friend for the information he has provided.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SPECIALIST BLAKE HARRIS

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

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, yesterday we resumed reading the names of our servicemembers on this House floor that have paid the ultimate sacrifice in this war. To date, 3,188 American servicemembers have lost their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I am greatly saddened today to add the name of Specialist Blake Harris to that list of the fallen soldiers.

Specialist Harris was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 12th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas.

Specialist Harris died on Monday, March 5, in Baqubah, Iraq, of injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near his patrol.

Blake Harris was born and raised in Pueblo, Colorado. He was a 2002 graduate of Pueblo South High School.

In Pueblo, Blake leaves behind a loving wife, Joanna; a 2-year-old son, Jonah; and his mother, Deborah Harris. He is also survived by his father, John Harris of Denver.

Madam Speaker, I extend my heartfelt sympathy and condolences to his family and friends who have suffered this loss, and I pray for their comfort and strength in their time of greatest need.

Specialist Harris was a proud and courageous soldier whose story must never be forgotten. Blake Harris was 22 years old.

Madam Speaker, I submit this recognition to the United States House of Representatives in honor of his sacrifice so that the memory of Blake Harris may live on forever.

CALLING FOR REAL BORDER SECURITY AND ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, yesterday afternoon in western North Carolina, a routine traffic stop netted 11 illegal immigrants. How do we know they were illegal? Because when they were asked for identification, they presented their Mexican voting card; and when asked by the sheriff's deputy whether or not they were illegal, they said, ''yes.''

The sheriff's deputy called the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency in Charlotte, North Carolina, to which the reply was, ''We are sorry; we can't pick them up.'' So the sheriff's deputy let them go on their way. According to the illegal immigrants, 11 in the car, they were going to New York City to get a job.

This shows in real form the need for real border security and real border enforcement. It also shows the need for the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency to get with the times, to get rid of this bureaucracy in Washington, D.C., that is hamstringing the agents in the field, to increase their budget.

And, Madam Speaker, I call on the House of Representatives to act to make sure that we have more border enforcement agents and Customs agents in this Nation to make sure a travesty like this never happens again.

PEACHCARE IV

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today I rise for the third time this week to speak about Georgia's PeachCare crisis.

This Sunday, in just 2 days, PeachCare closes its doors to new enrollees. And if funding shortages continue, it will close its doors to all children next month. The collapse of PeachCare will leave hundreds of thousands of hardworking Georgia families unable to provide health care for their children.

This Congress and the State of Georgia cannot let this happen. I call on the Governor of Georgia to use available State funds, and there are some that are available, to reinstate new enrollment and to sustain this imperative program until Federal funding can be increased.

PeachCare provides health care for our most precious and most vulnerable population: our children. It simply must be saved.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

CONGRESS MUST NOT INTRUDE ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVINCE OF THE PRESIDENT AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, it has been quite a week here on Capitol Hill with the unveiling by the Democratic majority of their new plan for a fully funded withdrawal from our presence in Iraq.

The contrast that took place yesterday also was quite striking. General Petraeus, our new commander on the ground in Baghdad, had his first meeting this Thursday with the media in Baghdad, describing what our military leaders were doing in the midst of that war-torn country. And at the same time, on the other side of the world, many would-be generals here in Congress were describing their plans for the war in Iraq.

Democratic leaders, according to press releases from the House Appropriations Committee, outlined a plan for veterans' funding in the so-called war supplemental but also a plan that would set a timeline for bringing United States participation in Iraq's war to an end.

Setting very, very specific dates, the leadership, at least at this point, as we know, has outlined a proposal that establishes a timeline that would end U.S. participation in Iraq's civil war by July 1, 2007. If the President does not certify that the troops have met certain specific criteria that has been released to the media, the troops must

begin at that point an immediate redeployment of their involvement in the Iraq War which must be completed by December of 2007. Other dates, October 1, also are being discussed and other dates, including March 1, 2008. It was a startling contrast, to say the least.

On Thursday of this week, our generals in Baghdad and our ''generals'' here in Congress were describing their plans for the war in Iraq.

But I must say that history teaches that we have but one commander in chief, Madam Speaker. In fact, if you study the minutes of the Constitutional Convention in that balmy summer of 1787, you will find more agreement on no other point than that our Founders believed in the unified chain of command, that there would be one commander in chief and that that power, under article II of the Constitution, would be vested in the President of the United States.

We have a role in this Chamber. Under article I, Congress has the exclusive authority to declare war and to make decisions which will be a part of the aforementioned legislation to determine whether and to what degree we will fund war.

But the conduct of the war on the ground, including the setting of benchmarks, the execution of timetables on the ground and the like, fall within the purview of the commanders and specifically the commander in chief. And I would argue, as something of a student of American history, during the Revolutionary period, that our Founders rejected this because of painful experiences during the Revolutionary War. Our first commander in chief, George Washington, actually would spend every night writing letters in his tent to Congress to ask permission for military maneuvers and almost failed as a result of that micromanagement.

Congress must not intrude on the constitutional province of the President of the United States to lead us as Commander in Chief. Napoleon said it best. He said, ''I would rather face 20 brilliant generals than one mediocre one.''

We must, as we move into this debate, carry before the American people a very simple principle: We must support our troops in the field, provide them with the resources they need to get the job done and come home safe. But in the midst of this debate, with civility, let us also take the case to the American people of whether or not they want one commander in chief or whether they want 435 commanders in chief elected to this article I body of the Congress. I say we have one leader of our military who leads our commanders on the ground. The Constitution says it; I will stand by it.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 985, WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007; AND H.R. 1362, ACCOUNTABILITY IN CONTRACTING ACT

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee intends to meet the week of March 12 to grant a rule which may structure the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 985, the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2007.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H–312 in the Capitol no later than 1 p.m. on Monday, March 12.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. A copy of that bill is posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee. Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and also should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

In addition, the Rules Committee intends to meet next week to grant a rule that may structure the amendment process on H.R. 1362, the Accountability in Contracting Act.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H–312 in the Capitol no later than 1 p.m. on Tuesday, March 13.

Amendments must be drafted to the bill as ordered reported on March 8 by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. A copy of that bill will be posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee. Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

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.)

□ 1445

TRIBUTE TO DR. TED STILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise to mark the passing this week of one of the most effective environmentalists in the State of New Jersey, indeed in the country, Dr. Ted Stiles. Perhaps not the most celebrated, he should be celebrated. He preserved thousands of acres, advanced the understanding of ecology, and improved the environment for millions of people for generations to come. To some of my colleagues from the western States, thousands of acres may not sound like much, but the significance of that preservation and the difficulty of doing it in the densely populated Northeast are great.

Dr. Stiles chaired and led boards of the Stony Brook Millstone Watershed Association, the Mercer County Open Space Preservation Board, the Friends of Hopewell Valley Open Space, the Municipal Land Use Center, the New Jersey Academy of Science, and the Hutchinson Memorial Forest. He served for many years on boards, including the Crossroads of the American Revolution Association; The Nature Conservancy, New Jersey chapter; and others. He continued all of this work through his illness and up to his death.

He showed creative approaches to locally based environmental decision-making, such as his creation of the Municipal Land Use Center; and he received awards from academia and regional and community organizations and the highest environmental award from the Governor of New Jersey.

What distinguished Dr. Stiles especially was his unparalleled, unmatched ability to make people want to do those things that contribute to the general good. He made landowners want to offer their land to preservation organizations, and he made people want to spend their money to purchase and preserve that land. He made volunteer board members want to give of their time and effort to build communities and to improve the environment.

He made grad students want to go to remote places around the world to do such things as measuring the size of fruits relative to the sizes of birds' beaks so we could better understand the relationship between communities of plants and communities of animals.

He made hundreds of local citizens want to spend a day twice a year cleaning up their town. And he made a politically interested scientist want to leave a research career to run for Congress. Yes, I am that scientist. Dr. Stiles' research students continue to make contributions to research, teaching, and public policy around the country.

Throughout his life, it is not an empty cliche to say, Dr. Stiles, through goodwill and good ideas and

leadership, made this country a better place.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL J. HOLLMANN

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a great American. Mr. Daniel J. Hollmann of Odessa, Texas, has been a community leader in Odessa and the Permian Basin for more than three decades. A small businessman, family man and steadfast volunteer, Dan is one of the shining stars in the Eleventh Congressional District of Texas.

April 1 of this year marks the 30th anniversary of Dan receiving his license to practice law and the founding of his own firm, now Hollmann, Lyon, Patterson and Durell. Reaching this milestone is a great achievement, and I congratulate him for showing the hard work and perseverance I know it takes to run a small business.

I would also like to recognize and congratulate Dan as the 2006 recipient of the Odessa Chamber of Commerce's Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award. The award, given to the chamber member who best represents the collective goals of the business community of Odessa, was given to Dan because of his extensive volunteer history to the community and involvement in volunteerism that led to this award.

He has donated legal services to various nonprofit organizations, including the Formation of Court Appointed Special Advocates of Ector County and Catholic Charities Community Services, and is a proud supporter of many public school booster clubs, ranging from the Permian High School Choir Booster Club to the Odessa High School Basketball Booster Club.

Again, I congratulate my friend Daniel J. Hollmann on all of these achievements and thank him for his continued service to our community. Other citizens should look to him as a role model, and I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress and to call him my friend.

PROPOSED TIME LINE FOR WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. FORCES FROM IRAQ

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, on a different topic altogether, we have heard talk that the Democrats will bring forth the idea that we can set some sort of an artificial time line on when to get out of Iraq. I would argue there are really only two choices in this issue, and this third choice is false and misleading.

Here is the example: let's assume for the sake of this argument that Democrats decide in March of 2008 we need to stop this fight. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how do you look those family members in the eye whose loved ones are killed or maimed in March of 2008 and say, gee, if we had known in March of 2007 what we now know in March of 2008, that your loved one would have gotten killed, I might have thought a February 28 date was a better date.

Madam Speaker, we have no three choices. We have two choices, and they are honorable, in a sense. One is to fight this fight and win, which is the choice I believe is the correct one; or we simply raise the white flag, admit defeat, say that we have lost and get our troops out today. Anything short of that is untenable. The impact it has on the war fighter is obvious, ignoring, of course, the impact it has on the folks we oppose and the advantages it gives them. We simply cannot hamstring our fighters in this fight.

I cannot face families in July of this year or March of next year and say, gee, but for the calendar clicking off, your loved one would not have been at risk.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pick sides in this fight. Either we fight it or we get out. Pick a side. There is no third alternative.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Office of the Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, Effective immediately, I hereby resign from my position on the House Committee for Education and Labor. I have gained much from my time served on this committee, and now look forward to serving the 110th Congress in other capacities.

Best regards,

BOB INGLIS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

MANNER OF CONDUCTING PROCEEDINGS IN THE 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, we have had I think a very eventful week here this week and accomplished a significant amount and had some intense debates here on the floor of this Congress. In my time here and in anybody's memory here, I don't think anyone remembers a time that there have been three motions to recommit that have actually succeeded and attached that new policy on to the bill that was prepared for final passage here on the floor. That makes it an eventful week.

Madam Speaker, I reflect here that at the beginning of the 110th Congress there were a lot of objections to a scoreboard vote board that was kept open when Republicans were in charge for the sake of being able to allow people to change their votes until everyone was satisfied. There were strong and loud and vociferous complaints to keeping that board open when it was the Republicans in charge.

I am not here to make a loud, vociferous objection to the Democrats keeping the board open, but I am here to point out that the shoe is on the other foot today, and today this motion to recommit went up on the board, and it had 147 Democrats that voted ''no'' on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit, what it did was said that no individual who has been issued a transportation worker identification card may board a maritime vessel if the individual has been convicted of or found not guilty by reason of insanity in a civilian or military jurisdiction of any of the following felonies. In other words, nobody is going to be boarding a maritime vessel if they are guilty of these crimes: espionage or conspiracy, sedition or conspiracy to commit sedition, treason,

and a number of other crimes along through the list one can imagine, distribution, manufacture, purchase receipt, dealing with explosives. In other words, terrorists, people who have been identified as terrorists, convicted as terrorists. The motion to recommit said no one will be boarding a maritime vessel that has those things on their record.

Upon the first vote that was up there, the peak came out to be 247 Democrats voting against a motion that would block those who have committed those violent crimes, those crimes against this country. Then the board was left open, and as minutes went by, and I didn't watch my watch, but I am going to suspect it was 20 to 25 minutes, I watched Democrats vote their convictions and then began to adjust to their convictions, and 111 Members changed their vote here, getting down from 147 that voted ''no'' to 56 that voted ''no,'' and final passage became 359 to 56 on the passage of the motion to recommit.

So I point out that sometimes that criticism that comes when you are in the minority doesn't seem like when the shoe is on the other foot that the rules you claim should apply are the ones that actually apply when you find yourself in a position of making the rules.

I would point also out that the circumstance before the Rules Committee, since that word came out of my mouth, Madam Speaker, and in the Rules Committee, we brought rules before, there were rules that were brought before this full Congress and approved for the 110th Congress. This was going to be a 110th Congress with a new majority and a new Speaker and there was going to be sunshine on everything we did. There was going to be a level of integrity in the process that was here. There were great objections to the process we had, and there was going to be a change, a new era in government, which means more openness, more honesty, more reporting.

But written into the rule was an exemption for the Rules Committee, so they are not required to report the recorded votes within the Rules Committee.

Now, how is it that here we are a more open government, but we are writing in provisions that allow for more secrecy? And that is the fact, Madam Speaker. That is the fact that came before this Congress. That is the fact that many of us voted against on the rules package. That is the amendment that I brought before the Rules Committee a couple of days ago.

What is ironic about that is that I have to go and appeal to the same people that want the secrecy and ask them if they will let me have a vote here on the floor about taking away the secrecy they have assigned themselves. Of course, the people that sat in judgment, that assigned themselves the secrecy, said, no, we won't allow a debate on it; we won't allow a vote on it. We are going to maintain the secrecy. And, by the way, it was offensive to them to have anyone raise the issue that they should be required to report the votes of the Rules Committee when there is a recorded vote.

So that amendment was denied. The American people were denied a debate. They were denied a vote and denied an opportunity to even judge whether this is a more open process or whether it has become a more closed process.

But I think these two instances that I brought up just this week, Madam Speaker, illustrate that the process is not more open, it is not cleaner, it is not with more sunshine on it, and it is not more reflective of the representation here in this Congress. There are other instances as well as I could go on, but I think that suffices to make my point.

Madam Speaker, I came here to talk about another issue that has been rolled out in the media yesterday and today, this issue of the supplemental appropriations bill that the President has asked for in order to fund our troops in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

The President has made a request so that we can provide adequate materials, supplies, training and equipment and munitions to our military that are on the front lines who put their lives on the line for our freedom. I am pledged to uphold that support for them. But what I see come out, at least with the report of the news with regard to the supplemental, has so many strings attached. This is an unprecedented attempt on the part of Congress to micromanage a shooting war.

Our Founding Fathers understood this, and they declared in the Constitution that the President is the Commander in Chief. They didn't write in the Constitution that the President will be presiding over a committee of 435 Members of Congress on the House side and 100 Senators on the Senate side and they shall be a committee that will micromanage the nuances of a war.

The Founding Fathers knew that you could not fight a war on consensus, that you can't fight it on majority vote. You have to have a Commander in Chief who is in charge. That was a clear understanding of history and human nature. It was reflected by our Founding Fathers into our Constitution, Madam Speaker. And yet to this day, I don't know how many Members of this Congress even understand how the Constitution controls the things that they do, even though every single one of us takes an oath to this Constitution at the beginning of every Congress.

Every 2 years we stand up and we say: ''I pledge to uphold the Constitution of the United States.'' I do so here on the floor. I make that oath on a Bible.

□ 1500

Most don't because it is hard to remember to bring the Bible with you on that day, but most do go over and have their picture taken ceremonially with their hand on the Bible. Well, I do both if I've got the time, but the one I don't miss is I bring the Bible to the floor and I take that oath, ''so help me God,'' to uphold this Constitution.

And if it is inconvenient to have a provision in the Constitution, we have to live with it until it becomes so inconvenient that we are willing to amend it. But we do not have the authority here in this Congress to amend the Constitution, neither does the Supreme Court and neither does the commander in chief. The people of America have to ratify an amendment to the Constitution. And that is how the Founders saw it because they understood they were not creating a democracy, Madam Speaker. And if anybody is teaching out there in the classes of civics and government that go on all over America in nearly every school in America that we are blessed to be born and live in a democracy, I have to say, Madam Speaker, that is an erroneous lesson to be teaching our young people and to be perpetuating through the adults. And, in fact, a lot of the people in this Congress still believe this is a democracy.

Well, when Benjamin Franklin stepped out of the Constitutional Congress he was asked by a lady on the streets, ''What have you produced?'' And his answer was, ''A republic, Madam, if you can keep it.'' And that is what we have. We have a constitutional republic because our Founders understood that if you went to the pure democracy form, and they studied the democracies of the city-states in Greece; in fact, I have been there to see the displays at the National Archives of the pottery that the Greeks had and their method of voting demagogues out of the city and banishing them for 7 years. And some of that system is still within our Greek system on our universities today.

The Greeks identified a demagogue as someone who was so skilled with their rhetoric, so moving and passionate in their delivery of their oratorical speeches, that they could move the masses by emotion rather than rationale. So they banished the demagogues from their city-states because it sent them down the path of emotion rather than deductive reasoning.

So the Founders understood that we didn't need to have the masses moving by emotion; they understood that the definition of a democracy was two wolves and a sheep taking a vote on what's for dinner. Majority rules; guess who's for dinner?

They wrote rights into our Constitution and into the Bill of Rights because they understood human nature, and they knew there had to be protections in place higher than a majority vote, higher than being in the majority. There had to be guaranteed constitutional rights for all citizens in this country on equal standing, drafted in, plugged into the Bill of Rights and ratified by the several States, and now

ratified by all of the States, the 50 States in the Union. Those guarantees must be in place.

This Constitution, Madam Speaker, means something. And the language in this Constitution means what it says. The text of this language means what it meant, means what it was understood to be when it was ratified. And if it is inconvenient or if we disagree with the fundamentals, we should amend it. We shouldn't ignore it.

This Constitution grants Congress, this body in particular I am speaking to, but also the Senate as well, only two authorities when it comes to war; number one is, first, I will state it again, the President is the commander in chief of all Armed Services. We didn't have an Air Force then, but that is implied. So that is the standard, Madam Speaker.

And then the Constitution grants Congress two different authorities when it comes to war: Number one, the authority to declare war. That has happened several times in our history, but the last time it happened was in the beginning of World War II.

The second constitutional authority Congress has is to fund the war. But what we are seeing come out of the Democrat side of this is to micromanage the war in such a way that they can squeeze down and constrict the commander in chief's authority and responsibility to conduct war. And that can only end in disaster for our troops and disaster for the destiny of our country.

But we do not have that authority to micromanage. We can appropriate to the Department of Defense. We can appropriate to the Department of Homeland Security and some other lesser departments within the fringes. But we don't have the authority to micromanage.

I am going to go further, Madam Speaker, and take this position, that if this Congress should decide that building a bunch of ICBM missiles and placing them in places, say, across the polar ice cap are a high priority and they appropriated the money for that and we found out that we were in a shooting war that flared up maybe in six different places in the world and we needed to spend that money for armored Humvees and bullet-proof vests and more M–4 machine guns or more surveillance equipment, whatever it might be; if this Congress refused to change that appropriation, I am taking the position that the President has the authority, because he is commander in chief at a time of war, to do an interdepartmental transfer and prioritize those dollars within the Department of Defense in the place that he sees fit because he is the commander in chief. Anything less than that, Madam Speaker, is something that ties the hands of the commander in chief and the feet and puts our military at risk. That is the effort that is coming from the other side of the aisle here. And it is one that will eventually debilitate this country. This debate has encouraged our enemies and has diminished our ability to succeed.

And so if we look back at history, I don't believe there has been any time in history that this constitutional principle that I have laid out here has been challenged and been taken to court. And even then, I wonder how the Supreme Court would come down on this. But there were times back in 1973, 1974 and 1975, at least 2 of those 3 years, if not 3 of those 3 years, when Congress put strings on Department of Defense appropriations. And those strings said this, that none of these funds and any funds heretofore having been appropriated, meaning any money that is out there in the pipeline now, none of these funds can be spent in either North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia. And it shall not be used in the skies over those four countries or offshore from those four countries. So none of our appropriations money could be used there by the restrictions that were put on by this Congress, the micromanagement of this Congress.

But the fact was that we pulled our troops out of Vietnam at that point. It wasn't the President's intent to go back into Vietnam, but it was his intent to provide air cover. So when that message went, North Vietnam probably didn't have C–SPAN then, but they watch what goes on in this Congress, just like our enemies do in Iraq and the Middle East today; they understood that Congress had lost its will to conduct war in Vietnam. And they began to marshal their forces and provide the munitions and the armament necessary to mount the invasion, which they did in the spring of 1975. And in the aftermath of Congress micromanaging a nonshooting war, 3 million people died in the South China Sea, in South Vietnam and in the countries of Laos and Cambodia, 3 million people, because Congress injected themselves into a decision that was made by the commander in chief.

But the commander in chief didn't challenge that. The commander in chief at the time, the initial one was President Nixon, who was very weak politically. And then, of course, the appointed, not elected, President Ford, whom I revere, neither challenged that restriction put on by Congress.

So I don't believe we have a constitutional challenge that has taken place because President Ford and President Nixon did not challenge the Congress when they began to tie the strings in Vietnam.

This Congress is preparing to tie the strings. And I am saying to the public, Madam Speaker, and to the President, my position is I am going to uphold this Constitution. I'm going to defend the President's right to do interdepartmental transfers of funds if they think they are going to tie strings to this. I think the President can ignore any conditions that this House puts on him if the money is appropriated at DOD because that is his responsibility as commander in chief, not the responsibility of this Congress, not the Pelosi Congress, not the Murtha Congress, but the President of the United States is the commander in chief.

In fact, I believe the last gentleman I mentioned would like to be the commander in chief. And given some of the legislation that he has drafted and introduced in this Congress, I think he would probably squeal had he been the commander in chief and someone tried to put the strings on him that he has tried to put on the White House.

And I would add that, in the Department of Defense appropriations bill last year, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) was able to slip language into that appropriations bill that would prohibit any basing agreements from being negotiated in Iraq. He stated that it was for permanent bases, but the language said any bases. And there was misinformation that was brought to this floor. And my amendment that tried to strip that out of the appropriations bill failed here on this floor, which compelled me to go to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and ask for a letter to support my amendment, which we put to the conference committee. And that letter then was enough to get that stripped out of the language.

That is the kind of thing that is going on; that would have us already moving out of Iraq if General Pace hadn't agreed with me and made that request of the conference committee. And so the conference report came without that language, and we were able to keep our operations going in Iraq. It was that close in a Republican majority. And now you see what's coming, Madam Speaker, under this new majority.

And here are some of the bullet points that come up on this subject that would come from the majority side of the aisle. This new appropriations, the strings that would be tied, the strings that I contend are unconstitutional, one would be, the legislation prohibits the deployment of troops who are not fully mission capable. Now, who would decide that? A definition apparently that is identified by the majority here in this Congress.

There are a list of other conditions in this, but I also recognize that the gentleman from Arizona, who has a heart full of appreciation for our troops and the Constitution, is on the floor. I would be very happy to yield so much time as he may consume, Mr. SHADEGG.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate his taking the time to bring this message here to the floor and to talk about it.

I guess my curiosity or my interest is piqued by you talking about the conditions that are placed in this bill. I will tell you that I fundamentally do not believe that you can justify, that any nation could ever justify, announcing, while their troops were in the field in the middle of a war, announcing that on a date certain in the future, we are

going to unilaterally stop. It seems to me that the illogic of that should be apparent to everybody, but even perhaps the immorality of that should be important. How do we say to troops, well, fight until August of 2008, and then, by the click of a tock on the arm of a clock, by the hand going one more notch until it now becomes August 2008, the fight is over. To me, that makes no sense. And I think it is important that the Nation have a discussion about whether that policy makes any sense.

I would like to discuss it from two points of view. First of all, will withdrawing from Iraq end the war? I think that is a fair question. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, if we withdraw from Iraq, if we so called ''redeploy,'' that will end the war. Well, I think that is worth discussing, and I think that is an important issue. But I think there is another important issue, and that issue is, what do we owe to the people of Iraq? And on that latter point, I want to note that this morning a reporter for UPI appeared on Washington Journal; her name is Pamela Hess. She has written a series of articles that, as you know, in Washington Journal, they have callers call in. And a caller called in and said, look, this is an unjustified war; we are never going to win, all the various arguments. And she said, well, I would like to suggest, and she was not taking anybody's side in the fight; she said, I would like to suggest that it is important for us to recognize that while one can criticize or analyze the reasons why we went to war, and that is one set of facts and circumstances, one can also look at why we are there now. And interestingly, her assertion is one that I have made, and she laid out an explanation. She said, having come into Iraq as we did, having dismantled their army, sent them packing, having dismantled their police forces, sent them packing, having dismantled, disassembled, taken apart their government, we created a situation where there was chaos.

□ 1515

Ms. Hess, in her comments on Washington Journal this morning, said, stop for a moment and imagine if another country had invaded the United States and if they had wiped out our Army and wiped out and disbanded our police forces and sent them home and then taken down our government. How long would it take before even here in the United States we began to see chaos, not unlike the chaos you see on the streets in Iraq?

And her argument was one that I think is the other important argument which is not being made in this debate. The one, as I mentioned, is if we retreat, if we embrace defeat, as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are urging us to do, and say we cannot win in Iraq, let us leave and let us leave by a date certain, my first argument is, we can leave but the war will not end. I would suggest they have already demonstrated they will come to the United States. They will attack us here. They will attack Americans and nonradical Muslims all over the world. They will attack us and other Westerners in Europe, in Spain, in Indonesia. They will attack us everywhere. So I will suggest the war will not end.

The second argument is, forgetting how the war started, what obligation do we have to assist the people of Iraq in reestablishing the basics of a government, of a police force and of an army such that they can stop chaos, they can stop lawlessness?

One of the ways that you hear people in the Middle East articulate this, and the ambassadors from Jordan and Saudi Arabia came and made this argument to us and I think you heard them talk, they said the United States came into Iraq uninvited; the United States owes it to the Middle East and to the people of Iraq not to leave uninvited. And then you ask them what they mean by that, and they mean the same thing that Pamela Hess said, which is we have an obligation to aid the Iraqi people at least until they can get a government up and functioning, an army up and functioning, and a police force so that chaos does not reign.

I think those are the two key arguments. I would insert into the RECORD articles that Ms. Hess has written since returning from her most recent visit to Iraq that document the things that have changed.

ANALYSIS: LOUDSPEAKER DIPLOMACY

(By Pamela Hess)

RAMADI, IRAQ, FEB. 17.—It's old fashioned. It's low-tech but it works. One U.S. unit operating in Iraq has found the best way to win hearts and minds is to put loudspeakers on police stations. The speaker systems are erected over the police stations. The daily broadcasts are 10 to 15 minutes long. They are timed not to compete with the call to prayers, and the messages are written by the police and local political officials. Some of the speeches are copied onto CDs and distributed around town. The broadcasts include Iraqi top 40 music; news dispatches taken from the BBC and Al Jazeera, speeches by the governor and the police chief, warnings about high threat areas, and the national anthem.

''That's a pretty catchy song,'' said Maj. Dan Zappa, the executive officer of the 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, responsible for security operations in some of the most contested areas of Ramadi. ''It's interspersed with popular music. We've got video of kids dancing, hundreds of them, jumping around.''

''We have the police chief in western Ramadi'' Zappa said, ''and he's addressing his family, his extended family and his tribe.'' Said Maj. Tiley Nunnink, a guest staff member of the battalion sent by the Marine Corps Warfighting Lab in Virginia: ''It's a vehicle for Iraqi policemen to say what they need to say to the people.''

The loudspeaker program would be a gamble in a town without a legitimate local police presence. In that case it would just be the overbearing—and clumsily worded—symbol of the occupation trying to co-opt local religious customs, senior commanders said.

But they believe the loudspeaker broadcasts are part of what seems to be turning the population in Ramadi against the insurgency.

''The system's working because the local population is approaching the Iraqi police with valuable information to help put down criminal acts—roadside bombs, building IEDs, stuff like that,'' Zappa said.

''Those are definitely the metrics, how does the population respond to this?'' Nunnink said. ''You can hear it in the broadcast. The broadcast says thank you for providing this information. You're contributing to the further security of the city.''

The loudspeaker initiative addresses a huge hole in U.S. warfighting capabilities in Iraq: Insurgents can turn around videos of successful attacks on U.S. convoys, or dead Iraqi soldiers, or doctored or misrepresented footage of events within hours, sometimes before those events have even been reported to American headquarters. The videos show up on racks of bootlegged DVDs and CDs that seem to be for sale on nearly every street corner almost instantaneously.

Deployed U.S. forces however, do not have the authority to respond directly on their own; ''information operations'' products and messages have to be approved at high levels in the chain of command. That takes time, and by the time the message is approved, the story has moved on. Score one for the adversary.

''I have the power to call in a lethal air strike but not to respond to an insurgent video,'' one senior U.S. commander told UPI this week.

''We've been getting our butt kicked by the (local) media,'' Zappa said. ''There would be an incident when they would blow up a Humvee and kill two Marines and wound civilians, and they would turn that around and say that we wounded the civilians.''

''That's how information travels out here, by word of mouth,'' Nunnink said. ''So the question was, how are we going to compete with that?''

Ramadi is notorious as one of the bloodiest battlefields for U.S. forces.

''There are local Iraqis doing great things for the community, innocent civilians, heroes, trying to put down the insurgents,'' said Zappa, a native of Pittsburgh. ''They are out there but they don't have the ability to get the voice that the insurgents do. So that population sitting on the fence doesn't know, doesn't understand because they are not in receive mode of that information.''

For the last four years, U.S. forces have tried hosting daily radio shows or cobbling together television broadcasts to try to win the loyalty of the people. They hand out flyers promising additional reconstruction funds if violence ebbs. None of the delivery methods are really ideal for this culture; the flyers go unread, the television and radio require a recalcitrant public to actively tune in to listen. But one thing everyone listens to is the booming call to prayers from the local mosque's loudspeakers, five times a day, plus a sermon on Friday.

Zappa and Nunnink and several other headquarters officers meet weekly to discuss the ''non-kinetic'' campaign—that is, all the non-lethal activities the battalion conducts.

''Our approach was what can we do that is gonna be more effective. We can kill bad guys all day but you're never gonna kill enough of them; They are always gonna create more. So we ask, what do the people really need? What's gonna give a tactical advantage? What's gonna get the Iraqi army, get the police out there? These are the things that drove us,'' Zappa said.

''We realized the opportunity was here if we could convince people the insurgency is not supporting them, it was destroying their city . . . it was just offering chaos, and capitalize on that, and the little successes that

these (Iraqi police) guys were bringing to the table.''

It was in one of these meetings they came up with the notion of a loudspeaker campaign of their own.

ANALYSIS: THE U.S. WAR OF IDEAS

(By Pamela Hess)

WASHINGTON, JAN. 5.—As the ''global war on terrorism'' enters its sixth year, the United States government is beginning to rethink its approach to the larger battle—the so-called ''war of ideas.''

The war on terror is, at its heart, a physical fight against extremists. The war of ideas, on the other hand, is a philosophical debate that pits extremist ideology in the Muslim world against tolerance and freedom. So far, however, the United States seems to be losing.

A Zogby International poll released in December shows that the vast majority of Arabs in five key countries view the United States and its policies in a strongly negative light. In two countries, Jordan and Morocco, attitudes have declined precipitously in the last year.

U.S. government officials are grappling with how to win the war of ideas, and some are embracing fresh conclusions: that U.S. actions speak louder than any propaganda it can put forth; that the promotion of democracy should be a sidecar to providing humanitarian aid and economic development in the Arab world; and acceptance that the United States has only a peripheral role to play in the core philosophical debate central to the war of ideas.

''I think we have to think about influencing people. The way we influence people is not just what we say, but by what we do and who we are,'' a Pentagon official closely involved in the Defense Department's piece of the war of ideas, told UPI last month. ''It is not primarily about messaging.'' For 40 years during the Cold War, the U.S. waged a war of ideas against communism and totalitarianism, and won.

''During the Cold War, that was arguably easier to do because the Soviet Union was oppressing people. It was an easier argument to make, and (in Eastern Europe) we were more or less culturally on neutral ground,'' he said.

'' . . . They didn't really know about us because they were in relatively closed societies. They didn't necessarily hate us,'' he said.

This new battle is more difficult and requires a different approach, the official said. ''We are starting in the hole,'' he acknowledged. ''In the Muslim world when 70 percent of the people are opposed to the United States, that's a much harder sell.''

It does not help that many people in the Middle East identify their own governments as their oppressors, and the United States as their oppressors' allies.

''We start going in, we go in knowing they dislike us,'' he said. ''It's gonna take a long time.'' He conceives the battle as having two major fronts, and in only one of them can the United States play a major public role.

The official said the U.S. should not be trying to counter terrorist propaganda. It should be finding ways to encourage competing visions within the Islamic world.

''In the strategic sense I don't think we need to have a counter-narrative,'' the official said. ''The violent extremists, they have a single narrative. And I think from a purely strategic perspective we just have to make sure there are other narratives—not necessarily our own—that compete with theirs.'' The debate must be engaged by ''protagonists within the Muslim community,'' he said—probably theologians from Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim country.

''We know that the (Muslim) community is much more diverse than it (seems). We have to find those people. I actually think we would do ourselves a great favor if we worked from the outside in, but look to examples outside of the Arab core.''

There are ''individuals who don't necessarily agree with the United States but who don't agree with violence as a tool,'' he said. ''Supporting that is very important. How we do that is the tough part, because we don't want to taint them by virtue of overt association (with the United States). The government is struggling with how to do that.''

The second front in the war of ideas is one in which the United States can play a direct public role: changing the conditions in the Arab world that feed terrorism—the lack of educational and economic opportunity, poor health care, and repressive regimes.

''Look at the level of despair in the Arab world. It rivals sub-Saharan Africa,'' he said. ''That, plus broken regimes in that part of the world—it's a tinder box.''

The official believes desperate conditions do not cause Islamic extremism. But they are what makes the Middle East so ripe for recruitment.

''They are the kindling of terrorism. They are what terrorists exploit,'' he said. ''I think what the United States can do is essentially remove the kindling.''

Done well, that could have two effects—draining the number of potential terrorist recruits and sympathizers, and demonstrating American good will in the Muslim world with actions rather than words.

''Think about Hezbollah or al Qaida affiliates or . . . (Muqtada Sadr in Iraq). What do they do? They don't stand on street corners only getting out proselytizing. They set up clinics, they give out food. That's their way of getting in,'' he said.

''If you look at the (U.S. response to the) tsunami, to the earthquake in Pakistan, the earthquake in Iran—that's when we got the biggest spike,'' he said. ''Some of the things that have given us the greatest return are not the things we intended.''

The Bush administration's emphasis on democracy building in the region is necessary, he said, but likely to fail if the ''kindling'' is not addressed.

''I do think you have to address the regimes. But I would say that the second-tier efforts, removing kindling (is more important). It's not just about notions, however justified, of democracy alone. It's more broadly about (developing a) healthy society, a civil society and addressing grievances.'' Moreover, what the United States considers a democracy may have to change if democracy is to be embraced in the Muslim world.

''We often ask the question... is Islam compatible with democracy? But we never question the other side, taking the religion as a given and seeing how flexible democracy is,'' he said. ''We pay lip service to the fact that (Arab democracies are) not going to look like us. But I think we very rarely say we ought to revisit what a democracy is, and what role religion can play in it,'' he said. ''If we do that we might be more flexible, and there might be different approaches that might be successful.''

He is disturbed that pundits characterize the war on terrorism as a clash of civilizations. ''That feeds our adversaries,'' he said. ''The reality is I don't see this as a (rift) between Islam or between the East and West. It's a horizontal (split) within civilizations,'' he said.

ANALYSIS: IRAQ OUT OF TIME, NEEDS TROOPS

(By Pamela Hess)

WASHINGTON, DEC. 15.—A leading U.S. military analyst is advocating the addition of some 30,000 U.S. forces to Iraq, with a new mission: to protect the Iraqi people.

Frederick Kagan, a former instructor at West Point and now a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, believes his plan to add seven Army brigade combat teams and Marine regiments to Baghdad and Anbar province early next year could establish security in Baghdad by the fall of 2007. While much of the focus in Washington is on increasing the pace of American training of Iraqi security forces who will eventually take on the bulk of the fighting, Kagan argues the United States and Iraq no longer has that luxury of time.

''Iraq has reached a critical point. The strategy of relying on a political process to eliminate the insurgency has failed. Rising sectarian violence threatens to break America's will to fight. This violence will destroy the Iraqi government, armed forces, and people if it is not rapidly controlled,'' he writes. ''Violence is accelerating beyond the Iraqis'' ability to control it.''

The surge in troops, if it succeeds in turning around the deteriorating situation in Iraq, would pave the way for a major troop withdrawal in 18 to 24 months, he says.

But the surge would also mean an increase in battle casualties, now nearing 3,000.

''Short-term increase in casualties is not a sign of failure ... As troops actively secure the population the enemy will surge its attacks on coalition troops and Iraqi civilians,'' Kagan writes.

He envisions a four-phase strategy in 2007: surging forces into Iraq by March; preparing for ''clear and hold'' operations by June; clear critical areas by September; and then transition control of them to Iraqi forces.

''These forces, partnered with Iraqi units, will clear critical Sunni and mixed Sunni-Shiite neighborhoods, primarily on the west side of the city. After the neighborhoods have been cleared, U.S. soldiers and Marines, again partnered with Iraqis, will remain behind to maintain security,'' Kagan writes in a new paper for AEI.

The clear and hold operation would be closely linked to a U.S. military led-reconstruction package with a fully funded plan in place prior to the battles so they can immediately pick up trash and get water and electricity working, area by area.

''Even large reconstruction efforts are cheap compared to continued fighting,'' he notes. It's an expansion of the tactics used with some success in Tall 'Afar and Fallujah but far more ambitious. Those towns were a fraction of the size of Baghdad and relatively isolated, making them easier to surround, empty and conduct house-to-house searches. Their size and location also allowed the return of residents, and potential fighters, to be managed.

Five U.S. brigades are currently operating in Baghdad along with six Iraqi brigades. In Anbar province, there are two Marine regimental combat teams and one U.S. Army brigade combat team. Together, they comprise just 52,500 combat forces in a total U.S. deployment of about 140,000. The remainder are serving in combat service support, headquarters, intelligence and other non-battle functions. Kagan's plan would bring the number of combat troops to 84,000 by September 2007, nearly a 50 percent increase in combat power.

Kagan is not alone in advocating a troop increase. Senior military officers who spoke to UPI on condition of anonymity say that having sufficient troops in Iraq to actually quell the insurgency and combat sectarian violence is the one approach the United States has not yet tried. Since the insurgency began in earnest in November 2003, U.S. forces have been playing catch-up, never having quite enough troops to both carry out

aggressive offensive operations and to maintain a daily presence in the areas already under control. That has resulted in a nationwide ''whack-a-mole'' strategy, they said.

When they have come down hard on one area, the enemy has squeezed out to somewhere they are not. The training of more than 300,000 Iraqi army and police has provided a ''holding'' force but their performance has been uneven at best, and in the case of the police, sometimes counterproductive. And the intervening three years has similarly allowed the insurgent and militia forces to grow as well, diminishing the impact Iraqi forces can have.

The answer, according to Kagan, is a dramatic increase in the number of U.S. troops assigned to protecting Iraq's civilian population.

To get the number of U.S. troops up, Kagan proposes to accelerate the deployment of the next four brigades, now scheduled from April to February. The remaining BCTs would be extended from a 12-month deployment to 15 months. The Marine regiments would be extended from seven months to 12. That would bring the American troops presence in Baghdad up to nine or 10 BCTs, each with about 4,000 soldiers. The plan would also result in two additional Marine regimental combat teams in Anbar province.

Kagan would not pull forces from outside of Baghdad into that fight, Rather, he would leave them in place to continue their daily operations—preventing insurgents and sectarian militias from establishing a foothold in areas previously secured from them.

This military version of ''robbing Peter to pay Paul'' has been played out repeatedly throughout the war, commanders have complained. When they have stabilized an area, troops get called on to put out a fire somewhere else—leaving a security vacuum where they came from and inviting new violence.

If the clear and hold plan is carried out in Baghdad in 2007, Kagan writes that in 2008 the U.S. military could help disarm Shiite militias, stabilize Anbar or northern Iraq, and/or continue the training mission. Kagan concedes the potential responses to an invigorated American offensive in Iraq, outlining each factions' likely responses, and the most dangerous short- and long-term scenarios, along with a plan to counter them.

Kagan also says the U.S. Army and Marine Corps must add at least 60,000 troops to their pay roll in the next two years and the increase must be permanent.

It is ''vital to offset increased demand on the ground forces in Iraq, and vital to provide strategic options in many scenarios beyond Iraq,'' he writes.

Army Chief of Staff Gen. Peter Schoomaker said Thursday that the most the Army can hope to recruit above the 80,000 a year it does now is 6,000 to 7,000 additional soldiers. Marine Corps officials believe they can add another 2,000 additional recruits annually. However, the Army and Marine Corps could likely retain far greater numbers of troops than they currently do. Re-enlistments and extensions are at all time highs, particularly among combat units deployed to Iraq.

Schoomaker also warned that if he does not get additional troops, and more freedom to use reservists to fill out the force, the Army is in danger of ''breaking.''

Kagan says his plan will not break the Army: only four units would be accelerated to Iraq, and they were tapped to go anyway. Moreover, no unit will have less than a year between deployments under his plan.

''Losing now will certainly break the force,'' Kagan writes.

Kagan could not be immediately reached for comment. An AEI spokeswoman said he was at a White House briefing.

As I mentioned, she has written a series of these articles. She went to Iraq, as she explained this morning on Washington Journal, to look at the question of how is it that our troops in Iraq feel they have such an important mission, feel they are accomplishing things. She mentioned that this was her third, I believe, visit to Iraq, and she said, this time, more than either of the two visits, she felt like our troops were more engaged, working more closely with the Iraqi people, felt a greater kinship with the Iraqi people, and felt like they were making progress.

Her purpose was to say, well, this must be just a myth. It must not be true that our troops are really feeling like they are accomplishing something; they are just parroting words given to them from the commanders and higher up.

But her pitch this morning was that is not true; that in point of fact, the thing that has changed was in part the attitude of our troops and the enhanced ability of our troops who have now been deployed there two or three times to speak Arabic, but also that the attitude of the Iraqi people has changed. She talked about how the Iraqi people are now rising up, resisting the violence, fighting back on their own and engaged in this battle in a way in which she had not seen before.

I believe this supplemental is extremely important to our Nation. I believe our confrontation with radical, militant Islam is the single most important confrontation we will face probably in my lifetime. I think back about the threat to world peace posed by communism, which is the threat I grew up with as a child, and I have to evaluate that threat versus the threat we now face with radical, militant Islam.

I have begun to read some of the writings on radical, militant Islam and what they want. I would commend to anyone who cares about this issue a book by a Yale professor by the name of Mary Habeck. Professor Habeck came and spoke, I think you know, to the bipartisan caucus on anti-terrorism and I heard her. I was very impressed. She has written a book called, ''Knowing the Enemy,'' and that book goes into detail on how the radical Islamic wing, the jihadi wing of the Islam faith, strays from the Koran, and how at times they have twisted the Koran, at least in her opinion, and have come to this conclusion that they must reestablish the caliphate, they must stay at a constant state of war, they want to not only reestablish the caliphate in its historical areas, but then expand it and at least require that every nation in the world be under the domination of radical Islam; and that everybody there has to at least be offered the opportunity to live under radical Islam. Then the question of whether or not they have to kill you if you do not remains on the table, but it is an excellent book, and I would urge that people read it. The other book that I would say people should read is a book called, ''America Alone,'' by Mark Steyn.

Again, I think the challenge we face from radical Islam and its confrontation of Western society, ours here in America, Japan, Germany, France, Italy, Britain, is the single most important confrontation, single most important challenge of our lifetimes for us, for our children, for our grandchildren.

I understand the frustration of my colleagues who want us to get out and get out as quickly as we can. It breaks my heart. I have been there three times. I have seen grave errors made in the conduct of the war. I am troubled by the conduct of the war. I am embarrassed by our conduct of the war at times, but that does not answer the fundamental question. The fundamental question is: Can we leave? If we leave, does the war stop? If we leave, does it instead get worse?

I would suggest that if we leave Iraq, if we decide we cannot win there now, if we follow what the current draft supplemental proffered this week by the other side says and say in August of 2008, we are out no matter what, I think things do not get better. I would suggest that what happens is that the radical jihadi now in Iraq seeking to kill us there simply pick up their stakes, jump in a pick-up truck and head to Afghanistan, and suddenly we are fighting the same fight in Afghanistan.

I heard my colleagues on the floor and in the statement say we should be fighting in Afghanistan, and that is a serious fight, and the Taliban and the insurgency are re-arising in their battle and their challenge to us. I agree with them about that. But the problem is, what have we gained if we just moved the fight from Iraq to Afghanistan? And are we willing to stand up to the radical jihadi somewhere? Because if we do not do it in Iraq, I would submit we are going to have to do it somewhere.

I would also suggest that before we abandon Iraq, we need to think about what it is we owe to the people of that society. Having torn down their institutions, having torn down their government, their police and their army, what do we owe them to help them rebuild those institutions before we walk away?

And so I think the supplemental is very important. I think it is going to get a lot of discussion and debate. I personally believe that as long as you leave an arbitrary cut-off date in it that says we will be out of there as of a date certain, it is something I personally cannot support; and I would hope the American people would look at what jeopardy that places us in.

I think you also hear General Petraeus say, look, I just started this job. I need the troops to be able to accomplish it. There are early signs we are making progress. Give me a chance.

I think that is a plea that I hope we do not abandon. I hope that it is a plea

we acknowledge. I would agree that we cannot leave it totally open-ended.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me some time on this point. I thought it was worth my time to cite this reporter, Pamela Hess, and talk about her because she has just been there. She went with the purpose of trying to find out are things different, and at least as I heard her comments on Washington Journal this morning, she said things are different, progress is being made, and the Iraqi people are kicking in. She cited vastly better than I can examples of that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), and I pick up a point that Mr. SHADEGG made, and that is about what the enemy thinks and what happens if we should pull out of the central battlefield in this war on terror called Iraq.

So I am going to just make this transitional point here, Madam Speaker, and that is, I have a date written down here. July 11, 2004, I was sitting in a hotel in Kuwait City waiting to go into Iraq the next day, and I turned on al Jazeera TV, and I saw the face of this rather notorious person right here, Moqtada al Sadr, and he was speaking in Arabic with the English crawler going on underneath, and as I read what he said, and I heard it sparingly in Arabic, he said, If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu. Moqtada al Sadr who has now absconded to Iran to be with his cronies who have been funding him, supporting him, sending him munitions and training him.

But the philosophy that he has voiced here is a philosophy that echoes back in the ghosts of Vietnam and through Lebanon and Mogadishu, and that is, do our enemies take great heart in believing that we do not have the will to complete a military task if it gets difficult or if it gets long?

So the voice of Moqtada al Sadr saying Americans will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, Lebanon and Mogadishu will be replaced should we not succeed in Iraq, and I will point out that Prime Minister Maliki stood right back here at this microphone some months ago, and he said, if this war against terrorism cannot be won in Iraq, it cannot be won anywhere.

Our enemy will know that. We must succeed there on that battleground. The al Qaeda is in Iraq. They have come there to fight us. They have generated a few more out of the Sunnis there in particular; but if we pulled out of Iraq the way the other side would like to see that happen, then the battlefield does transfer to Afghanistan, and that battlefield in Afghanistan will be inspired by a failure to achieve victory in Iraq.

I would point out that the next poster you will see on this floor after such a time, if this Congress acts in a disgraceful fashion, then the next poster you will see will not be the face of Moqtada al Sadr, Mr. Speaker, but it will be the face of Osama bin Laden himself and the quote will not be quite like this. It will be close, though. It will read like this: If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Afghanistan the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu and the same way they left Iraq.

That is what is coming if this side of the aisle does not suck it up and understand that far more American lives are at risk if we do not have the will and the resolve to succeed. Playing politics with the lives of American soldiers and playing politics with the destiny of America just simply cannot be tolerated.

This supplemental appropriations bill, as it is announced to be written, and we do not have a draft to work with yet, is, I believe, an unconstitutional micromanaging of the powers of the Commander in Chief of the United States.

I wish to support and reiterate the statements made by the gentleman from Arizona when he said with the tick of a clock, the fight is over. Can you imagine, Madam Speaker, that a war would be like a prize fight and you would go for 10 rounds, or if it is a championship battle, maybe 15 rounds, could be 12, and when the round is over, the bell rings and the fight stops, and we come home on a date certain, at a time certain, without succeeding in a victory? That is an amazing and astonishing thing, and anyone who is involved in a guerrilla warfare of an insurgency against the United States will know all they have got to do is go underground, hole up and wait; when American soldiers are finally gone, whether lifted off of the U.S. embassy or whether they happen to be deployed out of their troop ships or flown out in jet airliners, they would know that then the enemy would have that battlefield to themselves.

The point made also by Mr. SHADEGG, we came in uninvited, we cannot leave uninvited. That is a profound statement that should be in the conscience of all of us, and we have made progress. We have made significant progress.

The attitude of the Iraqi people I thought was good 3 years ago or even 4 years ago, and I do understand that their attitude is betting better and better, but they are also nervous that we are not going to stick it out.

But if we should leave, there is no doubt things will get worse; and the worse that I would describe, Madam Speaker, is I do not think this is necessarily the worst-case scenario, but I will describe this as a likely-case scenario, and that is, right now Iran is fighting a proxy war against the United States. They are doing so in Iraq. They have been funding and supporting two large Shia militia. One of them would be Sadr's militia and the other one is the Badr Brigade. They have been supporting anyone who will increase the chaos and the disorder in Iraq. They have not only been funding them and supporting them and they have been putting munitions into Iraq that are used against American service personnel and against Iraqi military security personnel. That has gone on for at least 2 years that I know of and it has gone on intensively and finally came out in the press a little over a month ago.

□ 1530

Iran is fighting a proxy war against the United States, and those who attack the United States and provide munitions and funding and training have a sovereign sanctuary to retreat to and hide in, and that is Iran.

I know of no example in history where you have had an insurgency that was funded by a sovereign sanctuary nation that has been protected from the assault of the troops that have been attacked out of that nation, and that prevailing side has always been the side that had the sanctuary, not the side that gave sanctuary.

I am opposed to giving sanctuary in Iran to them so they can fight their proxy war against the United States. If we have enemies, they cannot be hiding behind national boundaries. We must regard them as enemies wherever they are. But if we do not prevail in Iraq, and the pervasive influence that has taken place there by the Shi'a from Iran is imposed in the southern part of Iraq and also in Baghdad as well, which it surely could be controlled by the Shi'as, that would allow Iran in the aftermath with their hegemony to control 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil.

If Ahmadinejad has control of 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil, and about two-thirds of the real estate in Iraq and ultimately maybe more than that, his coffers get flushed full of cash. As the cash flows out of his treasure chest, he starts putting more and more money into his war chest, and that war chest becomes more and more nuclear capable, accelerating their development of nuclear weapons, weapons, in the plural, multiple plural, and means to deliver them, which means more and more missiles to put nuclear warheads on them, not just to threaten Israel, which Ahmadinejad has sworn to annihilate.

He has also sworn to defeat and annihilate the United States. Those missiles would not be constrained to just having the range to drop into Tel Aviv, but they would have soon the range to get into Western Europe and, not much later than that, the range to reach the United States.

This is a nation that has a suicidal tendency and a belief that they are called upon by Allah to annihilate the infidels. Infidels happen to be anyone who doesn't agree with them on their religion.

So think, Madam Speaker, in terms of a Middle East that is controlled by Ahmadinejad and the mullahs in Iran. They set on the Strait of Hormuz. If they have that valve, they will have

the valve at the Strait of Hormuz to control what goes in and what goes out, which amounts to 42.6 percent of the world's exportable oil supply. That is easily enough to make them filthy rich and easily enough to affect the world's economy if they crank that valve down and shut down just a valve, it is a figurative valve, shutting down the oil exports going out of the Strait of Hormuz. They would control all of the Middle East if this happens. Then this Nation would go into a recession, probably a depression.

If that happens, that reflects back to China, because China also is out there on the world market doing all that they can for the oil that they need, and they are dependent on the U.S. economy. The United States and China would be the big losers. Russia and Iran would be the big winners. Iran for obvious reasons; Russia because they have a lot of oil.

That explains why Putin has taken a hostile position against the United States. He wants things to go that direction in Iraq. He wants us out of there. He wants the Iranians to take over in Iraq because that helps his world dominance and that helps his power base. That is an equation that I don't believe is considered by the retreatniks that are writing these line items of micromanagement into this supplemental appropriations bill, this, I believe, it will come out to be an unconstitutional supplemental appropriations bill.

I would be happy to recognize the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman. You hit upon one of the keys or at least one of the major concerns or arguments that I have over the idea of our colleagues that we can withdraw from Iraq and it will end the war.

You touched upon the fact that radical Islam teaches that they must kill all infidels. I make the point that, look, I understand the desire of people who want us out of Iraq to end the war and end the killing and to not have American troops on the battleground dying each day. I want that as well.

The question one has to ask is, is that a viable strategy? A lot of people think back to the Vietnam War and say, well, look, we ultimately made a decision that we couldn't win the Vietnam War. Indeed, as your discussion earlier in this hour pointed out, there were Members of this Congress who decided we want out of Vietnam; we are going to cut the funding back; that will bring us home.

Some could argue that with the help of this Congress, we did cut off funding for the Vietnam War, and the Vietnam War did end. I would suggest for thoughtful Americans looking at this today, we are in a very different world. To my knowledge, and I have asked this of a number of people, I know of no incident ever where any North Vietnamese leader had announced that, if we finished in Vietnam and left Vietnam, that would be insufficient. I know of no Vietnamese, North Vietnamese, leader, Communist Vietnam leader, even leader of Communist China at the time, who said, as soon as we defeat the Americans in Vietnam, then we will take the fight to them in the United States.

That is a very, very, very, very different circumstance than we have here. Read Osama bin Laden. Read Ayman al Zawahiri. Read any of the leaders of the radical militant Islamic movement in the world of the leaders of al Qaeda, now thought to be reforming in the mountain areas of Pakistan and reasserting itself in a more cohesive fashion; they have made it clear. They don't want us just out of Iraq. Their goal isn't, if the Americans will leave Iraq, the war will end. They have never said that. What they have said over and over and over again is, we intend to kill the great Satan.

You talked about Ahmadinejad. He has given speeches in which he envisioned a world in which there is no Israel and a world in which there is no United States. How does one unilaterally declare peace? I think that is a fair question; could we have said at some point during World War II, you know what, we are losing soldiers in France, we are losing soldiers in the Netherlands fighting this battle, let's just quit, and the war will end? Or had Hitler said, I am going on, I am going forward, my plan is an Aryan domination of the world?

This is a different circumstance. The leaders of this radical, militant, jihadist movement have said, we must confront the infidel. As you just explained, they define it: Anybody who doesn't believe and practice Islam the way they believe it and practice it must be killed.

I think by announcing, as this proposed supplemental bill does, and the language of it clearly states, we will leave Iraq by August 2008 no matter what. We have to think about the message that sends. That is a very clear message. That message is, if you are Osama bin Laden hiding somewhere in Pakistan or on the border lands between Pakistan and Afghanistan, and you hear that message, and you know he is paying attention, and he has heard that message, what do you think? If you are Ayman al Zawahiri and you are his chief lieutenant and you hear that message, it is very clear: Hang tight, lay low, go to the cities outside of Baghdad, keep your profile low, kill a few people on the side as you are going, but don't worry about it, because, in a handful of months, maybe as early as next January, but, according to this measure that the Democrats announced earlier this week, no later than August 2008, the Americans will withdraw from Iraq, gone, finished, out of here.

You have just announced to Osama bin Laden: Hang on, hold tight. In August, the Americans will abandon Iraq. In August, the war will end, and you will have control of Iraq, assuming the Iraqis can't defend themselves at that point, and you can take this war forward wherever you want to take it forward.

I don't understand the mindset of that. I understand the mindset of somebody who says, end the war tomorrow, let's bring them home. That is safe. If that's the choice of the American public, if that's the choice of the majority in this United States Congress, that is something, get them home and get them home tonight because they are safe.

But announcing that they will leave as of almost a year and a half from now, and between then they fight for what, is something I just can't understand. I do believe that Osama bin Laden and Al Zawahiri will understand that message.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I reflect upon the last time we fought this enemy, and the first time that I know that we fought this enemy goes clear back into the early part of the 1500s, and I pick it up in a book called, ''Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters,'' when the Corsairs, Barbary pirates, would set upon the merchant marines that were sailing around the Mediterranean; they also raided the coastlines from Greece all the way up along the coast, Italy, France, Spain, up to England and as far north as Iceland.

Iceland itself was the furthest, most northerly venture on the part of the Barbary pirates, who pressed 400 Icelanders into slavery, took them back to the Barbary Coast on the north shore of Africa and put them into slavery, where they died faster than any of the other slaves. But all together the history totals up about 1.25 million Christian slaves pressed into slavery by the Barbary pirates. This was just in the 1500s.

Now, the first shooting war we got into in the United States began right after the end of the violence in the Revolutionary War. We finished, the battle was over, and 1783, here in this country, we had the protection of the French flag for our merchant marine at that time on the high seas; 1784, we lost the protection of the French flag when we had won our independence. Between that period of time and our Constitution being ratified in 1789, the protection of the French flag left us.

So, from 1783 was when hostilities ended with Great Britain; 1784, the Barbary pirates fell upon our merchant marine ships, pressed our soldiers into slavery, and we had to build a Marine Corps and a Navy to go on and take on the Barbary pirates who were negotiated with in 1786 by Thomas Jefferson and by Ben Franklin and by John Adams. Jefferson brought a report back to this Congress, and that report is clearly a document within the history of this Congress.

It can be found in a report that is delivered over here in the Library of Congress, where he said that he had tried to negotiate with the Muslim leader at

the time, and he asked: Why do you attack us? Why do you kill us? We have no quarrel with you. We have had a peaceful posture with regard to you, and yet your whole regime sets upon us in the high seas.

The answer he got back was, Allah commands that we do this. He commands that we attack and kill you, or press you into slavery until you either pay homage or adopt and convert to our religion.

That report comes back from Thomas Jefferson. Those are the same circumstances that we are in today, just a few, couple 300-plus years down the line. Jefferson's analysis was, how do you negotiate with people who have a religious belief that they need to kill you in order to be saved? In fact, in Jefferson's report, the world of Islam over there, the Barbary pirates at the time said that anyone who was killed attacking the infidels would surely go to paradise.

He understood them. That is why he bought a Koran, was to do his oppositional research. That is what we are up against today, the same thing. If we don't understand our enemy, if we don't understand nosce hostem, which is a Latin term for, ''know my enemy,'' came out of Romans, then we have the kind of appropriations bill that would have all these strings tied in such a way as the President can only deploy unprepared troops, and then it sets up some standards for that. If we need to defend ourselves, we couldn't do so unless we met this standard that is created by the other side of the aisle.

Mr. KING of Iowa. This bill presumably also requires the Iraqi government to meet the key security, political and economic benchmarks established by the President in his State of the Union address. That was January 10.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is interesting, since you were talking about history and since you have been using this quote, and I knew this before the gentleman got here, but the last time, to my recollection, that the United States Congress has cut off funds for troops in the field and demanded they be taken out of someplace was in November of 1993. It was a motion written by a gentleman from New York, a Republican by the name of Ben Gilman. It was brought to this floor by a Republican by the name of Jerry Solomon, and it instructed the Clinton administration to get troops out of Somalia.

I just think that is important to add, in a historical context, that this has happened before. In fact, Members through the Republican party have led the effort to get the troops out of a Muslim-dominated country within the last couple of decades.

I do want to remind the American people that you were not here for that. I was. I had to do a little research to remember the exact set of circumstances, but I do think it is important to add to this debate.

□ 1545

Mr. KING of Iowa. I also recognize you are a fair-minded Mississippian, and I appreciate that and the tone and the history that you have added. And perhaps on your walk across here, you might not have heard my remarks with regard to the Vietnam era and the constraints that were put on the appropriations bill then. And so I don't think that we are in disagreement on the precedence or the history. We may or may not be in disagreement on the constitutional aspects.

And what I have done is taken a position that Congress does not have the authority to micromanage. And I was not here to put up a vote on that, but you can expect, Madam Speaker, how I would have voted had that been the case.

But these micromanaging efforts, and this is a newspaper publishing information, would appear to require that the Iraqi government meet key security, political, and economic benchmarks that were established by the President in the State of the Union Address on January 10. Now, those were goals at that time. I don't speak for the commander in chief on that, but I know now that we are well passed January 10. On January 10, there wasn't a plan that had been unfolded like the plan we are working on today. And you have to be flexible in a time of war. And to go back and pull things out of his speech and say, and we are going to tie you to that on appropriations, I think that does two things: I don't think that is prudent, and I don't think it is constitutional.

Another one would be the Iraqi failure to meet these benchmarks would mean the beginning of U.S. withdrawal from Iraq and will restrict economic aid to the Iraqis. Another case, Madam Speaker, of setting up a standard here in Congress, and the slow wheels of this Congress can creep along. And then we put something in place that would prohibit us, prohibit the commander in chief from being flexible in time of war.

It goes on. Another standard would be, if progress toward meeting any key benchmark is not met by July 1, 2007; we will hardly get any legislation passed before then; a redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq begins immediately and must be completed within 180 days.

Madam Speaker, progress towards meeting benchmarks, that is a gray line, not a bright line but a grey one. Well, we are making progress every single day, but I don't think the people that are drafting this legislation would agree that we are making progress every single day. So, therefore, by their judgment of this standard, that would mean that we begin pulling out July 1, 2007, just a few months from now, and may be even retroactive, because I don't think this bill can get out of this Congress by then.

Another one says, if key benchmarks are not met October 1, 2007, a redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq begins immediately and must be completed within 180 days.

It goes on and on. And, again, this is a huge, huge reach for Congress to get involved in the micromanagement of a war. There have always been consequences.

And, by the way, the gentleman from Mississippi that raised the issue of the appropriations bill in the early 1990s Congress that said, get out of Somalia, if you look at the aftermath of that, I think it would have been far better for the United States had we stayed and had we completed the mission there; it would be perhaps done by now and not a place where there are terrorists pulling into that. There has been a long, drawn out war in that area since that period of time that has washed back and forth across that countryside. And part of it is because we lacked resolve. And part of that is shown right here in the words of Muqtada al-Sadr.

So, Madam Speaker, I would bring up one more point, and that would be, we have made progress there. And the progress that we have made, some of it is measured by construction projects that are completed. There has been a lot that has been said about things not getting done in Iraq, and I would submit that I have been over there a number of times but twice specifically to review the construction projects that have been initiated and in progress and completed. And this shows in green the projects that are completed. Along that map, it is easy to see that we have got most of our work done. We are nearing the end really of all of them. The green are completed. The yellow is under construction, and the red are those that are planned but not started. Tiny little numbers under the red here. Big numbers under the green. Significantly smaller numbers than those that are under construction.

We have gotten a lot of projects completed, Madam Speaker, and we are almost to that point where we can wrap up this work that started here in Iraq, that started out with $18.4 billion. We put supplemental funding in there. And then a final number, I can't speak to factually here on the floor, although it is significantly larger than $18.4 billion. There has been a lot of infrastructure that has been picked up to speed. If you look around here on the edge, these are all border forts along the edge on the border between Iran and Iraq. That is also the case down along here with Jordan and Syria. We have fortified the border and put people there on the outposts. That has done a lot to slow things down, but it has not done enough to keep it from coming out of Iran.

I have been to a good number of these projects. Some would be sewer projects in Sadr City, Baghdad, itself that began about 3 years ago. And under the

first armored division controlling that, General Carelli, who is now the Corps commander there. I have been up here to the Kirkuk area where the mother of all generators sits there producing electricity 24 hours a day, every day, a gas-fired generator plant. There is work done all over this area. We have gone back and reflooded the swamps where the swamp Arabs lived that were dried up and drained by Saddam Hussein. They have moved back into that area. About 8,000 square miles were drained; we got about 4,000 square miles put back in. We have done a tremendous amount to improve the environment there in Iraq, and 80 percent of the violence is confined to Baghdad and 30 miles within Baghdad. So why would we be concerned that we can't control this or we can't manage this?

I would point out that, in 1944, on December 22 of 1944, the 101st airborne was surrounded at Bastogne, and the Nazis demanded that the 101st surrender. And General McCollum's response was a retort, it was ''Nuts.'' The Germans didn't know how to understand that, Madam Speaker. But what it meant was: We are staying here. We have got you right where we want you. You are all around us. We can hit you. We can fire and hit you in any direction.

And the Americans underwent a relentless artillery barrage, but the response, the rhetoric, ''Nuts'' prevailed. And General Patton's Army was able to relieve the 101st Airborne. The 101st today contends they didn't need the help; they would have liked to just whip the Germans themselves.

That was the spirit we had in this country and our fighting personnel in December of 1944. When they were surrounded, and it was hopeless, they said, ''Nuts.'' Now we have Baghdad surrounded and we have Baghdad penetrated, and all we have to do is maintain stability there, and we have people talking about surrender. And I think they are nuts, Madam Speaker, to talk about surrender with all of this investment in blood and treasure, to be so close to success and victory here, and to be waffling and go wobbly at a time when you need a spine and you need courage.

To bring this supplemental appropriations bill with all of these strings attached that are designed to appease the 75 or 76 members of the Out of Iraq Caucus and the left-winged liberals here in this Congress, not because of their leadership on war but because of their position on other issues, I think, is a disservice to the American people. The American people know how important this is. And the fathers and mothers, the widows and widowers, and sons and daughters of those who have given their lives for Iraqi freedom and a safer future for Americans must be respected and honored.

As the father of a son who was killed over there, a Gold Star father from California said to me, and his name was John, he said, ''It is different now. You can't pull out of there now, because that soil is sanctified by the blood of our children. You must stick with this battle and succeed and not lose your will.''

As a major from Kentucky said to me the last time I was there, ''We appreciate your prayers. We have everything we need to do what we have to do. We have all of the weapons we need and the clothing and the food and the training that we need, and all of the support that we need. So when you pray for us, pray for the American people. Pray that the American people understand this enemy that we are up against. Pray that the American people don't lose their resolve. We will not lose ours.''

INSURANCE ISSUES IN WAKE OF KATRINA

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I have the great fortune to represent the people of south and coastal Mississippi, and I never want to miss the opportunity on their behalf to thank the other people of our great Nation for the help that has been provided to us in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, both individuals, Rotarians, college kids. But so many people have just been magnificent in their helping South Mississippi after the storm, and we want to thank you.

There has, Madam Speaker, unfortunately been a group that has been particularly unhelpful to the recovery of south Mississippi, and that is the insurance business, in particular the property and casualty business around the country.

I want to bring to your attention just one of the many of the thousands of homes in south Mississippi that were destroyed by the storm. The people there had insurance, contrary to what the Wall Street Journal will tell you. They had insurance against flood. They had insurance against wind. And when the storm came, they thought they were covered. And they woke up the day after the storm, and their homes were gone.

This is a sketch of Will Clark's home in Pass Christian, Mississippi. Being very fond of his place, he hired a local artist to sketch it. This is what it looked like the day before Katrina. That is what it looked like the day after.

Will, being a good businessman, had $250,000 worth of homeowners insurance on his home. The folks from State Farm, within a few days of the storm, came to his property, looked around, said they saw no evidence of wind damage, despite all the things you see knocked down by the wind, and paid him nothing on his insurance claim. A $250,000 policy paid him nothing.

The next homeowner I want to bring to your attention is the home of Mr. and Mrs. James Scanlon. This is what it looks like. The Scanlons had $304,000 worth of insurance on this home. The day after Katrina, it looked like that. The Scanlons were with Nationwide Insurance Company. Nationwide paid them $13,000 on that damage. For those of you who have done some remodeling yourselves, you know that $13,000 might replace that front door and maybe that window; $304,000 worth of insurance paid them $13,000.

The third one I want to bring to your attention is the home of Ms. Diane Quinn in Biloxi, Mississippi. To give you the magnitude of this storm, it stretched all the way from New Orleans to Mobile, Alabama. This is what Mrs. Quinn's home looked like the day before Katrina. She had $249,000 worth of insurance with Allstate Insurance Company. The day after the storm, her home looked like that.

Within days of the storm, in addition to all the other trauma she had been to, the folks from Allstate, I believe that is ''The Good Hands'' folks, came and told her that they would give her $10,000 for the loss of her home.

Mr. Speaker, there is zero Federal regulation of the insurance industry. When people came to me with claims like that and said, ''What can you do for me,'' I had to give them the unfortunate answer, ''Absolutely nothing.'' But it wasn't just these folks who were harmed by the storm, you see; it was every American.

The people that did pay claims was our Nation's flood insurance policy. The Nation's flood insurance policy is written in a way that we hire the private sector to sell that policy, and we hire the private sector to adjudicate the claim in events like this.

The problem that came in is, when those insurance agents went to those three properties, and even though the Navy tells us we had 5 hours of hurricane-force winds before the water got there, the insurance agents said, ''We see no evidence of wind damage. So, therefore, we are not going to pay you on your homeowner's policy; you have to pay your flood policy.''

Under the law, they are required to have a fair adjudication of the claim. And yet, at the same time that they require our Nation to have a fair adjudication of the claim, folks like State Farm and Nationwide are sending out memorandum to their claims adjusters, and this is a quote: ''Where wind acts concurrently with flooding to cause damage to the insured's property, coverage for the loss exists only under the flood coverage.'' That means that not only these folks were cheated out of their homeowners policies, but you as taxpayers were cheated to pay claims that should have been paid by the insurance industry.

Now, the folks who run that company, a gentleman by the name of Ed Rust to be particular, rather than expressing remorse for what his company did to the people of America, was rewarded this year with a $9,890,000 bonus

for telling folks like that, ''We're not going to pay you.''

Madam Speaker, this needs to be investigated. There are claims adjusters who were so disgusted with what they saw and what they did to individuals that they have turned the insurance industry in for this fraud that has been perpetrated upon the American people.

Madam Speaker, this Democratic Congress needs to keep faith with the people of America and investigate this, because I am convinced that the biggest Katrina fraud of all was ripping off the American taxpayer to the tune of billions of dollars.

□ 1600

DISASTER RELIEF FOR AFFECTED AREAS IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I, too, feel, as I believe most Americans do, for those who have been impacted by the effects of the disaster that occurred with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. And my colleague and good friend from Mississippi makes, I think, strong arguments that it is part of our responsibilities as representatives of the people's House, to, in fact, respond to needs and crises when natural disasters occur.

My district, the 20th Congressional District in California, includes the heart of California, some of the best farm land in the country, from Fresno in the north all the way down to Bakersfield in the south.

I rise this afternoon to address the concerns, the deep concerns that our constituents have because of a lack of Federal support in declaring Federal designation disaster status for the 31 counties in California that were impacted by the freeze that took place in California between January 11 and January 16.

Now, this is a disaster of significant proportions. Unlike a hurricane or a tornado, as we have witnessed recently in other parts of the country, a dramatic freeze takes on different visual effects. But the damages and the impacts to families and their children and people with farms and farm workers, compesinos, can be just as devastating.

Since January 11, January 16, doing our due diligence, Governor Schwarzenegger has declared 31 counties in California available for Federal designation disaster. Yet, we have gone now 6 to 7 weeks without the Federal Government responding. It believes now the total cost of the impact of this freeze to the farms, to the citrus industry, to the vegetable industry is totaling over $1.3 billion and growing.

These farm workers, these compesinos, are out of work. These farmers have their life holdings in these citrus orchards. The communities, the economic impacts are reverberating throughout the communities within these 31 counties.

Last Friday, we had a listening session on the impacts of agriculture. We had members from the foodbank in California, the Fresno County foodbank, Sarah Reyes, an old friend and former colleague of mine. She indicated that over 3,100 households, which contain over 14,700 individuals, over 7,425 children under the age of 5 years of age or less, have been provided food because these folks have no jobs, because there are no jobs available, because the citrus industry and related industries have been devastated by this freeze.

It goes on. You know, in places like Orange Cove and Parlier and Reedley and Selma and places in Tulare County, we have seen the need to provide food for families increase 1,000, 2,000 percent. The UFW, faith-based organizations have chipped in. The State has paid millions of dollars. But yet the Federal Government response has been lacking.

We have had bipartisan support from Members of the California congressional delegation, by both our United States Senators. Congressman NUNES and myself have introduced an Impact for Freeze Relief for those farm workers, those farmers, their families and the businesses and these small communities. Yet the President has yet to declare, since January 11 through January 16, that these counties are deserving of Federal designation disaster relief.

But in the meantime, my colleagues, since December 19, 14 other States have been declared Federal designation disaster areas. Nebraska, December 19, for severe winter storms; Kansas, January 28, severe winter storms. The President, on January 7, declared both those States disaster areas. Missouri, Oklahoma, Florida, Illinois, Washington State, winter storms, mud slides, tornados, all deserving, I believe, and the President believed, for Federal designation disaster status.

Yet, 7 weeks later, California, that complied with all the requirements under the Federal law in which our Governor made the request, now finds itself, 7 weeks later, without the sort of Federal designation status that we deserve as taxpayers to the Federal Government.

We ask the President, please respond as you have responded in 14 other cases in these other States. Our citizens need the support and the same sort of help that we have given to other parts of the country.

So I ask, once again today, for the President to respond to FEMA and to produce the Federal designation disaster relief that our citizens in California deserve and need for those farmers, for their families, for those farm workers and for the communities they live in.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House once again. And as you know, the 30-Something Working Group, we come to the floor two, three, sometimes four times in a given week, in a legislative week, to share with the Members some of the issues that we are working on and some of the issues that we must tackle here in the 110th Congress.

As you know, the work of the 30-Something Working Group has been going on now for, going on close to 4 years of hard work and making sure that not only the will of the American people prevails in this House, the people's House, this U.S. House, but to make sure that we act, we legislate in an accountable way; also bring about the kind of oversight, and put us on the new direction that we need to be in several of the areas that we face now, such as Iraq, such as making sure that we have affordable health care, making sure that we have a clean environment, making sure that we take care of our veterans. And fiscal responsibility is the backdrop of the overall accountable flag that we stand under.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has happened in the last couple of weeks, and a lot has happened since the 110th Congress took control of the U.S. House of Representatives, Democratic control, and working in a bipartisan way.

I spent a lot of time on the floor in the past talking about the bipartisan votes that have taken place here on this floor because I think that it is something that we should all be proud of. I am not talking about proud Democrats. I am talking about Republicans, Independents that are paying attention to this process, Democrats, first time voters. Individuals that are thinking about voting should be encouraged about the spirit that we have here in the U.S. House of Representatives and making sure that we bring work products that a majority of the Members can vote for, and that means Democrats and Republicans.

These are a few of the votes that I just want to highlight here once again: implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations, H.R. 1, which was the first bill, Mr. Speaker, we spoke of that we had the opportunity to lead. When I say ''we,'' I am saying the Democratic majority, to be able to bring to the floor, which was a bipartisan 9/11 Commission. And it was a book that many read, and one of the New York Times bestseller books. Passed 299–128, with 68 Republicans voting for it.

Raising the minimum wage, H.R. 2, which was the second bill in this 110th Congress, this Democratic Congress that came up. Again, we must be reminded that the vote was 315–116, with 82 Republicans voting with the Democrats on that particular measure.

Funding for enhancement of stem cell research, H.R. 3, again, bipartisan vote, 253–174.

Making prescription drugs more affordable for seniors, H.R. 4, 255–170, which is a majority vote in a bipartisan manner.

Something that really means a lot to the 30-Something Working Group, reversing the increase of interest rates to students and also American families that are trying to educate themselves to take advantage of the high-tech jobs that we are trying to provide, and also the skilled labor jobs that we are trying to generate here in our economy, cutting student loans, interest rates in half, which was H.R. 5, which passed by 356 votes to 71.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to really make a case in point as it relates to that particular vote because young people are our future, and even working, some folks think that many of our students graduate from high school and they go right into college. We have many working Americans that have to work and go to school at the same time, or have to work and then go to school later. And they have to take out these student loans. And cutting that interest rate in half is going to mean so much to the forward progress of our young people and our middle-age population that is trying to educate themselves to compete, not only with the person that is standing next to them, but compete against other countries.

And so our education, the education of the people of the United States of America is paramount. And I am so happy to see, and this was one of the major objectives of the 30-Something Working Group, not to just represent those that are graduating from high school, but to also represent those parents that are trying to pay for higher education for their children.

The greatest goal, I think, for a grandparent or a parent is to make sure that their children and grandchildren have better opportunities than what they have had. And I am excited about that opportunity that so many are going to have. Now, we have moved here in the House to cut those interest rates in half.

Also, creating long-term energy initiatives, which was H.R. 6, which passed 264–168, bipartisan vote, something that was needed as it relates to using subsidies for alternative fuels. Making sure that we invest in the Midwest versus the Middle East is something that we have all embraced and something that we all feel very strongly about.

I am going to keep sharing that, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is important. In the 109th Congress, I spent a lot of time here working with the 30-Something Working Group talking about the uncontrollable debt that the Republican Congress kept accruing on behalf of future generations. And I talked about that, and it was a chart, and I had a rubber stamp. But I am going to talk a little bit more about it as we start to look at this question of accountability, the question of oversight, the whole slogan of moving in a new direction, fiscal responsibility.

And I just want to make sure that I paint this picture, because what we are talking about now in the 30-Something Working Group, we used to talk about what we, if we had the opportunity to lead, what we will do. Now we are talking about what we are doing.

But to be able to really paint a good picture, Mr. Speaker, for not only the Members to understand, but also the American people to understand, this is where we are right now, and we didn't just get there last week.

As it relates to foreign debt held by foreign nations, this is as of December 2006. We updated this chart because we had numbers in place. As you know, we had the little Velcro numbers, which I understand that we are going to get that soon so that we can pull it off to really show what is happening here.

We have Japan, that owns a part of the American apple pie at $644.3 billion. And I think that it is important to understand that they buy our debt. That means they have a piece of the American pie because of a lack of fiscal responsibility, because the President has passed budgets down that has asked for tax cuts for the super-wealthy, that we spent out of control with a lack of accountability and oversight, with two wars that are going on, just continuing to borrow the money with very little oversight.

I am setting the stage for a little later on in our talk here today.

We have China. As of 11/05 it was $249.8 billion. And now, as of December 2006, China has moved up to $349.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also important, and I want to ask staff if we can get that Bush chart with the Republican Congress if we have that because I want to just show how historical these numbers are, because one may say, well, you know, there are a couple of wars going on. We have had 9/11. We have had a number of issues.

I have a chart that is really going to show that that is contrary, that logic is contrary to the obvious of what has happened.

□ 1615

It is because the administration has decided to borrow from future generations and the present generation where the economic outlook for our children and grandchildren would not be what it should be because of our lack of responsibility. Thank God that we have a Congress in place right now that is going to put accountability first. Fiscal responsibility we have already adopted in our rules and continue to live under that flag of oversight and a new direction: $349.6 billion; the U.K., $239.1 billion; the Caribbean, $68 billion; Taiwan $63.1 billion. OPEC nations, again, these are oil-producing nations in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker. Many of these nations the United States have bilateral talks and agreements with, but many of them are in question as it relates to the present situation in the Middle East. But guess what? They own a piece of the American apple pie. I don't even want to start to talk about gas prices and what is happening as it relates to OPEC nations. You have $67.8 billion as of 11/2005. And now, Mr. Speaker, December of 2006, OPEC nations, they have gone up in owning more of the American apple pie due to a lack of fiscal responsibility on behalf of the Bush administration and the past Republican Congress. Of the budgets that they have passed, they now own $100.9 billion of the American apple pie.

Korea, $70 billion; Hong Kong, $53.9 billion; Germany, $52.5 billion.

I think it is important that we pay very close attention to those numbers, and that is something that we should be very concerned about and continue to keep our eye on the prize so that we spend in a fiscally responsible way and that we make sure that we are accountable to the American people. And I feel good about the fact that we have a majority that is willing to fight on behalf of the greater good to make sure that we work on behalf of all of the American people.

Now, this chart is a little old, Mr. Speaker, because these actually have the 2005 numbers, and we are updating it. This is something I feel very fond of because I always said that this chart is going to end up being a part of the national archives one day because it really shows a story, and it is factual.

President Bush in 4 years, in 4 years, has managed to borrow more from foreign nations than 42 Presidents in 224 years of history. Now, these are 2005 numbers. I mean, I just want to make sure that we understand that these are 2005 numbers. So the numbers are higher now. Forty-two Presidents, look at them. All the way from George Washington, they were only able to borrow $1.01 trillion. President Bush and the Republican Congress, the 108th Congress and 109th Congress, borrowed $1.05 trillion in just 4 years.

Now, one would say, how can that happen, Mr. Speaker? How do these countries, China of all countries, Red China, own so much of the American apple pie?

Well, I can tell you how it happens. It has happened because the past Republican Congress rubber stamped everything that the Bush administration sent to this floor at the objection of so many Members of the House.

But now the proper leadership has stepped forward and said that we are going to pay as we go. So that means that this budget process will be more controlled than it has ever been in recent history of saying that, if you are going to spend, you are going to show how you are going to pay for it. Not where you are going to get it from because we know where they got it from. They borrowed it. It is like taking out a high-interest credit card and saying, I am knowingly and willingly using this high-interest credit card to carry out spending that I know I can't afford to spend. I know this. I mean, it is not

that it is an emergency. In the budget that the President has sent to this U.S. House of Representatives, the Bush administration budget, it is saying, let us make the tax cuts permanent for the super wealthy. Meanwhile, these countries that I outlined are paying for that tax cut. And I think it is important that we look at that. That is the fiscal responsibility end of the talk here today.

I think it is also important for us to realize the discussion that we are having now on Iraq, Mr. Speaker. We talked about oversight. We talked about accountability. But to date, as of last week, last Friday, there have been 81 hearings on the issue of oversight and accountability on Iraq, across the committees in the House. And I think it is important that the Members pay very close attention to this because, as these hearings continue to happen, we have learned more about what is happening in Iraq, what is happening in Afghanistan, what is happening with our troops here and our veterans here on the ground; hearings were not happening at this rate in the past.

Again, one of the obligations of the 30-Something Working Group is to make sure that everyone and every Member of the House understands that we are here to work, that we are here to make sure that accountability blows through the air conditioning ducts here in the hospital House.

Why are we spending so much time talking about Iraq? Next week there will be a supplemental that will be in committee, and it will be marked up. What we call a markup, that means that there will be a discussion about what goes into that supplemental bill. There will be appropriations, some $100 billion-plus, that will be in this bill, from what I understand. Why are we spending so much time having so many conversations about what should be in that bill?

This is why, Mr. Speaker: On March 8, as of 10 a.m., 3,178 U.S. troops died; dead, period. As of March 9, which is today, Mr. Speaker, 10 a.m., we have 3,186 troops that are dead. Now, I said, 3,178, as of yesterday, 10 a.m. Today, as of 10 a.m., 3,186. That is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, so many Members are spending time focusing on this issue of Iraq accountability and benchmarks on behalf of the American people and those that are in harm's way. That is not a Democratic issue. That is not a Republican issue. That is not an Independent issue. That is an issue that should be dealt with at the U.S. Congress, and it is going to take courage and leadership and commitment and some tenacity to bring about the kind of change that needs to happen to make sure that those individuals that have died in the line of duty, that their memory is not in vain, and that we accomplish and we have benchmarks and we take the training wheels off the Iraqi government, period, dot. I can't sugarcoat it. It is what it is, and it has to be laid out that way for folks to understand, for the Members to understand, I must add, that it is very important. This conversation and this debate and the discourse that is taking place in committee, it is very serious, and it should be above politics.

The American people sent a very strong message in November. Democrats and Republicans, I am just going to say, the American people, period, sent a very strong message in November that they wanted to move in a new direction. They want more accountability. They want more oversight out of this U.S. House of Representatives. And they understand what is going on in the White House. There are places where Republicans won elections by landslides in the past. And guess what? In the November election, you couldn't elect a Republican as far as the eye can see or within eight or nine area codes because of the lack of oversight and accountability that was not carried out here in this House in the last couple of sessions of Congress versus this session.

Why is this issue important? As of 10 o'clock today, 23,924 wounded and 10,627 of those cannot return to battle or to duty.

What is in this so-called Defense supplemental bill? Some may talk about benchmarks. I want to talk a little bit about what is in the bill or what is going to be in the bill as the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee starts to what we call mark up and create this bill. The Speaker has said that U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act will provide our troops with equipment they need and require Iraqis to take control of their own country, help fight the war on terror and establish a date of withdrawal from Iraq.

Well, what is wrong with that? What is wrong with making sure our troops have what they need when they go to war? Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor 2 weeks ago because I happened to pick up the paper, and I saw some Members were complaining about the fact that the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee was looking to put language in the bill that said, if you are going to deploy a troop into harm's way that that soldier or that troop, that Marine or that sailor or that airman or that Coast Guard person, National Guard, Reserves, you name it, that they have to have the equipment they need to carry out the mission. What is wrong with that? That is almost like sending a football player out in the field without a helmet and shoulder pads and saying, go play. This is serious business. And I named the number of those that are wounded and have died, and I can guarantee you, if we had had some of the language that we are talking about in place, maybe, just maybe, a number of those individuals would be living today. It is important. We are not four-star generals. We are Members of Congress. And we have been sent here to make sure that we are accountable to those that have signed up in a volunteer Army and a volunteer Marine Corps and a volunteer Navy and a volunteer Air Force to go defend this country and that have allowed us to salute one flag. It is our responsibility and our duty. And while we carry out that responsibility and duty, one may be misunderstood every now and then. And if it is about being misunderstood, then that means that you are not leading.

My mother served in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, prior to my arrival here, and she said, ''Son, if you are not misunderstood from time to time, you are not leading.''

I am glad to pick up periodicals, and I am glad to see the kind of discourse that is taking place on television, folks talking about what the Congress is doing, because you know something? At least we are doing something about the status quo. No longer will this House stand by, Mr. Speaker, and watch those that are unelected carry out the duties that the Congress should be carrying out.

I have been on the Armed Services Committee now three Congresses, Mr. Speaker, and I can tell you many times I sit there and I watch individuals that are on the panel before us, and I kind of want to ask the question, but I don't want to be sarcastic by saying, I hope you are not filling me with confidence that the troops have everything they need.

When I came to Congress, we went into Iraq. I wasn't here for the vote to go or to give the President authority or what have you, but I was here, and I remember asking the question, are we ready for this guerrilla warfare once we reach Baghdad? That answer was, ''yes.'' Do we have the equipment in place? That answer was, ''yes.'' Do we have up-armored vehicles in place? That answer was, ''yes.''

News report after news report, document after document this big, Mr. Speaker, says the contrary. Two trips to Iraq represents something different from what I heard here in a committee room in the Rayburn Building that the troops have what they need. Well, guess what? We no longer want to go off of what someone tells us in Washington, D.C., that is happening or not. We want the President to have to be able to confirm that there is a need for additional troops or to send additional troops to Iraq. We want to make sure that the troops know that there is a Congress here that is going to put that language in place to make sure they have what they need.

I can't tell you how many marines and how many soldiers told me, sir, with all due respect, sir, I will be here as long as you want me here, but I went on a patrol the other night, and I didn't have the proper equipment. I didn't have the up-armored vehicles. And it takes a Member of Congress to go to someone and say, I heard a patrol went out last night and didn't have what they needed.

□ 1630

We are not trying to make command decisions on the ground. We are just trying to make sure the men and women have what they need.

Also within this supplemental that we are looking at is legislation that prohibits the deployment of troops that are not fully mission capable as defined by the Department of Defense. In other words, troops who are not fully trained, equipped and protected by the standards of the Department of Defense will not go.

Now, this is what the Department of Defense has asked for. Why can't the Congress then back up the Department of Defense and say we agree with you, even though we know you have not been practicing some of the things that you have adopted as policy?

The President can only deploy unprepared troops if he certifies in writing to Congress that the deployment of those troops are in the national interest. That means it is imperative that we send troops that are untrained and unprepared into harm's way. The President has to confirm that it is within the national interest that that should happen. That is not taking his powers away as Commander in Chief, it is just putting in another level of accountability, making sure that the President knows that there is a Congress here that is willing to carry out the accountability and the oversight that is needed.

It also provides that the Veterans Administration has to meet the obligations of the new generation of veterans that will be coming out of two of these wars.

There are two wars going on, Mr. Speaker. A lot of folks forget. Iraq? Okay. Afghanistan. But guess what? There are two different wars going on. Because of the lack of planning in the Iraq war, troops were sent to Iraq from Afghanistan, and guess what? The Taliban is back and strong in Afghanistan. Now we need more troops, more coalition troops, because of the decisions that were made in a Congress that did not provide the oversight that it should have provided to make sure that we brought about ultimate accountability. I think it is important that we endorse the philosophy that we are going to prepare for what is to come.

It is time for the Iraqis to take control of Iraq. We say it all the time. In this bill, the bill will require that the Iraqi government has to meet key security, political and economic benchmarks that were established, Mr. Speaker, by the President of these United States on January 10 when he addressed this Congress. What is wrong with that? The President said if it doesn't happen, then they will see a withdrawal and we will not be there forever. I am paraphrasing. This is what the President said.

Now, being a Member of Congress, now going on my third term, I think it is very important for us to understand, there are some things that the President has said during the State of the Union that ended up being reality, or becoming reality, and there are a lot of things that he said that did not.

I trust the fact that the Commander in Chief and Members of Congress will not send someone into war unprepared. I will trust that. I would want to believe that. But we know that it has happened, where we failed our troops as it relates to getting them what they need.

But I think it is important for us to understand, Mr. Speaker and Members, it is very, very important that we put in the language of this supplemental, which I must add, let me break this down more, when I say defense supplemental bill, that means this is an appropriations bill that is going to be $100 billion that will go towards operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and in other parts of the world as it relates to this issue of fighting terrorism. But it should not be a blank check. It should not be a one line bill.

Some would like to leave it up to the Pentagon. Leave it up to folks who we don't have any idea, the public, who they are. Unelected individuals. Leave it up to them. They know what is best. They are the professionals.

Well, I believe in professionalism too. But when I go down to the Seventeenth Congressional District of Florida and my constituents ask me, Congressman, what did you do to make sure that my tax dollar is being spent appropriately? ''Well, they just said send the money. I thought it was important. We just voted and let them deal with it.''

It is not an us and them. It is a we. And when money is spent in an inappropriate way, when you have companies like Halliburton and other contractors that are under investigation, I must add, that are still receiving contracts, U.S. Federal contracts, the taxpayer dollar, then we have to have accountability.

Now, I don't know anyone that really has a problem with that. I can go to a rally of conservative to the right of the right of the right Republicans and ask them, do you want accountability measures in a $100 billion-plus supplemental bill, or do you just want us to pass it and say leave it up to whoever is making the decisions in whatever department they are in with no-bid contracts and allow some of the things that happened in Iraq, when companies get a flat tire and then they torch the truck and we buy a brand new tractor-trailer because it was better for the company if they just replace the truck. Which one do you want? Do you want accountability measures in it? Do you want benchmarks in it? Do you want to have hearings?

Do you see the number? Oh, goodness, I am glad the staff changed this for me, Mr. Speaker. It is that quick. I started talking about last week's numbers. I get new numbers. Ninety-seven hearings held on Iraq oversight. Do you want this? Or do you want seven hearings? Which one do you want? Do you want 96 hearings, or do you want seven?

We have Members around here complaining saying, oh, well, you know, I don't necessarily like all this, you know, what is going on.

Well, it is our job. When we have two wars going on and we have the kind of lack of fiscal responsibility that has not been taking place here in this House prior to the arrival of the Democratic controlled Congress, you have to sleep in shifts. You have to make sure you do what your obligation is, to have oversight.

I think it is important to be able to make sure if the Iraqis fail to meet the benchmarks, that it will mean the beginning of a U.S. withdrawal and that it will also restrict economic aid to the Iraqis.

The bottom line is, you cannot reward bad behavior or lack of good behavior. You can't reward that. You can't say, well, no, that is okay, that is fine. Take your time, whatever the case may be. Don't worry about it.

I'll tell you, there are some Iraqi forces that are fighting. There are some Iraqi forces that are doing some good things. But there are some folks within the Iraqi government that do not understand the urgency we have here.

The longer we are in Iraq, the more I have to tell my U.S. mayors, my Governors, my school board members, my constituents, no, I cannot help you with your project. No, I cannot help you, Governor, as it relates to the transportation dollars to help Florida become even a stronger State in the United States of America. Mr. Mayor, I know it is important that we have security in our community. Mr. Sheriff, I know it is important that you want that COPS Program back. But guess what? We have two wars going on. We got a tax cut for the super-wealthy that the President of the United States wants, and we are too busy fighting them on that. And meanwhile, we got folks foot dragging over in Iraq about accountability. They don't have any urgency. Some folks don't even have the urgency we have here in the United States.

This is snatching bread and butter out of the mouths of U.S. taxpayers and their children. Do you know why the interest rates went up on the student loans? To be able to pay for tax cuts for the super-wealthy, and to also continue the business of saying let's just rubber stamp supplementals and send it to the President of the United States and the Bush administration and the Department of Defense. And it took an election to bring about the kind of paradigm shift and the thinking that we should have done on our own as responsible adults and elected to U.S. Congress. It took an election to do that.

Thank God for democracy. Thank God for level-minded Americans saying I am going to put my party aside for a

moment. I have to stand up on behalf of my children, because this is now becoming personal. You have veterans that have served and that have fought and that have allowed us to salute one flag who are just turned, totally, politically about who they sent to Congress, and they made a change. And we are not going to sit there and allow their vote and their prayer and their hope that there will be change here in Washington, D.C., and just sit by and say we want to go along to get along.

Someone says something about maybe I am doing the wrong thing, and who am I to try to govern a war from Washington, D.C.? It is not governing a war. It is bringing about the kind of accountability that the American people have cried and have asked for.

The Bush administration and the Republican majority in the past are far, far behind where the American people are. And if we have to drag, pull, through this House and push legislation through to bring us up-to-date to where the American people are, that is what we were sent here to do. And Members who don't want to be a part of that experience, they have to go home and they have to face their constituents.

Believe what I am telling you right now. It is not just individuals that are walking around with flowers and saying ''I don't believe in war'' that are saying that we have to bring some accountability to what we are doing. There are individuals that work hard, individuals that have retired, individuals that are looking for a better future for their family. You have local government officials that don't even know how they are going to survive from this point on because we are sitting around here cutting taxes for individuals who are not even asking for tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: Superwealthy billionaires that are not even marching the halls of Congress and saying please give me a tax cut, they are not asking for it. The Republican Congress just gave it to them.

So this paradigm shift, I want to prepare the Members, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to take some courage, and it is going to take some leadership, and we are going to be misunderstood. But you know something? Time after time again, history has reflected on leadership in a good way.

I can tell you right now, a perfect example, Mr. Speaker, and then I am going to move to the next point, when the Walter Reed story broke about what was going on at Walter Reed, and the Newsweek cover of this specialist here, this amputee that served and the kind of treatment that our soldiers were receiving at Walter Reed, the vindication for the Democratic majority was the fact that before this article came out, before we even knew of a Washington Post story, or probably even before the reporter started working on the story, we had an appropriation continuing resolution that we had to pass because the Republican Congress did not do their job and pass their appropriations bill, and we put $3.6 billion towards veteran healthcare because it was the right thing to do.

And the good thing about it is that I could stand here on this floor without any Member being able to march down here and say otherwise, that we did what we had to do because we had the opportunity to do it. And that is what is so good about good leadership.

I am glad NANCY PELOSI is the Speaker of the House, and if there are some Members that have a problem with that, then they have a problem with leadership, because this could have happened last year, it could have happened the year before last.

The Bush administration has passed time after time again budgets that have cut veterans healthcare. Again, Bush Republicans, see this, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you right now, I can't think of anything else I could be doing outside of making this point right now. This is very, very important. And I want my Republican colleagues to be with us on this change that we are working on. I want our new Members in Congress to understand their responsibility as it relates to the American people and what they sent us here for.

We have to have resolve, just like the men and women on the front line have resolve. We have to have resolve, just like the veterans who went out there and laid their lives down and watched their friends pay the ultimate sacrifice. We have to have that same resolve. We have to have that political courage, like they have to have the courage to go outside the gates of Camp Victory in Iraq.

We have to have that same resolve here in this House. We cannot allow someone just because they say something about you or they think something about you when you are right, that you are going to turn around, just because someone on the minority side, on the Republican side, is saying well, look what they are trying to do.

Well, you know something? I say to my Republican colleagues, in all due respect, and many of them are my friends, especially the leadership, the bottom line is when you are pointing your finger and saying look at what they are doing, you need to be looking in the mirror and saying you had the opportunity to do it and you didn't do it, and we are not getting back in the same boat that you just got out of. We are going to do it. We are going to grab a paddle and we are going to go down the stream.

Summer of 2005, at the Democrats' pressure, the Bush administration finally acknowledged that FY 2006 shortfall in veteran healthcare was totaling $2.7 billion and Democrats fought all summer to get it.

March 2006, President Bush budget cut veteran funding by $6 billion over 5 years. Passed by the Republican-controlled Congress.

□ 1645

January 31, 2007, Democrats increase VA health care budget by $3.6 billion in a joint resolution funding.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues who are against that kind of action to go home and tell your constituents that you are against that. I welcome you to do it because you won't be a Member of Congress anymore. I am so glad I was on the prevailing side of $3.6 billion going into veterans' health care.

I say all of that because we use key words like accountability, oversight. We talk about a new direction and fiscal responsibility. I can tell you, there are many times here on this House floor that Members are going to have to go see the wizard and get some courage. That courage is very easy because the American people are egging on this kind of spirit that is in Washington, D.C., right now.

I think it is important that, even after all of the articles and even after all of the talk about what went on at Walter Reed dealing with our veterans, that the Democratic-controlled Congress sprung into action, not weeks, not months down the road, not years down the road, sprung into action. Articles came out in the Washington Post. I have it right here. We don't come to the floor to play around or waste Members' time or staff time. I think it is important to talk about the fact that articles came out on the 24th. There was a review panel. We looked at the Army Times article that came out in September 2006, but when articles started rolling out on the 19th and after that on the 26th, and then on March 2nd because we were on President's break, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform subpoenaed one of the major generals who was fired, who was head of Walter Reed after Army officials refused to allow him to testify before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, that is what oversight is about. It was not firing a general. It is about getting down to the truth. And, of course, the administration took the position to ask him to step down.

March 5 of this year, this is all recent, oversight in Committee on Government Reform began holding investigation hearings into the Walter Reed scandal.

March 6 and 7, House Veterans' Affairs Committee holds hearings on Walter Reed scandal.

The same day, March 7, House Armed Services Committee holds Walter Reed scandal hearing. I was there.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to all members in the Army and those who came, and Secretary Chao and all of the folks over at the Pentagon, they did apologize. They did say they were sorry. I can give them credit for that. But I am thinking about the men and women, as we continue to peel back what has been happening at Walter Reed, and as we continue to learn about other DOD medical facilities and

the service that they are not providing, as we learn these things, we have to go about correcting them.

I would much rather appropriate dollars to make sure that someone's uncle, someone's mother, someone's daughter, someone's nephew who laid it down on behalf of this country gets what we said we would give them. That is quality health care, accountability and oversight.

If any Member has a problem with that, they need to evaluate themselves or their purpose here in Congress. I am glad to hear many Members saying to the Army: Tell us what you need. Now there will be strings attached, and there will be language to bring about oversight. And there will be individuals who will be paying attention to what you are doing. The old days of giving you the money and you just doing what you want to do are over. Accountability measures will be in place.

As we start to look at next week and as we start to move into next week, I think it is important that folks understand that this is going to be an open House, and we are going to promote government and crack down on waste. That is what next week is going to be all about. Next week is going to be about trying to crack down on waste and for us to start turning this around and balancing the budget. And of course, only Democrats can say we have actually balanced the budget because we have. Republicans had 12 years of control and did not balance the budget. They talked about it but did not do it. We did it.

To be able to say that, again, we need to crack down and highlight and investigate waste. We are here representing the American people. We are not just here representing ourselves. No, I am not here to represent Kendrick Meek. I am here to represent those who have sent me here and those that are counting on us to do the things that we have to do.

The Democrats have pledged to end the culture of corruption in Washington, making the Congress accountable to the people by sheer good government. What is wrong with that?

Next week the House will consider measures to ensure that the Federal Government is open and accountable to the American people. The legislation that is going to be brought up next week is going to be the whistleblower reforms, strengthening protections for Federal whistleblowers to prevent abuse, a lack of accountability. We want to empower those who want to step forward and say, there is corruption and waste over there. We want to insulate those individuals. They are our heroes and the heroes within the Federal Government and contracting world pointing out waste.

When we have countries like OPEC and China owning so much of the American pie, in the billions, that is a national security issue. So we need to treat these individuals accordingly.

Also next week, Presidential record disclosure, which nullifies the 2001 Presidential executive order and restores public access to Presidential records. That is important. Of course, there will be language as relates to super national security issues. They won't be able to touch those.

Presidential library donations, require the disclosure of donors to Presidential libraries. We have a lot of that going on. Additional material will be shared next week as it relates to the bills that will be coming to the floor, but I think it is important that we have the kind of flow to the House floor that we need to have to be able to prepare ourselves to govern for the rest of the 110th Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we continue in the 30-Something Working Group to look at issues that we travel the country to hear Americans and those that have come to Washington, D.C., looking for accountability; as we carry their prayer and their hope, and again I am not talking about proud Democrats, I am talking about all Americans, it is our obligation and responsibility to make sure that they get the best representation possible. And it should not be in the back halls of Congress, a deep secret in the corner or some sort of special meeting in the corner over here. It should be under the lights of this Chamber and to make sure that every Member understands.

One of the other principles of the 30-Something Working Group, on this side of the aisle and the Democratic Caucus, we want to make sure that every Member knows exactly what he or she is doing and has the information that they need, so they know what is coming up, they know what we have done, they know the responsibility that we have to carry out as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, because we don't want the American people to be cheated in anyway by saying, you know, when I voted on that, I didn't quite know what was going on. I'm sorry I voted against that, veteran.

If you voted against the continuing resolution, then you voted against $3.6 billion on behalf of veterans' health care.

Now for you to be a Member of Congress and not to know that, something is wrong, because that is the number one group that is counting on you to do the right thing on their behalf. They have families, too.

They are elderly, too. They allow us to be able to salute one flag. I say that time and time again. I get chills, bumps every time I say it, because it is important.

My children have a better value for the service that our men and women carry out because they hear me talk about it constantly. We travel and we talk and read about foreign countries and what is happening there. America is the best and the most free country on the face of the earth, and we want to keep it that way. Whatever we have to do to keep it that way, we are willing to do it. But we are going to do it in a coordinated fashion. We are not just going to do it entrusting others somewhere in some building in Virginia, Maryland, or Washington, D.C., that are not empowered and validated by the people of the United States of America and sent here to watch out for their best interest.

There are parents right now, when I go grocery shopping in my district, Mr. Speaker, I have parents walk up to me and say, Congressman, my son is 16, how long is this Iraq thing going to be going on?

I have to be brutally honest with them. I say, listen, as we talk about redeployment of troops, we have to understand, we are still in Korea and we are still in Germany. But the real issue is, we have to bring about the kind of coordination that is needed on the accountability end. We don't want to be putting brigades and platoons and saying, you run over here. That is the generals' job. That is not what we are doing.

We are making sure that the troops have what they need so when a general says, go over here or send three brigades over there, they have all of the equipment and logistical support that they need, and they have their mission and they have the things that they need to carry out that mission. That is what we are calling for.

We are also calling for the Iraqi government to stop playing with the United States Government. It will not be allowed. So give us more time, give us another chance, don't worry about it, as long as the U.S. troops are there, and other countries have already announced redeployment of their troops. We are sending more troops. You heard the number, and I will close with this, a number that I shared with you at the beginning, March 8, 10 a.m., 3,178 troops gone.

The next day, the next day, 10 a.m., March 9, 3,186 troops gone. That is the next day.

So this is beyond serious. These are families. And there are individuals that are counting on us to lead, and as long as you have a Democratic majority in this House, they will get that leadership because the will and the desire is there. The political courage is there to do it, and the American people are 110 percent behind accountability, fiscal responsibility, moving in a new direction. They are in that circle with the leadership of this House right now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker and the Democratic leadership for allowing the 30-Something Working Group to have an hour two nights ago and tonight to share the message with the Members of the House. It was an honor addressing the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in the district.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

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. HOLT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WAXMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONAWAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, March 15 and 16.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COSTA, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 12, 2007, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

794. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Inflation Adjustment of Acquisition-Related Thresholds (DFARS 2004-D022) (RIN: 0750-AF16) received February 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

795. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revisions to the Official Sign Indicating Insured Status (RIN: 3133-AD18) received February 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

796. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change of Using Agency for Restricted Areas R-3008A, B, C, D; Grand Bay Weapons Range, GA. [Docket No. FAA-2006-26273; Airspace Docket No. 06-A50-16] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

797. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, A321 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24431; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-011-AD; Amendment 39-14648; AD 2006-12-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

798. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25030; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-14649; AD 2006-12-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

799. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 95-ANE-10-AD; Amendment 39-14650; AD 2006-12-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

800. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22481; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-176-AD; Amendment 39-14647; AD 2006-12-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

801. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives Raytheon Model HS.125 Series 700A and 700B Airplanes; Model BAe.125 Series 800A (Including Variants C-29A and U-125), 800B, 1000A, and 1000B Airplanes; and Hawker 800 (Including Variant U-125A), 800XP, and 1000 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25011; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-118-AD; Amendment 39-14646; AD 2006-12-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

802. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC130 B4 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2006-24807; Directorate Identifier 2005-SW-41-AD; Amendment 39-14603; AD 2006-10-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

803. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 301.7805-1: Rules and Regulations (RIN: Rev. Rul. 2007-14) received February 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 985. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify which disclosures of information are protected from prohibited personnel practices; to require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements to the effect that such policies, forms, and agreements are consistent with certain disclosure protections, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 110–42, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1254. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations (Rept. 110–43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1255. A bill to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records; with amendments (Rept. 110–44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the Committee on Armed Services discharged from further consideration, H.R. 985 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BACA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARROW, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of

Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MICA, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RENZI, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. WAMP, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1424. A bill to amend section 712 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, section 2705 of the Public Health Service Act, and section 9812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require equity in the provision of mental health and substance-related disorder benefits under group health plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POE, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 1425. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4551 East 52nd Street in Odessa, Texas, as the ''Staff Sergeant Marvin ''Rex'' Young Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H.R. 1426. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans enrolled in the health system of the Department of Veterans Affairs the option of receiving covered health services through facilities other than those of the Department; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. WATT, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1427. A bill to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 1428. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce the eligibility age for receipt of non-regular military service retired pay for members of the Ready Reserve in active federal status or on active duty for significant periods; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WU, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. CLARKE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 1429. A bill to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1430. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the diversity immigrant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WAMP, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 1431. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to establish provisions with respect to religious accommodation in employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 1432. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1433. A bill to provide for the treatment of the District of Columbia as a Congressional district for purposes of representation in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ALTMIRE (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 1434. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 896 Pittsburgh Street in Springdale, Pennsylvania, as the ''Rachel Carson Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 1435. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot program to reduce the backlog of claims for benefits pending with the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 1436. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 1437. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent the deduction for qualified tuition and

related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1438. A bill to establish demonstration projects to provide at-home infant care benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1439. A bill to provide for free mailing privileges for personal correspondence and parcels sent to members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty in Iraq or Afghanistan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 1440. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Men's Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 1441. A bill to prohibit the sale by the Department of Defense of parts for F-14 fighter aircraft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 1442. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate automatic increases for inflation from CBO baseline projections for discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1443. A bill to treat arbitration clauses which are unilaterally imposed on consumers as an unfair and deceptive trade practice and prohibit their use in consumer transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HALL of New York:

H.R. 1444. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make interim benefit payments under certain remanded claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1445. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the exclusion from gross income for amounts paid to individuals pursuant to the Road Home program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JINDAL:

H.R. 1446. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow an increased deferment period for loans under the 7(b) loan program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 1447. A bill to amend sections 5313 and 5318 of title 31, United States Code, to reform certain requirements for reporting cash transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. EDWARDS):

H.R. 1448. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Hospital Quality Report Card Initiative to report on health care quality in Department of Veterans Affairs hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SALI, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 1449. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for reassignment of certain Federal cases upon request of a party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H.R. 1450. A bill to create 4 new permanent judgeships for the eastern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 1451. A bill to provide incentives to reduce dependence on foreign oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Science and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 1452. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require the disclosure of certain information by persons conducting phone banks during campaigns for election for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. GORDON):

H.R. 1453. A bill to provide for communications training to improve the ability of scientists to interact with policymakers; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California (for himself and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 1454. A bill to create 4 new permanent judgeships for the eastern district of California, to provide for an additional place of holding court in the eastern district of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MEEKS of New York):

H.R. 1455. A bill to establish the African Burial Ground International Memorial Museum and Educational Center in New York, New York, and for other purposes.; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SPACE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 1456. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to allow for certain claims of nationals of the United States against Turkey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SALI, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 1457. A bill to provide for research on, and services for individuals with, post-abortion depression and psychosis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. POE, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income gain on the sale or exchange of farmland development rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TANNER (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WAMP, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HODES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. REYES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1459. A bill to improve Medicare beneficiary access by extending the 60 percent compliance threshold used to determine whether a hospital or unit of a hospital is an inpatient rehabilitation facility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 1460. A bill to commend the members of the United States Armed Forces on their performance and bravery in Iraq, to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 107-243), to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a plan for the phased redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq, to establish a Coordinator for Iraq Stabilization, and to place conditions on the obligation of funds to the Government of Iraq based on the achievement of benchmarks established by Iraq and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 1461. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to ban abusive credit practices, enhance consumer disclosures, protect underage consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 1462. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the implementation of the Platte River Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Species in the Central and Lower Platte River Basin and to modify the Pathfinder Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 1463. A bill to provide a source of funds to carry out restoration activities on Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 1464. A bill to assist in the conservation of rare felids and rare canids by supporting and providing financial resources for the conservation programs of nations within the range of rare felid and rare canid populations and projects of persons with demonstrated expertise in the conservation of rare felid and rare canid populations; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WEXLER:

H.R. 1465. A bill to provide additional discretion to the Secretary of Homeland Security in designating countries eligible to participate in the visa waiver program under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 1466. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to permit qualifying States to use a portion of their allotments under the State children's health insurance program for any fiscal year for certain Medicaid expenditures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. GINGREY):

H.R. 1467. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to award grants to institutions of higher education to develop and offer education and training programs; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. CARDOZA (for himself, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. FARR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. BACA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution honoring the life of Ernest Gallo; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued honoring Varian Fry, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RENZI, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H. Res. 231. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require all committees post record votes on their web sites within 48 hours of such votes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. RENZI, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H. Res. 232. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to pregnancy resource centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Res. 233. A resolution recognizing over 200 years of sovereignty of the Principality of Liechtenstein, and expressing support for efforts by the United States continue to strengthen its relationship with that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself and Ms. LEE):

H. Res. 234. A resolution congratulating Wyclef Jean for being named the ''Roving Ambassador'' for Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H. Res. 235. A resolution supporting an upgrade in Israel's relationship with NATO to that of a leading member of NATO's Mediterranean dialogue and to that of a member of NATO's Partnership for Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 36: Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

H.R. 39: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 42: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 45: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 73: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 82: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 146: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 171: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 180: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 226: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 243: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 245: Mr. WAMP, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 255: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 260: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 303: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. WU.

H.R. 315: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 367: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 380: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 393: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 397: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 418: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 432: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 463: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 473: Mr. SALI.

H.R. 493: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 506: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KIND, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 510: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 511: Mr. ISSA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 550: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GERLACH, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 552: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 553: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 579: Mr. WU, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 592: Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 618: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 621: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KAGEN, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 624: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 625: Mrs. BONO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 627: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 628: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 636: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 642: Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 643: Mr. WAMP, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 654: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KIND, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 657: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 667: Mr. HARE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. CUBIN, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 670: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 685: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr.

JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 690: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 695: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 711: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 713: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 721: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 725: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 741: Mr. WELCH of Vermont and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 756: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 779: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 787: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 790: Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 814: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 821: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 822: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 861: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 881: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 887: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 891: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 894: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HILL, Mr. KIND, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 901: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 934: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 954: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 960: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 962: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 970: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 972: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 980: Mr. CLAY and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 984: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 985: Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 998: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1014: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1022: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1029: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KIND, and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 1030: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1031: Mr. FORBES and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1032: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1038: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1043: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 1048: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1061: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1063: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JINDAL, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1072: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1073: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. REYES, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1076: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1093: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1099: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 1102: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SHULER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 1108: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1111: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1112: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1117: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1121: Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 1122: Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 1125: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HARE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1127: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1132: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1150: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1153: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 1154: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1188: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 1193: Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1194: Mrs. BONO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1211: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 1225: Mr. MCNULTY and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1228: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

H.R. 1229: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 1230: Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1239: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1246: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1252: Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1254: Ms. WATSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1255: Ms. WATSON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1261: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1279: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1280: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1282: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1283: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PORTER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1293: Ms. BERKLEY and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 1298: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1304: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1307: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1314: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1323: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 1325: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1330: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 1333: Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1342: Mr. POE and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1347: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1350: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CARSON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1354: Mr. ARCURI and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 1359: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1362: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1372: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1391: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1395: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 1398: Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1403: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1409: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. CONYERS.

H.J. Res. 12: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. COHEN and Mr. STARK.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. WU.

H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ARCURI.

H. Con. Res. 25: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. SPACE.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. REYES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HARE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Con. Res. 71: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 37: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Res. 100: Mr. RUSH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HARE, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H. Res. 107: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H. Res. 111: Mr. LAHOOD.

H. Res. 113: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 118: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 119: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 121: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 125: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 128: Mr. SAXTON.

H. Res. 136: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H. Res. 197: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 208: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 221: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CARSON, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Res. 222: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 223: Mrs. SCHMIDT.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 2007 No. 41

Senate

The Senate met at 9:15 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SHERROD BROWN, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, the fountain of wisdom, we thank You for those who guard our fragile gift of freedom. Thank You for Senators who more than self their country love, who daily make courageous decisions that keep us free. Lord, use the Members of this body to ensure that this precious gift of liberty will remain inviolate for those who come after us.

Thank You also for the brave souls, stout hearts, and indomitable spirits of those who have paid the ultimate price for the privileges we enjoy. Sustain and comfort the families they have left behind.

During this blessed moment of talking to You, we ask that Your presence will follow us throughout this day. As we labor, fix our thoughts and efforts on whatever is true, honest, just, pure, and productive. Support us today, Lord, until the shadows lengthen and the evening comes and our work receives Your commendation of ''well done.''

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable SHERROD BROWN 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable SHERROD BROWN, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BROWN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we will shortly vote on the cloture motion filed by the minority.

AMENDMENTS TO S. 4

Mr. President, first, let me start with a letter written to me dated February 26. There was a comparable letter written to the Republican leader. The letter reads:

It has been exactly 14 years since the first attack on the World Trade Center; over 5 years since the terrorist attacks of 9/11; and over 2 years since the 9/11 Commission released a blueprint for strengthening America's security. The pace of Congressional response to these wake-up calls has been glacial.

The House of Representatives has validated its commitment to improving national security by passing H.R. 1. When S. 4 goes to conference, its provisions must match or surpass the strength and comprehensiveness of H.R. 1. Failure to act ratchets up the danger for America. The longer critical security issues remain unresolved, the more time and options the terrorists have.

S. 4 should be a clean bill, limited to implementing the remaining 9/11 Commission recommendations. This legislation is far too important to be politicized by the introduction of non-germane, controversial amendments and debate, particularly those relating to Iraq. Attention to both issues is critically important. As such, each deserves separate deliberation.

We urge you to act now to protect America by passing stand-alone, comprehensive security legislation under S. 4 based on the 9/11 Commission blueprint without complications regarding Iraq. The legacy of those whose lives have been taken by terrorists on American soil is in your hands. Prove to the families of those killed in 1993 and 2001, and to all Americans, that this is a new day in Washington, and that safety and security will finally take precedence over special interest groups and politics.

Mr. President, the two managers of the bill, LIEBERMAN and COLLINS, have followed the admonition of that letter. They have worked very hard to have a clean bill. That is basically what we have. But I am sorry to report that of the 100-plus amendments filed, virtually all of them, except 7, are nongermane. To top it off, what the minority did is lumped a bunch of these nongermane amendments together and filed cloture on them.

Here is what the 9/11 families had to say about that. This is a letter to Senator MCCONNELL, dated March 8, 2007:

As family members who lost loved ones on 9/11, we support full implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. We are writing out of grave concern that your recent introduction of highly provocative, irrelevant amendments will jeopardize the passage of S. 4. It is inconceivable that anyone in good conscience would consider hindering implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations and we strongly disagree with these divisive procedural tactics.

Just as the Iraq war deserves separate debate, so do each of the amendments you offered. S. 4 should be a clean bill and debate should conclude this week with a straight up

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

or down vote. Each day that passes without implementation of the remaining 9/11 Commission recommendations, the safety and security of our nation is at risk.

Tactics such as those you are contemplating, aimed at endangering the 9/11 bill, sends a signal to America that partisan politics is alive and well under your leadership. Both parties must work together to pass this critical legislation. We, the undersigned, understand the risk of failure all too well.

It is signed: ''Respectfully,'' Carol Ashley, mother of Janice, who died, who is a member of Voices of September 11th; Beverly Eckert, widow of Sean Rooney, who is a member of Families of September 11; Mary Fetchet, mother of Brad, who died, who is founding director and president of Voices of September 11th; Carie Lemack, daughter of Judy Larocque, who died, who is cofounder and president of Families of September 11.

Mr. President, this is what the 9/11 families have said. The amendments lumped into one are not germane to the pending bill. That is without any question or debate. It is a collection of far-reaching immigration and criminal law provisions that have never been considered by the Judiciary Committee—never. Senator LEAHY said he would be happy to do that. They have never been considered.

These are complex matters which should not be considered on the Senate floor in this manner, especially on this very sensitive legislation. For example, one part of the amendment would overturn a recent Supreme Court decision. Now, remember, seven of the nine members of the Supreme Court are Republicans. They wrote the opinion. They want it overturned. Another part of the amendment would say visa revocations can never, ever be reviewed by any court.

The cloture motion was nothing more than an effort to delay passage of the 9/11 Commission bill. We need to move forward on this vital legislation.

I again ask everyone to listen to the words of the family members of those who perished on September 11. I have read those into the RECORD. We have, as I speak, these women and others who are watching what we do here today. I hope Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator COLLINS can go forward and complete this legislation without this. It is just absolutely hard to comprehend that this is what is being attempted on this bill.

I respectfully suggest, as they said in this letter, ''It is inconceivable that anyone in good conscience would consider hindering implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. . . .'' That is what they said, not what I said. ''Each day that passes without implementation of the . . . 9/11 Commission recommendations [risks] the safety and security of our nation. . . .'' That is what they said, not what I said. ''Tactics such as [these],'' they write to Senator MCCONNELL, '' . . . are . . . aimed at endangering the 9/11 bill, [and it] sends a signal to America that [is inappropriate].''

IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 4, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4) to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 275, in the nature of a substitute.

Sununu amendment No. 291 (to amendment No. 275), to ensure that the emergency communications and interoperability communications grant program does not exclude Internet protocol-based interoperable solutions.

Salazar/Lieberman modified amendment No. 290 (to amendment No. 275), to require a quadrennial homeland security review.

Dorgan/Conrad amendment No. 313 (to amendment No. 275), to require a report to Congress on the hunt for Osama bin Laden, Ayman al-Zawahiri, and the leadership of al-Qaida.

Landrieu amendment No. 321 (to amendment No. 275), to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to include levees in the list of critical infrastructure sectors.

Landrieu amendment No. 296 (to amendment No. 275), to permit the cancellation of certain loans under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

Landrieu modified amendment No. 295 (to amendment No. 275), to provide adequate funding for local governments harmed by Hurricane Katrina of 2005 or Hurricane Rita of 2005.

Allard amendment No. 272 (to amendment No. 275), to prevent the fraudulent use of social security account numbers by allowing the sharing of Social Security data among agencies of the United States for identity theft prevention and immigration enforcement purposes.

McConnell (for Sessions) amendment No. 305 (to amendment No. 275), to clarify the voluntary inherent authority of States to assist in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States and to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide information related to aliens found to have violated certain immigration laws to the National Crime Information Center.

McConnell (for Cornyn) amendment No. 310 (to amendment No. 275), to strengthen the Federal Government's ability to detain dangerous criminal aliens, including murderers, rapists, and child molesters, until they can be removed from the United States.

McConnell (for Cornyn) amendment No. 311 (to amendment No. 275), to provide for immigration injunction reform.

McConnell (for Cornyn) modified amendment No. 312 (to amendment No. 275), to prohibit the recruitment of persons to participate in terrorism, to clarify that the revocation of an alien's visa or other documentation is not subject to judicial review, to strengthen the Federal Government's ability to detain dangerous criminal aliens, including murderers, rapists, and child molesters, until they can be removed from the United States, to prohibit the rewarding of suicide bombings and allow adequate punishments for terrorist murders, kidnappings, and sexual assaults.

McConnell (for Kyl) modified amendment No. 317 (to amendment No. 275), to prohibit the rewarding of suicide bombings and allow adequate punishments for terrorist murders, kidnappings, and sexual assaults.

McConnell (for Kyl) amendment No. 318 (to amendment No. 275), to protect classified information.

McConnell (for Kyl) amendment No. 319 (to amendment No. 275), to provide for relief from (a)(3)(B) immigration bars from the Hmong and other groups who do not pose a threat to the United States, to designate the Taliban as a terrorist organization for immigration purposes.

McConnell (for Kyl) amendment No. 320 (to amendment No. 275), to improve the Classified Information Procedures Act.

McConnell (for Grassley) amendment No. 300 (to amendment No. 275), to clarify the revocation of an alien's visa or other documentation is not subject to judicial review.

McConnell (for Grassley) amendment No. 309 (to amendment No. 275), to improve the prohibitions on money laundering.

Thune amendment No. 308 (to amendment No. 275), to expand and improve the Proliferation Security Initiative while protecting the national security interests of the United States.

Cardin amendment No. 326 (to amendment No. 275), to provide for a study of modification of area of jurisdiction of Office of National Capital Region Coordination.

Cardin amendment No. 327 (to amendment No. 275), to reform mutual aid agreements for the National Capital Region.

Cardin modified amendment No. 328 (to amendment No. 275), to require Amtrak contracts and leases involving the State of Maryland to be governed by the laws of the District of Columbia.

Schumer/Clinton amendment No. 336 (to amendment No. 275), to prohibit the use of the peer review process in determining the allocation of funds among metropolitan areas applying for grants under the Urban Area Security Initiative.

Schumer/Clinton amendment No. 337 (to amendment No. 275), to provide for the use of funds in any grant under the Homeland Security Grant Program for personnel costs.

Coburn amendment No. 325 (to amendment No. 275), to ensure the fiscal integrity of grants awarded by the Department of Homeland Security.

Sessions amendment No. 347 (to amendment No. 275), to express the sense of the Congress regarding the funding of Senate-approved construction of fencing and vehicle barriers along the southwest border of the United States.

Coburn amendment No. 301 (to amendment No. 275), to prohibit grant recipients under grant programs administered by the Department from expending funds until the Secretary has reported to Congress that risk assessments of all programs and activities have been performed and completed, improper payments have been estimated, and corrective action plans have been developed and reported as required under the Improper Payments Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note).

Coburn amendment No. 294 (to amendment No. 275), to provide that the provisions of the act shall cease to have any force or effect on and after December 31, 2012, to ensure congressional review and oversight of the act.

Lieberman (for Menendez) amendment No. 354 (to amendment No. 275), to improve the security of cargo containers destined for the United States.

Specter amendment No. 286 (to amendment No. 275), to restore habeas corpus for those detained by the United States.

Kyl modified amendment No. 357 (to amendment No. 275), to amend the data-mining technology reporting requirement to avoid revealing existing patents, trade secrets, and confidential business processes, and to adopt a narrower definition of data-

mining in order to exclude routine computer searches.

Ensign amendment No. 363 (to amendment No. 275), to establish a Law Enforcement Assistance Force in the Department of Homeland Security to facilitate the contributions of retired law enforcement officers during major disasters.

Biden amendment No. 383 (to amendment No. 275), to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop regulations regarding the transportation of high hazard materials.

Biden amendment No. 384 (to amendment No. 275), to establish a Homeland Security and Neighborhood Safety Trust Fund and refocus Federal priorities toward securing the Homeland.

Bunning amendment No. 334 (to amendment No. 275), to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify the authorities relating to Federal flight deck officers.

Schumer modified amendment No. 367 (to amendment No. 275), to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to establish and implement a program to provide additional safety measures for vehicles that carry high hazardous materials.

Schumer amendment No. 366 (to amendment No. 275), to restrict the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to issue a license authorizing the export to a recipient country of highly enriched uranium for medical isotope production.

Wyden amendment No. 348 (to amendment No. 275), to require that a redacted version of the Executive Summary of the Office of Inspector General Report on Central Intelligence Agency Accountability Regarding Findings and Conclusions of the Joint Inquiry into Intelligence Community Activities Before and After the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001, is made available to the public.

Bond/Rockefeller amendment No. 389 (to amendment No. 275), to provide the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate should submit a report on the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission with respect to intelligence reform and congressional intelligence oversight reform.

Stevens amendment No. 299 (to amendment No. 275), to authorize NTIA to borrow against anticipated receipts of the Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Fund to initiate migration to a national IP-enabled emergency network capable of receiving and responding to all citizen-activated emergency communications.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, how much time remains under the current order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Four and a half minutes is remaining before the vote.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the majority leader and I agree about one thing: Securing America ought to be about doing just that and not about politics. But, unfortunately, the majority has demonstrated its interest in rewarding unions by providing a provision for collective bargaining for the Transportation Security Administration in this bill which elevates the union rights of the Transportation Security Administration over the national security and safety of the American people.

So we should not be fooled by the rhetoric or the attempt of the majority leader to stand behind the 9/11 families. Unfortunately, I fear these 9/11 families are being manipulated for political purposes in order to justify promoting the union rights of Transportation Security Administration workers, which will hinder the safety and security of the flying public. This 9/11 bill should be about strengthening security, not about unions.

Mr. President, I have another letter from 9/11 Families for a Secure America to Senator MCCONNELL, which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD after my comments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this letter says:

On behalf of 9/11 Families for a Secure America, an organization representing the families of 300 victims of the 9/11 attacks, we would like to thank you for your recent efforts to ensure and enhance America's security.

This letter goes on and will be part of the RECORD.

But I simply do not understand why the majority leader objects to our ability to have an up-or-down vote on whether dangerous criminal aliens who are currently being released into the population—because under a 2001 Supreme Court decision, they cannot be held more than 6 months pending deportation—why he would object to an up-or-down vote on that amendment.

We started off this year with the majority leader and those in the new majority saying they wanted to work with Republicans in a bipartisan way to try to do what was important for the American people. Nothing is more important than the safety and security of the American people. But why, 6 years after this 2001 Supreme Court decision, the majority insists on allowing this condition to exist, where dangerous criminal aliens are released into the American population to commit additional crimes, is beyond me. That is not about safety and security.

Frankly, the comments I heard this morning which say that somehow this is being politicized are just not correct. If anything, the majority has demonstrated that their desire to promote union rights as a reward for political support in the last election dominates their thinking on this bill. It is unfortunate.

I hope that if, indeed, that provision, which I do believe in all sincerity will impair the safety and security of the American people, is included in this bill once it is taken to conference, I hope the President follows through on his promise to veto the bill because it will not elevate but, rather, it will diminish the safety and security of the American people.

So I regret, Mr. President, that the majority leader has obstructed the ability of the U.S. Senate to have a full and fair debate on these important national security amendments. Frankly, the reasons for not allowing that just do not stand up to scrutiny.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

9/11 FAMILIES FOR A SECURE AMERICA,
March 8, 2007.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: On behalf of 9/11 Families for a Secure America, an organization representing the families of 300 victims of the 9/11 attacks, we would like to thank you for your recent efforts to ensure and enhance America's security.

As the parents of two men who lost their lives in the World Trade Center attacks, we take the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission more seriously than most. When President Bush threatened to veto the 9/11 bill over a provision related to airport security screeners, we were pleased by your efforts to strip the provision to ensure a presidential signature.

We also appreciate your recent efforts to implement a number of new policies aimed at closing dangerous loopholes in existing security law. We represent an organization that advocates strengthening our borders as a way of improving national security, and your proposals would do just that. As you know, current law prevents us from holding dangerous illegal immigrants and from deporting anyone whose visa has been revoked for terrorist-related reasons. These loopholes must be closed.

Those who would use the 9/11 bill as a vehicle for political patronage and stall its passage in the process do not have America's security interests at heart. Nor do those who would block a vote on measures aimed at securing our borders by screening those who come here illegally. Thank you for keeping faith with those of us who have made the security of this country a real priority. Your efforts are greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

JOAN MOLINARO,
Treasurer, 9/11 Families for a Secure America,
Mother of Carl Molinaro, FDNY.

PETER GADIEL,
President, 9/11 FSA, Father of James Gadiel,
WTC North Tower 103rd floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on pending amendment No. 312, as modified, to amendment No. 275 to Calendar No. 57, S. 4, a bill to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

John Cornyn, Jon Kyl, Mike Crapo, John Ensign, Saxby Chambliss, Judd Gregg, Richard Burr, Jim Bunning, Sam Brownback, Mitch McConnell, Craig Thomas, Tom Coburn, Wayne Allard, Jim DeMint, John Thune, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 312, as modified, offered by Mr. MCCONNELL of Kentucky, to S. 4, a bill to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 46, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alexander	Dole	Murkowski
Allard	Domenici	Roberts
Bayh	Ensign	Sessions
Bennett	Enzi	Shelby
Bond	Graham	Smith
Bunning	Grassley	Snowe
Chambliss	Gregg	Specter
Coburn	Hatch	Stevens
Cochran	Hutchison	Sununu
Coleman	Inhofe	Thomas
Collins	Isakson	Thune
Corker	Kyl	Vitter
Cornyn	Lott	Voinovich
Craig	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	Martinez	
DeMint	McConnell	

NAYS—49

Akaka	Hagel	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Inouye	Obama
Bingaman	Kennedy	Pryor
Boxer	Kerry	Reed
Brown	Klobuchar	Reid
Byrd	Kohl	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Landrieu	Salazar
Cardin	Lautenberg	Sanders
Carper	Leahy	Schumer
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Clinton	Lieberman	Tester
Conrad	Lincoln	Webb
Dorgan	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden
Feingold	Mikulski	
Feinstein	Murray	

NOT VOTING—5

Brownback	Dodd	McCain
Burr	Johnson	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the following cloture motion which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the Reid substitute amendment No. 275 to S. 4, the 9/11 Commission legislation.

Joe Lieberman, Charles Schumer, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Dianne Feinstein, B.A. Mikulski, Christopher Dodd, Joe Biden, Debbie Stabenow, Harry Reid, Pat Leahy, Dick Durbin, Jeff Bingaman, H.R. Clinton, Bill Nelson, Tom Carper, Jack Reed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 275, offered by Mr. REID of Nevada, to S. 4, a bill to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Akaka	Durbin	Murkowski
Alexander	Feingold	Murray
Baucus	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Hagel	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Harkin	Obama
Biden	Inouye	Pryor
Bingaman	Kennedy	Reed
Bond	Kerry	Reid
Boxer	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Brown	Kohl	Salazar
Byrd	Landrieu	Sanders
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Smith
Carper	Levin	Snowe
Casey	Lieberman	Stabenow
Clinton	Lincoln	Stevens
Coleman	Lott	Tester
Collins	Lugar	Thune
Conrad	Martinez	Voinovich
Corker	McCaskill	Warner
Dole	McConnell	Webb
Domenici	Menendez	Whitehouse
Dorgan	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—26

Allard	Ensign	Kyl
Bunning	Enzi	Roberts
Chambliss	Graham	Sessions
Coburn	Grassley	Shelby
Cochran	Gregg	Specter
Cornyn	Hatch	Sununu
Craig	Hutchison	Thomas
Crapo	Inhofe	Vitter
DeMint	Isakson	

NOT VOTING—5

Brownback	Dodd	McCain
Burr	Johnson	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 69, the nays are 26. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion on the bill be vitiated; that the bill be read a third time, and a vote occur on final passage on Tuesday, March 13, immediately upon the disposition of the substitute amendment; that when the Senate convenes on Tuesday, March 13, and resumes consideration of the bill, all time under cloture be considered expired and the Senate immediately begin voting on those pending germane amendments; further, that during Monday's legislative session, the provisions of rule XXII shall not bar a motion to proceed made by the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I think this is a fair agreement that will allow us to finish the bill on Tuesday, and I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, this means that there will be no further rollcall votes today, there will be no rollcall votes on Monday, and we would resume voting on the germane amendments on Tuesday morning next week.

Our staffs will continue to be available to negotiate with our colleagues on a consent list of amendments that are agreed to by all concerned. In fact, we have a list now approaching 20 amendments where there is such agreement, but there are one or two individual Senators concerned that their amendments are not on that list and they are objecting to the overall consent. We hope very much that can be worked out and we can, in any case, move to final passage next Tuesday.

Mr. President, I briefly wish to thank my ranking member, Senator COLLINS, for her extraordinary contribution to this bill and her cooperation. As you know, we have had many ups and downs about the many amendments, agreements, objections, et cetera, but I am very pleased to say that the bill, as it came out of our committee, was nonpartisan, with a 16-to-0 vote, and one abstention, thus remaining essentially intact. That is the good news.

I hope some of the amendments that have been agreed to by almost everybody on both sides can be added to make the bill even stronger as we go to conference.

I thank our colleagues for their contributions and for some good debate.

This is a subject of urgent importance to the American people. It is completing the unfinished work that the 9/11 Commission gave us, it is building on all we accomplished in the 9/11 legislation of 2004, and it will, in a very direct way, make the American people safer both from potential terrorist attack and from the inevitable natural disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina.

I thank my colleagues, and I yield the floor to my ranking member at this time.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this is a very important bill. Many of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission were enacted as part of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and I have worked so hard to author. But there is some unfinished business, and this bill will help make our country safer and it will strengthen our protections against terrorist attacks.

As always, it has been a great pleasure to work with the Senator from Connecticut, whose leadership I so admire. I am optimistic we have now finally put this important bill on a path to completion, and I look forward to working to accomplish that goal on Tuesday.

I thank the Chair.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, though I am not sure if that motion has gone through, I wanted to ask the leaders, who have managed this bill so well, if they are familiar with amendment Nos. 295 and 296, relative to very urgent requests by the Gulf Coast States, one for loan forgiveness and one for the 10-percent waiver? Are the two leaders willing to say they are both supportive of these amendments and will continue to try over the weekend to get both these amendments up by unanimous consent?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Louisiana, the amendment on loan forgiveness is on the consent list. As the Senator knows, for reasons that are certainly perplexing to me, most everybody here seems to agree on the 10-percent forgiveness for the gulf coast based on Hurricane Katrina because of the extraordinary economic impact the storm had on both governments and people and businesses in the gulf coast. There is very broad support, but there continue to be objections, as the Senator knows. I regret that, and I hope we can find a way to overcome those between now and next Tuesday.

The Senator from Louisiana also knows there is an amendment on levees that is germane, and that will be one of the amendments that is up either for a vote or passage by consent on Tuesday because it remains relevant and germane after cloture.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator for his support.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield so I may respond to her question.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield.

Ms. COLLINS. The Senator from Louisiana has been tireless in her advocacy for both of these amendments. The junior Senator from Louisiana has also talked to me about these amendments, as has the Senator from Florida, Mr. MARTINEZ. I have been working hard with the chairman to try to address the concerns of the Senators from Louisiana.

As the chairman has indicated, there is good news on one of the Senator's amendments. The amendment that proposes the loan forgiveness authority for the President is on the list of amendments we are optimistic about clearing on Tuesday. The other amendment, with the 10-percent match eliminated, is more problematic because there are some outstanding objections to it.

I know the Senator from Louisiana has indicated a willingness to amend her amendment and put a 2-year sunset on that provision. That helps a great deal with one of the objections we have on our side of the aisle. I don't know whether we are going to be able to clear the other objections, but I certainly pledge to keep working with the Senator from Louisiana and the committee's chairman to accomplish that goal.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank all our colleagues, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRADE POLICY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last November, voters in my State of Ohio spoke out for change. Their call echoed across this country, as middle-class, working, and low-income families claimed ownership of their Government.

For too long, our Government betrayed their values. The drug companies wrote the Medicare law, the oil companies dictated energy policy, and large multinational corporations pushed job-killing trade agreements through the House and the Senate.

In my home State of Ohio, trade in particular was the focus for change in last year's election. Years of job-killing trade agreements are taking their toll on workers and small businesses alike. Two years ago, the largest ever bipartisan fair trade coalition was formed to oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement—the dysfunctional cousin of the fundamentally flawed North American Free Trade Agreement.

Forced through the House in the middle of the night by one vote, CAFTA did not pass on its merits. So flawed is CAFTA that to this day, nearly 2 years later, it has still not been fully implemented.

The question is not if we trade but how we trade and who benefits from trade. Unfettered free trade has afforded multinational corporations and morally bankrupt countries windfall profits on the backs of often slave, sweatshop, or even child labor. Proponents of unfettered free trade use words such as ''protectionism'' to hide their shameful practices, to mask agreements that trade in human suffering and economic destruction, and to simply try to push away their opponents' arguments.

I am pleased to say this Congress is not only committed to build on the efforts of the fair trade coalition, we are already at work changing trade policy. Earlier this year, Senator DORGAN, Senator GRAHAM, and I introduced legislation that would ban sweatshop labor. We shed light on the injustice of allowing China to enjoy permanent normal trade relations in the WTO while allowing the degradation of environmental and labor standards on massive scales.

In the coming months, Congress will debate fast-track negotiations due to expire this summer. It is clear this administration has little desire—has little desire—to change direction on trade, so it is up to Congress to chart a new course for the future of U.S. trade policy.

Fair trade is not just about doing the right thing for small business, doing the right thing for manufacturing, doing the right thing for workers; it means investing in entire communities.

Our middle class is shrinking. Our policies in Washington have betrayed the values of working families across this country—in Ohio and Rhode Island, all over this country—which is why we must revamp our economic trade policies and invest in our middle class. We must shrink income inequality, grow our business community, and create good-paying jobs. We must establish trade policy that builds on our economic security.

Job loss does not just affect the worker who has lost her job or that worker's family. Job loss, especially job loss in the thousands, devastates communities. It hurts the local business owner—the drugstore, the grocery store, the neighborhood restaurant. When people are out of work, they cannot support their local economy, which forces owners to close their small businesses. That means lost revenues to the community, which hurts schools, fire departments, and police departments.

The trade policies we set here and negotiated across the globe have a direct impact on places such as Toledo and

Steubenville and Cleveland and Middletown. We hear the word ''protectionist'' thrown around by those who insist on more of the same failed trade models. It is considered ''protectionist'' by them when they characterize those of us who are fighting for labor and environmental standards, but they call it ''free trade'' to protect drug company patents and Hollywood films.

If we can protect intellectual property rights, as we should, with enforceable provisions in trade agreements, we absolutely can do the same for labor, the environment, and food safety.

In my home State of Ohio, we have a talented and hard-working labor force and an entrepreneurial spirit that needs only the investment dollars and commitment from Government to realize their economic potential.

Oberlin College, near Cleveland, has the largest building on any university campus in the United States fully powered by solar energy. However, Oberlin College had to buy the solar panels for their building from Germany and Japan because we do not make enough solar panels in the United States.

Through investment in alternative energy, and through biomedical research and development, we cannot only create jobs, we can grow small business, we can help our environment.

Now is the time for our Government to do its part and redirect our priorities from favoring the wealthiest 1 percent in our Nation to, instead, growing our Nation's middle class. It is not a matter of if we revamp our trade policy but when we do it.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 835 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his courtesy. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

TRADE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I believe this morning President Bush is in Brazil. A week ago today, I and a number of Senators met with the President at the White House. The issue of the Brazil trip came up. He no doubt will talk to the Brazilians about trade this morning. As he discusses the issue of trade, I wanted to make a couple of comments.

Today we had a new trade deficit figure released, about 3 hours ago. It shows our merchandise trade deficit in the past month was $66 billion—in 1 month. I wanted to come to the floor to show what is happening to this country's trade. The reason I want to show the results of our trade policy is we now have proposals in front of us for free trade agreements. We have Colombia, Peru, negotiations with South Korea, Thailand, and others. We have been through a period when there has been this mantra, this chant, as it is, about free trade.

This chart shows what is happening to trade. In 1995, 12 years ago, we had a $174 billion trade deficit. Now it is $836 billion. Think of that: Every single day we wake up in this country, we import over $2 billion more in goods from overseas than we are able to sell abroad. It doesn't matter what the good is, much, and it doesn't matter what the country is.

I have been here with charts that show, for example, to cite one, last year we had automobiles put on ships in South Korea. Mr. President, over 700,000 automobiles were put on ships in South Korea and sent to America and sold in the United States—700,000 South Korean automobiles. How many American automobiles do you think we sold in Korea, Mr. President, 700,000? No, no—about 4,000. Fair trade? Hardly. Ninety-nine percent of the cars on the streets of South Korea are South Korean cars. Why? Because they don't want foreign cars sold in South Korea. They want to produce cars with jobs in South Korea and ship them to the United States.

Should we allow that kind of one-way trade—700,000 going one way, 4,000 plus going the other way—to continue? I don't think so.

Let me talk a little about the general area of trade. I want to put up a picture of a young girl named Halima. This is a beautiful 11-year-old girl. When I showed the chart of the $836 billion trade deficit last year, over $2 billion a day—well over $2 billion a day—the result of that statistic is American jobs being shipped overseas, products being produced overseas, in many cases with dirt-cheap labor, sent to a big box retailer in this country to be sold at a lower price. That is true, a lower price, so the American consumer gets a better price on a 12-pack of underwear or a gallon of mustard someplace. But what is the consequence of that to our economy, to our jobs? What ultimately is the consequence for our country? I frame all this in the context of the President saying: Let's do more, let's do more of this.

It seems to me if we do much more of that, we won't have much of an economy left. At what point do we think a trade deficit matters? This isn't money we owe to ourselves. One can make that case in fiscal policy with the budget deficit. This is money we owe to other countries, over $1 trillion of which we now owe to the Japanese and the Chinese. But what are the consequences?

I mentioned lost American jobs. Where do these jobs go? Who is producing what is sent to our country?

This beautiful young lady is named Halima. She worked at a factory in Bangladesh at age 11, and she made Hanes underwear. She worked long hours, very low pay, in sweatshop conditions.

One would think if this is a world market in which we care about the circumstances of people working in sweatshop conditions, we would take a look at something such as this and say: Wait a second, we don't want to buy Hanes underwear made with the hands of an 11-year-old working in sweatshop conditions.

Let me show my colleagues a certification of this plant in which Halima worked. ''Certificate of Compliance, February 21, 2007.'' It is hereby awarded to Harvest Rich Ltd., worldwide responsible apparel production. So they certified this company was doing just fine with international standards. An 11-year-old producing in sweatshop conditions, sending underwear to Americans? That is fine? I don't think so. So is this just an aberration? This just happens on the very unusual case, and I just happened to find the picture of Halima?

Let me tell you how this picture came about. This picture came from a woman named Sheik Nazma. She was a former child laborer in Bangladesh. She was forced to start working in the textile mills at age 12—a sweatshop—and she described the conditions. She organized her coworkers for better conditions, saying: Let us, as a group of workers, organize to see if we can get better conditions. For that, she was beaten and threatened to death for organizing workers.

Is that an aberration? No, not really. I can give you the names today of people sitting in prisons in China. Their transgression? Their crime? They tried to organize workers for better conditions, tried to organize workers to insist on backpay they were owed. For that, they are sitting in prison cells in China because you can't organize workers in China.

What is happening with respect to these trade issues is we are sinking deep into this abyss of worsening trade debt. I know what the papers will say tomorrow—that $66 billion, the last monthly merchandise trade deficit, is about a billion dollars or so less than the previous month, and the newspapers will say: Nirvana. What a wonderful thing—our trade deficit is shrinking. These, of course, are the same newspapers that beat to death this chant of free trade. There is not enough of this free trade for them; the more the merrier. My only question about all of this is, When do you suggest that this represents failure? Is

there never an opportunity to suggest that we need a change in trade strategy, a change that stands up for what we have built in a century in this country?

Let me describe what it is we have built in this century. A man name James Fyler was shot in 1914. The previous accounts of his death say he died of lead poisoning actually, but he was shot 54 times. Do you know why he was shot and lost his life? Because he believed that people who went underground to dig in the coal mines ought to be entitled to two things: No. 1, a safe workplace, and No. 2, a fair wage. For that, he was murdered.

In a century, from James Fyler forward, we had people who gave their lives and risked their lives to improve standards in this country, to insist on the right to organize, to insist on safe workplaces, to insist on a fair wage, and to insist on fair labor standards. It was tough. There were people beaten in the streets for it. There were people shot for insisting that we develop and lift those standards. But we did. We did. We expanded and created a middle class almost unparalleled in the world, which became the economic strength of this country. Working people understood they could get a good job, get some training, have a job that had a career ladder, an opportunity for a decent wage, an opportunity for benefits, and an opportunity to take care of their families. There is no social program in this Chamber that is as important as a good job that pays well for able-bodied workers. It is what allows everything else to work.

So we did that for a century, and we expanded opportunities. Now, all of a sudden, we are told it is a new day because of the global economy. In fact, Tom Friedman wrote a book saying that not only is it a new day, but the world is flat. I have yet to see the globe that represents that. When you go to most offices or libraries and you see a globe of the Earth, it appears round to me. Of course, I only graduated from a high school senior class of nine students, so maybe I missed a part of the lesson. So now we have books that say the world is flat, which, of course, is nonsense because it is not flat.

It is a global economy. What does that mean? What is the definition of what a global economy means for us and for our future? It means, according to some, that we ought to be able to understand that comparative advantage means you produce products where you can produce them at the least cost and then purchase them here and it is good for the consumer. The result is corporate executives flying around the world deciding where they can produce for the least cost.

How many of my colleagues remember Radio Flyer's little red wagon, which was an American product for 110 years, a Chicago company—the little red wagon we have all ridden in? It was named ''Radio Flyer'' because the inventor loved Marconi and he loved to fly, so he named his product ''Radio Flyer,'' and his company built it in Chicago for 110 years. Not anymore. It is just gone. It is now built in China. Do you think that is because the Chinese build better little red wagons? No, not at all. It is because you can find somebody who will work for 30 cents an hour, and you can work them 7 days a week, 12 to 14 hours a day, and you can build a cheaper little red wagon.

Similarly, you can do the same with Huffy bicycles and then eliminate all their jobs. You can do the same with Pennsylvania House furniture. In fact, with Pennsylvania House furniture, you can send the Pennsylvania wood to China. You can get rid of all the workers in Pennsylvania, send the Pennsylvania wood to China, and have them put it together and ship it back here, and that is exactly what has happened.

About 3½ to 4 million jobs have now migrated to where you can pay pennies an hour and then ship the product back to our country. That is about enhancing corporate profits, but I think it is at the expense of our economic future.

The former Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Blinder, a mainstream economist, said this: There are 42 to 56 million American jobs that are tradeable, meaning outsourceable. Not all of them will leave our country, but even those that stay are competing with others in the world who will work for lower wages. Therefore, there will be downward pressure on American wages for working Americans.

We see it every day. Open the newspaper and see how many people are losing their health care benefits, their retirement benefits, and the downward pressure on income. We see it every day. It is part of a strategy that says free trade, a global economy, produce where it is cheap, and sell to a marketplace like this.

My point is that it doesn't add up in the long run. I am for trade. I am in favor of trade, and plenty of it, but I insist and demand that it be fair trade for this country that attempts to lift, not depress standards. I am very interested in engaging with the rest of the world. I am not an isolationist, I am not a protectionist, as they define it, although I want to plead guilty quickly to wanting to protect our country's economic interests. If that is being a protectionist, then just sign me up. I want to protect our country's economic interests. We will only do that, and we will do it well, if we understand the need to retain a broad middle class, a middle class that sees jobs here that pay well, with benefits and opportunities in the future.

So how do we reconcile all of this? What will happen in the coming several months is—and I believe Senator SHERROD BROWN spoke about this earlier today—what will happen in the coming months is we will be requested to debate an extension of something called fast-track authority. Fast-track authority. They are going to want to run through fast-track authority trade agreements with, yes, South Korea and Thailand and Peru and Colombia and many others. The same people who have given us this want to give us more of it, a deep canyon of red ink, downward pressure on American incomes, and substantial pressure on the movement of American jobs.

Interestingly enough, we not only move American jobs overseas, we actually decide, for those who do it, that we will give them a big fat tax break. One of the most pernicious, ignorant pieces of public policy I can conceive of is when we said: Fire your American workers, close your American plants, move your jobs to China, sell your products back in America, run your income through the Cayman Islands, and we will give you a big fat tax break for it.

Four times we have voted on eliminating that tax break, four times I have offered amendments to shut it down, and four times I have lost. Mark my words—we will be voting again and again on that proposition. The very last thing we ought to do as a country is decide we want to subsidize the flight of American jobs.

We just introduced a piece of legislation that would deal with the issue of sweatshop labor in other countries. What are the standards of this so-called global trade in a flat world? Well, at least there is one standard. The one standard is that you can't sell tube socks from a prison in China at a big-box retailer in America. Why is that? Because it is presumed that if you make tube socks or shorts or whatever you make in a prison setting, then that truly is the ultimate sweatshop labor, I guess. So you can't send prison labor products to our marketplace.

Well, if we all agree with that, and we do, because we already have a provision on that, what about the next step up? What about the product of an 11-year-old girl? What about the product of a company that hires an 11-year-old girl named Halima and works her in sweatshop conditions?

Should we decide as a country that you cannot produce products in sweatshop conditions that abuse workers abroad and send the products here—which, by the way, then asks American workers working in plants in the United States to compete with that sweatshop labor. It not only abuses foreign workers, it also abuses domestic workers because we are saying: Compete with something that is completely unsavory. If this happened in our country, we would march down the street with law enforcement and say: Shut this down.

We have heard the stories. I think my colleague, Senator HARKIN, had hearings some several years ago about this with the international labor organizations—young kids in carpet factories having their fingertips burned with sulfur. They put sulfur on the fingertips, then light them on fire. Do you know why? They create scars on the

fingertips so that as they use needles to sew the rugs, two things occur: They don't hurt themselves because they have scars from having had their fingertips burned and, second, they won't get blood on the carpets. Is this something we should accept? No, I don't think so. Is it something we should care about? You are darn right we should. But almost nothing—almost nothing—is acceptable to discuss in this mantra of free trade without being called a protectionist.

Here is what I think is going to happen. In the last election here in this country, I think there were 6 or 8 or 10 Senate races in which the winning candidate said: You know what, we are on the wrong track here. It is not that we shouldn't trade. We should trade. The origin of this great country was the shrewd Yankee trader. We were the traders, good traders, and so we should trade. But we shouldn't decide that this kind of a trade deficit can continue. It simply cannot.

Let me pull up the chart with China. The largest trade deficit we have is with the country of China, with $232 billion last year alone. That is unbelievable.

I have mentioned before that part of our problem is just incompetent trade agreements, just fundamentally incompetent, and I will give an example of one.

I have threatened from time to time that trade negotiators should wear uniforms, like the jerseys they wear in the Olympics, so they can look down from time to time and, in a sober moment, they can see for whom they are working. It would say ''U.S.A.''

China. We did a bilateral agreement with China, a country with which we have a very large trade deficit—a very large deficit and growing. It is a country that is also developing a new automobile export industry, and they want to export automobiles aggressively to the United States. Here is what we said: If you export Chinese automobiles to the United States, we will impose a 2.5-percent tariff on your cars, but if we export American automobiles to be sold in China, China can impose a 25-percent tariff. We negotiated with China a deal that said: On a bilateral automobile trade, you ship a car to us and we will impose a 2.5-percent tariff, and if we ship a car to you, you can impose a tariff that is 10 times higher, and that is just fine. I am saying that is ignorant. That is ignorant of our economic interest.

One little piece of information. Most people don't know it, but you can rip open the intestines of these trade agreements and find case after case where we have traded away our own economic interests.

We are going to be confronting now, in the next 4 or 5 months, some very tough choices—not so tough for me but perhaps for some—choices about what do we do about fast-track trade authority. That is a mechanism by which the Senate decides in advance that when a trade agreement comes here that has been negotiated in secret, behind closed doors, with no participation of any of us, it comes here under an expedited procedure with no opportunity for anyone to make any change of any type. I don't support that.

What has happened with China and the world is the deepening abyss of red ink, and what has resulted from the strategy that comes from fast track is expedited procedures and a straightjacket for the Senate. It has come from incompetent agreements. It has come from lack of enforcement. In fact, our trade authorities cannot even find some of the agreements they have previously negotiated. They can't even find them, let alone enforce them.

I haven't talked here about the number of people who are working in our Government to enforce our trade agreements with China. It is fewer than 20. Enforcement is just the backwater of trade. Nobody wants to enforce anything. It doesn't matter. Yet, in my judgment, it does matter to this country's economic future.

What are we going to do about fast track and the extension for fast track that President Bush is requesting? I did not support fast-track trade authority for President Clinton, and I do not support it for President Bush, although President Bush has had it now for some while. But I think there is a new group of Senators who will have to sink their teeth into this discussion. What does this mean? What does this expedited procedure, fast-track straitjacket, mean? What does it mean when we do bilateral negotiations, so-called free-trade negotiations, with the countries I previously described, and how do we resolve them? How do we deal with them?

Many of my colleagues, myself included, believe when we negotiate trade agreements we should do so with an eye on what we have created and built in this country, lifting up standards for almost a century now. We should have labor provisions in the trade agreements. We should have environmental provisions in the trade agreements. We should have a shock absorber for currency fluctuation in the trade agreements. Some say that is radical. It is not radical. I will show you what is radical. It is the sheet that shows the combined trade deficit with the world. When you talk about what is radical, this is radical: the trade strategy that gives us this is radical. The trade strategy that gives us this morning's merchandise trade deficit of $66 billion, that is what is radical.

There is an old saying: If you don't care where you are, you are never going to be lost. You know, we have gone on here for some long while with people apparently not caring, but it is time for our country to care. There is only one United States on this planet. If you spin this globe and try to find another equivalent place, with democracy and a market system that have come together to create opportunity for so many—there is only one place. But we are quickly losing it with this ''the world is flat'' approach, with free-trade agreements that tend to put downward pressure on wages in this country and strip away benefits and decide in this new market system that comparative advantage is not just who has the best natural resources to produce what product, but who has decided to have rules in their country that prohibit workers from organizing, that allow sweatshops to operate, that allows 11-year-old kids in carpet factories.

That is not comparative advantage. Ricardo would roll over in his grave. It has nothing to do with comparative advantage. We have to confront these issues, the sooner the better, and there is no question we will begin to confront them in this year, perhaps in the next 4 or 5 months. The way we confront them and the decisions we make will have a profound impact on what kind of a country we have and what kind of economy we have in the coming years. That is why it is so important.

I wanted to make a couple of comments today by pointing out that we are now confronted with choices, and those choices, I assume, will be imposed upon us in a very short period of time. I look forward to new voices in the Senate weighing in on these important issues. Not in a way that suggests we are not a part of the world economy, we are a significant part of the world economy; not in a way that suggests the world has not gotten smaller, it has. The world is not flat, but the world certainly is smaller.

We are engaged in this information technology revolution. If something happens almost anywhere in the world, I will know about it 5 minutes later, and we will see pictures of it in a half hour or less. So things have changed. But what has not changed is our need and desire as Americans to look after the well-being of our economy and the opportunities that can exist for our citizens.

That is not being selfish. That is our responsibility. We are stewards of this country's future, and that stewardship, in my judgment, is vastly compromised by this chart and what has happened with the shipping of American jobs overseas, with the decision that cheaper prices at home for products produced elsewhere for pennies an hour represent fair competition for American workers. It is not fair competition, and we do desperately need, now, a new trade strategy, one that reflects the economic interests of this country but one that still insists on being a significant part of the world economy even as we try to lift others up without pushing our standards down.

AMENDMENT NO. 286

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I was pleased to join Senator SPECTER and Senator DODD in offering an amendment to restore the Great Writ of habeas corpus, a cornerstone of American liberty since the founding of this Nation. Senator SPECTER and I introduced

this legislation late last year and reintroduced it on the first day of this new Congress. This amendment continues our efforts to amend last year's Military Commissions Act, to right a wrong and to restore a basic protection to American law. This is an issue on which we continue to work together and urge Senators on both sides of the aisle to join with us.

As Justice Scalia wrote in the Hamdi case: ''The very core of liberty secured by our Anglo-Saxon system of separated powers has been freedom from indefinite imprisonment at the will of the Executive.'' The remedy that secures that most basic of freedoms is habeas corpus. It provides a check against arbitrary detentions and constitutional violations. It guarantees an opportunity to go to court, with the aid of a lawyer, to prove one's innocence. This fundamental protection was rolled back in an unprecedented and unnecessary way in the run up to last fall's election by passage of the Military Commissions Act.

The Military Commissions Act eliminated that right, permanently, for any noncitizen determined to be an enemy combatant, or even ''awaiting'' such a determination. That includes the approximately 12 million lawful permanent residents in the United States today, people who work and pay taxes in America and are lawful residents. This new law means that any of these people can be detained, forever, without any ability to challenge their detention in Federal court—or anywhere else—simply on the Government's sayso that they are awaiting determination whether they are enemy combatants.

I deeply regret that Senator SPECTER and I were unsuccessful in our efforts to stop this injustice when the President and the Republican leadership insisted on rushing the Military Commissions Act through Congress in the weeks before the recent elections. We proposed an amendment that would have removed the habeas-stripping provision from the Military Commissions Act. We fell just three votes short in those politically charged days. It is my hope that the new Senate and new Congress will reconsider this matter, restore this fundamental protection and revitalize our tradition of checks and balances.

This amendment to the 9/11 Commission bill provides the right time and the place for the Senate to make this stand. The 9/11 Commission bill seeks to make us stronger and to protect us from the threat of terrorism. Protecting our values and the safeguards that make us a strong democracy is key to that effort. Restoring our place as an example to the world of liberty and the rule of law will only increase our security and undermine those who would seek to recruit terrorists.

Giving the Government such raw, unfettered power as the Military Commissions Act did should concern every American. Last fall, I spelled out a nightmare scenario about a hard-working legal permanent resident who makes an innocent donation to, among other charities, a Muslim charity that the Government secretly suspects might be a source of funding for critics of the United States Government. I suggested that, on the basis of this donation and perhaps a report of ''suspicious behavior'' from an overzealous neighbor, the permanent resident could be brought in for questioning, denied a lawyer, confined, and even tortured. Such a person would have no recourse in the courts for years, for decades, forever.

Many people viewed this kind of nightmare scenario as fanciful, just the rhetoric of a politician. It was not. It is all spelled out clearly in the language of the law that this body passed. In November, the scenario I spelled out was confirmed by the Department of Justice itself in a legal brief submitted in a Federal court in Virginia. The Justice Department, in a brief to dismiss a detainee's habeas case, said that the Military Commissions Act allows the Government to detain any non-citizen designated an enemy combatant without giving that person any ability to challenge his detention in court. This is true, the Justice Department said, even for someone arrested and imprisoned in the United States. The Washington Post wrote that the brief ''raises the possibility that any of the millions of immigrants living in the United States could be subject to indefinite detention if they are accused of ties to terrorist groups.''

In fact, the situation is even more stark than The Washington Post story suggested. The Justice Department's brief says that the Government can detain any noncitizen declared to be an enemy combatant. But the law this Congress passed says the Government need not even make that declaration: They can hold people indefinitely who are awaiting determination whether or not they are enemy combatants.

It gets worse. Republican leaders in the Senate followed the White House's lead and greatly expanded the definition of ''enemy combatants'' in the dark of night in the final days before the bill's passage, so that enemy combatants need not be soldiers on any battlefield. They can be people who donate small amounts of money, or people that any group of decision-makers selected by the President decides to call enemy combatants. The possibilities are chilling.

We have eliminated basic legal and human rights for the 12 million lawful permanent residents who live and work among us, to say nothing of the millions of other legal immigrants and visitors who we welcome to our shores each year. We have removed a vital check that our legal system provides against the Government arbitrarily detaining people for life without charge. We may well have also made many of our remaining limits against torture and cruel and inhuman treatment obsolete because they are unenforceable. We have removed the mechanism the Constitution provides to check Government overreaching and lawlessness.

This is wrong. It is unconstitutional. It is un-American. It is designed to ensure that the Bush-Cheney administration will never again be embarrassed by a United States Supreme Court decision reviewing its unlawful abuses of power. The conservative Supreme Court, with seven of its nine members appointed by Republican Presidents, has been the only check on this administration's lawlessness. Certainly the last Congress did not do it. With passage of the Military Commissions Act, the Republican Congress completed the job of eviscerating its role as a check and balance on the administration.

Some Senators uneasy about the Military Commissions Act's disastrous habeas provision took solace in the thought that it would be struck down by the courts. Instead, the first court to consider that provision, a Federal court in the District of Columbia, upheld the provision. The DC Circuit, in a sharply divided 2–1 decision, upheld that ruling, holding that at least the hundreds of detainees held in Guantanamo Bay cannot go to court to challenge their detention. We should not outsource our moral, legal and constitutional responsibility to the courts. We cannot count on the courts to fix our mistakes. Congress must be accountable for its actions, and we should act to right this wrong.

Following the DC Circuit's decision, newspapers and experts from across the country and across the political spectrum have called on Congress to take action. Editorial boards from the Washington Post and the New York Times to the Evansville Courier & Press in Indiana, and the Columbia Tribune in Missouri have called for reversing the MCA's habeas provision. Prominent conservatives like Bob Barr and Bruce Fein, along with Aberto Mora, former Navy General Counsel in the Bush Administration, have echoed this call. I ask that a selection of these editorials be placed in the record.

A group of four distinguished admirals and generals who have served as senior military lawyers argued passionately for fixing this problem in a letter they sent to me earlier this week. They wrote, ''In discarding habeas corpus, we are jettisoning one of the core principles of our Nation precisely when we should be showcasing to the world our respect for the rule of law and basic rights. These are the characteristics that make our nation great. These are the values our men and women in uniform are fighting to preserve.''

Abolishing habeas corpus for anyone who the Government thinks might have assisted enemies of the United States is unnecessary and morally wrong. It is a betrayal of the most basic values of freedom for which America stands. It makes a mockery of the administration's lofty rhetoric about exporting freedom across the globe.

We should take steps to ensure that our enemies can be brought to justice efficiently and quickly. I introduced a bill to do that back in 2002, as did Senator SPECTER, when we each proposed a set of laws to establish military commissions. The Bush-Cheney administration rejected our efforts and designed a regime the U.S. Supreme Court determined to be unlawful. Establishing appropriate military commissions is not the question. We all agree to do that. What we need to revisit is the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus for millions of legal immigrants and others, denying their right to challenge indefinite detainment on the Government's say-so.

It is from strength that America should defend our values and our Constitution. It takes commitment to those values to demand accountability from the Government. We should not be legislating from fear. In standing up for American values and security, I will keep working on this issue until we restore the checks and balances that are fundamental to preserving the liberties that define us as a nation. We can ensure our security without giving up our liberty. That is what the 9/11 Commission bill aims to do, and that is what this amendment will help to achieve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 2007]

EXTEND LEGAL RIGHTS TO GUANTANAMO

(By Alberto J. Mora and Thomas R. Pickering)

For more than 200 years, the courts have served as the ultimate safeguard for our civil liberties. A critical part of this role has been the judicial branch's ability to consider writs of habeas corpus, through which people who have been imprisoned can challenge the decision to hold them in government custody. In this way, habeas corpus has provided an important check on executive power. However, because of a provision of the Military Commissions Act passed last fall, this fundamental role of the courts has been seriously reduced.

Habeas corpus—the Great Writ—has been the preeminent safeguard of individual liberty for centuries by providing meaningful judicial review of executive action and ensuring that our government has complied with the Constitution and the laws of the United States. Habeas review has always been most critical in cases of executive detention without charge because it provides prisoners a meaningful opportunity to contest their detention before a neutral decision maker.

In 2004, the Supreme Court held that the protections of habeas corpus extend to detainees at Guantanamo Bay, who may rely on them to challenge the lawfulness of their indefinite detentions. The court noted that at its historical core, ''the writ of habeas corpus has served as a means of reviewing the legality of Executive detention, and it is in that context that its protections have been strongest.''

But the Military Commissions Act eliminates the federal courts' ability to hear habeas petitions filed by certain noncitizens detained by the United States at Guantanamo Bay and elsewhere. Late last month the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit upheld this provision and dismissed the lawsuits filed by many of the Guantanamo detainees.

We fully recognize that our government must have the power to detain suspected foreign terrorists to protect national security. But removing the federal courts' ability to hear habeas corpus claims does not serve that goal. On the contrary, habeas corpus is crucial to ensure that the government's power to detain is exercised wisely, lawfully and consistently with American values. That is why we have joined with the Constitution Project's broad and bipartisan group of judges, former members of Congress, executive branch officials, scholars and others to urge Congress to restore federal court jurisdiction to hear these habeas corpus petitions.

The unconventional nature of the ''war on terrorism'' makes habeas corpus more, not less, important. Unlike what is found in traditional conflicts, there is no clearly defined enemy, no identifiable battlefield and no foreseeable end to the fighting. The government claims the power to imprison individuals without charge indefinitely, potentially forever. It is essential that there be a meaningful process to ensure that the United States does not mistakenly deprive innocent people of their liberty. Habeas corpus provides that process.

We recognize that the Military Commissions Act still enables the Guantanamo detainees to have hearings before a Combatant Status Review Tribunal, which is charged with determining whether the detainee is in fact an ''enemy combatant.'' But unlike court hearings, the tribunal hearings rely on secret evidence, deny detainees the chance to obtain and present their own evidence, and allow the government to use evidence obtained by coercive interrogation methods. While these tribunals have some utility, they cannot replace the critical role of habeas corpus.

The government has detained some Guantanamo prisoners for more than five years without giving them a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The United States cannot expect other nations to afford its citizens the basic guarantees provided by habeas corpus unless it provides those guarantees to others.

And in our constitutional system of checks and balances, it is unwise for the legislative branch to limit an established and traditional avenue of judicial review.

Americans should be proud of their commitment to the rule of law and not diminish the protections it provides. Our country's detention policy has undermined its reputation around the world and has weakened support for the fight against terrorism. Restoring habeas corpus rights would help repair the damage and demonstrate U.S. commitment to a counterterrorism policy that is tough but that also respects individual rights. Congress should restore the habeas corpus rights that were eliminated by the Military Commissions Act, and President Bush should sign that bill into law.

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 27, 2007]

RULE OF LAW CRIPPLED

(By Bruce Fein)

The Great Writ of habeas corpus is to the rule of law what oxygen is to life.

The U.S. Court of Appeals imprudently crippled the writ last week in Lakhdar Boumediene v. Bush (Feb. 20). A divided three-judge panel declared suspected alien enemy combatants held indefinitely at Guantanamo Bay may not question their detentions in federal courts though petitions for writs of habeas corpus under the Military Commissions Act of 2006 (MCA). Writing for a 2–1 majority, Judge Raymond Randolph mistakenly endorsed a cramped interpretation of habeas corpus as though he were addressing a tax exemption in the Internal Revenue Code.

Absolute power corrupts absolutely. Accordingly, the Great Writ prevents the president from disappearing political opponents or the unpopular into dungeons based on his say-so alone, a frightening power that has earmarked despots from time immemorial. The writ enables detainees to require the president to establish the factual and legal foundations for their detentions before an independent judiciary.

The goal is justice, the end of civil society as James Madison explained in the Federalist Papers. The president may be inclined to detain bogus enemy combatants in the war against global terrorism to inflate public fear and to justify executive aggrandizements, for example, spying without judicial or legislative oversight in contravention of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978. A former commandant and deputy commandant at Guantanamo Bay have averred that most of its detainees do not belong there.

The Great Writ does not threaten to release a single genuine enemy combatant. The burden to defeat the Great Writ is modest: plausible evidence (far short of proof beyond a reasonable doubt) that the detainee was implicated in active hostilities against the United States. In Rasul v. Bush (2004), the Supreme Court held the federal habeas corpus statute extended to aliens at Guantanamo. Two years later, Congress overruled Rasul in the MCA by suspending the Great Writ for alien enemy combatants detained anywhere. Its proponents were unable to cite a single habeas case either before or after Rasul that precipitated the release of an authentic terrorist. Such a case might be hypothesized with a fevered enough imagination. But the law would become ''a ass, a idiot,'' in the words of Charles Dickens' Mr. Bumble, if required to answer jumbo speculations that never happen in the real world.

Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the Constitution (Suspension Clause) declares ''The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.'' Judge Randolph tacitly acknowledged in Boumediene that neither habeas exception justified the MCA, i.e., global terrorists have not invaded America. He insisted, however, that the Great Writ has no application to aliens detained outside the sovereignty of the United States; and, that Guantanamo Bay is under the sovereignty of Cuba, albeit subject to a perpetual United States lease.

The latter observation is risible. Fidel Castro has no more access or control over Guantanamo than he does over Washington, D.C., or Des Moines. If Mr. Castro formally abandoned sovereignty over Guantanamo tomorrow, nothing would change. Judge Randolph maintained that a declaration by the political branches in the MCA that Guantanamo is not part of the United States is conclusive on the courts. But the dimensions of the Great Writ which defines what we are as a people should not be so easily contracted by semantic jugglery.

Judge Randolph observed that historically the Great Writ in Great Britain was withheld from remote islands, garrisons and dominions. Compliance with a writ from overseas would have been impractical because of time limitations for producing the detainee. But as Chief Justice John Marshall taught in McCulloch v. Maryland (1819), the Constitution was designed to endure for the ages and

to be construed accordingly to achieve its purposes. Congress is empowered to create an Air Force, although the Constitution speaks only of armies and navies. The Fourth Amendment protects against indiscriminate government interceptions of e-mails and conversations, although its language speaks only of persons, houses, papers and effects. Similarly, the Great Writ should apply to suspected alien enemy combatants detained abroad unless compliance would be impractical or unworkable.

No civilized Constitution risks injustice for the sake of injustice, aside from the folly of creating poster children to boost al Qaeda's recruitments. The Supreme Court should grant review of Boumediene and reverse the appeals court.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 23, 2007]

A CONGRESSIONAL DUTY

ON THE FIRST day of the new Congress, two leading senators announced they would join in an attempt to reverse the hasty and ill-considered decision of the previous Congress to deprive foreign prisoners at Guantanamo Bay of the ancient right of habeas corpus, which allows the appeal of imprisonment to a judge. One of the senators, Arlen Specter (R–Pa.), predicted that the courts would rule that the provision of the Military Commissions Act eliminating habeas corpus was unconstitutional; he nevertheless joined the incoming chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Patrick J. Leahy (D–Vt.), in sponsoring a bill restoring the appeal right.

Now Mr. Specter's prediction is looking less sure: The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit ruled this week that Congress's act was constitutional, and it threw the cases of dozens of Guantanamo detainees out of federal court. That ruling will almost certainly be reviewed by the Supreme Court on appeal, but Congress should not wait for its decision. It should move quickly on the Habeas Corpus Restoration Act.

The Supreme Court has already twice overruled decisions by the D.C. Circuit denying Guantanamo detainees habeas rights, but it is hard to predict whether it will do so again. The court's composition has changed since those rulings, with the addition of justices more likely to be sympathetic to the arguments of the Bush administration. Congress has reversed part of the basis for the court's previous rulings by enacting a statute saying that persons found to be ''enemy combatants'' by military review panels, including detainees held at Guantanamo, have only a limited right of appeal.

The principal remaining question is whether Congress's action is permitted under Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution, which says, ''The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended'' except in cases of ''Rebellion or Invasion.'' Two judges of the three-member appeals court panel ruled that the provision does not apply at Guantanamo because it is not on U.S. territory and the detainees are foreigners. A dissent written by Judge Judith Rogers pointed out that one of the earlier Supreme Court rulings stated that giving appeal rights to Guantanamo inmates ''is consistent with the historical reach of the writ of habeas corpus.'' But the court has not ruled squarely on the constitutional issue.

Rather than wait for the court's decision, Congress should correct its own mistake. The 51 to 48 vote rejecting Mr. Specter's previous attempt to restore habeas condemned hundreds of foreign prisoners to indefinite detention without trial at Guantanamo; only a few score are expected to be prosecuted by the military commissions. Since 2002 it has become clear that a number of prisoners at the facility were arrested in error, are not terrorists and pose no threat to the United States. Moreover, improvements in the prisoners' treatment have come about largely because of their court appeals. Congress has both a practical and a moral interest in ensuring that this basic human right is restored.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 2007]

AMERICAN LIBERTY AT THE PRECIPICE

In another low moment for American justice, a federal appeals court ruled on Tuesday that detainees held at the prison camp at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, do not have the right to be heard in court. The ruling relied on a shameful law that President Bush stampeded through Congress last fall that gives dangerously short shrift to the Constitution.

The right of prisoners to challenge their confinement—habeas corpus—is enshrined in the Constitution and is central to American liberty. Congress and the Supreme Court should act quickly and forcefully to undo the grievous damage that last fall's law—and this week's ruling—have done to this basic freedom.

The Supreme Court ruled last year on the jerry-built system of military tribunals that the Bush Administration established to try the Guantánamo detainees, finding it illegal. Mr. Bush responded by driving through Congress the Military Commissions Act, which presumed to deny the right of habeas corpus to any noncitizen designated as an ''enemy combatant.'' This frightening law raises insurmountable obstacles for prisoners to challenge their detentions. And it gives the government the power to take away habeas rights from any noncitizen living in the United States who is unfortunate enough to be labeled an enemy combatant.

The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, which rejected the detainees' claims by a vote of 2 to 1, should have permitted the detainees to be heard in court—and it should have ruled that the law is unconstitutional.

As Judge Judith Rogers argued in a strong dissent, the Supreme Court has already rejected the argument that detainees do not have habeas rights because Guantánamo is located outside the United States. Judge Rogers also rightly noted that the Constitution limits the circumstances under which Congress can suspend habeas to ''cases of Rebellion or invasion,'' which is hardly the situation today. Moreover, she said, the act's alternative provisions for review of cases are constitutionally inadequate. The Supreme Court should add this case to its docket right away and reverse it before this term ends.

Congress should not wait for the Supreme Court to act. With the Democrats now in charge, it is in a good position to pass a new law that fixes the dangerous mess it has made. Senators Patrick Leahy, Democrat of Vermont, and Arlen Specter, Republican of Pennsylvania, have introduced a bill that would repeal the provision in the Military Commissions Act that purports to obliterate the habeas corpus rights of detainees.

The Bush administration's assault on civil liberties does not end with habeas corpus. Congress should also move quickly to pass another crucial bill, introduced by Senator Christopher Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, that, among other steps, would once and for all outlaw the use of evidence obtained through torture.

When the Founding Fathers put habeas corpus in Article I of the Constitution, they were underscoring the vital importance to a democracy of allowing prisoners to challenge their confinement in a court of law. Much has changed since Sept. 11, but the bedrock principles of American freedom must remain.

[From the Columbia Tribune, Feb. 22, 2007]

ENEMY COMBATANTS: A FAST TRACK TO JUSTICE

Under the president's shortcut plan for wartime justice, anyone he labels an ''enemy combatant'' loses normal constitutional rights. The government denies hundreds of detainees in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, the right to a hearing in court.

Last year the U.S. Supreme Court declared this denial unconstitutional. In response, the Bush administration pushed through Congress the Military Commissions Act authorizing the use of such commissions instead of courts for hearing these cases.

This week the District of Columbia appeals court upheld the new law, a decision certain to be appealed, sending the issue back to the highest court, where I hope this latest gambit will be denied.

I suppose President George W. Bush and his crew refuse to let these prisoners have habeas corpus hearings in the U.S. court system because they fear the outcome. Why else? And if so, what does that say about their expectations for the military commissions? That these extra-judicial bodies will affirm the government's extralegal detention policies? What else?

This dogged insistence is but one example of Bush's eagerness to ignore essential constitutional guarantees, ranking right up there with his programs of warrantless wiretapping and other surveillance of U.S. citizens.

Bush simply refuses to go to court for oversight of his administration's actions in denial of civil rights. Before he took office, it was simple. When a person is arrested, he has a right to a real court hearing to determine the legitimacy of the arrest and his ultimate guilt or innocence. When citizens' privacy is invaded by government, it is to be done only with court permission.

We see signs that the American public is getting fed up with these constitutional shortcuts. These practices alone are enough to unwarrant this administration. Let us pray the Supreme Court again slaps them down.

[From the Evansville Courier & Press, Feb. 21, 2007]

A MATTER OF RIGHT: FEDERAL COURT UPHOLDS DENIAL OF HABEAS CORPUS TO DETAINEES OUTSIDE THE U.S

Congress should tear itself away from the pointless business of passing nonbinding resolutions on Iraq and begin cleaning up the damage we've done to ourselves in the war on terror.

That task became more urgent this week when the federal court of appeals for the District of Columbia upheld the constitutionality of a provision denying the right of habeas corpus to detainees held outside the United States.

The Military Commissions Act (MCA) was passed last year, hastily and without much thought like so much anti-terrorism legislation, after the Supreme Court told the Bush administration that it had to get congressional permission for its plan to try the detainees before military tribunals.

Part of that law banned the detainees at U.S. prisons in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and Afghanistan from challenging in civilian courts the legality of their detention. That right of habeas corpus is a bedrock principle of Anglo-Saxon law going back eight centuries. It is a fundamental right enshrined in the U.S. Constitution.

Carving out an exception to that right based on a sketchy designation as an ''enemy combatant'' was a terrible precedent, essentially justifying arbitrary imprisonment.

The senior members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Arlen Specter, R–Pa., and

Patrick Leahy, D–Vt., tried to rectify this departure from U.S. respect for the rule of law last year and failed by three votes.

They have reintroduced their bill in the new Congress.

Another bill, by Leahy and Sen. Chris Dodd, D–Conn., would restore the right of habeas corpus and clean up some other unfortunate provisions in the MCA by sharpening the definition of ''illegal combatant,'' excluding evidence obtained by coercion and allowing military judges to exclude hearsay evidence.

If the circuit-court ruling stands, the practical effect would be to force the federal courts to dismiss more than 400 habeas-corpus appeals. The ruling will certainly be appealed to the Supreme Court, and one hopes that the high court would stand up for this ancient and fundamental right.

But it would be better if Congress acted first to demonstrate our faith and confidence in our own system.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise today in support of amendment No. 366, offered by my colleague, Senator SCHUMER. This important amendment would restore the export restrictions on highly enriched, HEU, bomb-grade uranium for use as a reactor fuel or as targets to produce medical isotopes, except on an interim basis to facilities that are actively pursuing conversion to low-enriched uranium LEU.

Let's look at the history behind this amendment. From 1992 until 2005, we had a law that worked. Under that law, we allowed the exportation of HEU for the production of medical isotopes as long as the recipient of that highly enriched uranium cooperated with the United States to get to the point where the production of these medical isotopes could be done with low-enriched uranium. Low-enriched uranium is not of sufficient grade to make bombs. This law provided the incentive to work with the United States to attain conversion to LEU. Most important, it furthered our antiproliferation goal of reducing the circulation of HEU outside the United States. It is important to note that from 1992 until 2005, licenses for the shipments of HEU were never denied and the medical isotopes needed for radiopharmaceuticals were never in short supply.

Then in 2005 this effective, 13-year-old law was gutted through an amendment to the Energy Policy Act and the export restrictions on HEU were eliminated. These restrictions were lifted over the objection of a majority of this body, which voted in favor of retaining existing law, 52 to 46, after a thorough debate. You may ask why an amendment to allow weapons-grade uranium to leave the United States without restriction would resurface in conference and end up enacted into law. I ask that same question. There are no good explanations. One thing is certain, though; we need to fix it.

The major producers of medical isotopes are all foreign companies operating outside the United States. Under the previous law, these companies were moving toward conversion to LEU, and many have developed the capability to produce medical isotopes from LEU. Australia and the Netherlands are two good examples. The other major producer of medical isotopes is in Canada. That Canadian company has resisted conversion to LEU and in 2005 that company had enough HEU-material stockpiled to build at least four bombs. Today, who knows how much it may have stockpiled. One thing we do know is, if this material is lost or stolen, the United States would be faced with a serious nuclear threat. We must rectify this mistake. I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I make a point of order, en bloc, that the pending amendments are not germane under the provisions of rule XXII, with the exception of the following: Reid No. 275, Landrieu No. 321, Schumer No. 336, Coburn No. 325, Coburn No. 294, Kyl No. 357, Biden No. 383, Schumer No. 367, Stevens No. 299, Schumer No. 337, Bond No. 389.

Mr. President, I make that point of order on behalf of Senator LIEBERMAN. I believe it has been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken and the amendments fall.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it has been a productive week for the Senate. We have moved closer to completing the long overdue work of the 9/11 Commission—work that will make our country more safe, more secure.

It has been over 2½ years since the 9/11 Commission gave Congress a roadmap to follow to secure our country. This bipartisan Commission met for over a year, had hearings all over the country, did excellent work. It is important we do not delay their recommendations any longer. The safety and security of our country is too important.

Before we adjourn today, I wish to say a few words in praise of my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana, MARY LANDRIEU. In the face of many objections from the minority, Senator LANDRIEU has been tireless in working to eliminate rules that are nothing more than miles of redtape and mountains of paperwork that are delaying the rebuilding and recovery of the gulf coast, which was devastated by a natural disaster we now know as Katrina.

Her amendment No. 295 is very simple. It would waive the requirement that local communities put up a 10-percent match for every Federal dollar we spend to rebuild public facilities such as schools and fire stations destroyed by Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. These were all devastating hurricanes.

The President has the authority to do this with a single stroke of the pen. In fact, I joined with Senators LANDRIEU and LIEBERMAN urging him a month ago to do just that, to use his office to lift these significant burdens to recovery. To this day, he simply has not done that. He waived these rules for New York after 9/11. The first President Bush waived these rules after Hurricane Andrew, which was devastating but does not compare to what Katrina did. In fact, these rules have been waived every time disaster recovery costs have grown to even a fraction of those we are now seeing. But not with Katrina and its pals, Rita and Wilma.

So that brings us to why we are here today. What the President would not do we must do legislatively. I would say to all those who are from the administration who are listening to us talk today, when the President gets back from Latin America, let's have him do this. It would save our having to do it in the supplemental. He could call down here. Even maybe he could get some of the people to back off on the other side so we could do it before this bill passes. The President does not need legislation. He has the authority to do that right now. I would hope he would do that. The Senator from Louisiana has been patient and very aggressive. That is what is necessary. I would hope her patience would be rewarded with the President signing his name waiving this 10 percent. It is something that needs to be done. If not, I have committed to her and the people of Louisiana, through her Governor and others who have come to see me, that we are going to do what is right.

This is important. It has happened for every other major disaster, and it should happen for this one. If we cannot do it on this bill, and the President will not do it, then we will have to do it on the supplemental that will be here in a little over 2 weeks. The House has already said they intend to do this. We also intend to do this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the majority leader for those words and for him restating publicly and unequivocally his commitment to getting this job done, not just for the people of Louisiana but for the people of the gulf coast. We have spent a lot of time on the floor, as the majority leader knows, talking about rebuilding other places in the world. The leader is correct, and the Democratic caucus is

leading to try to redirect some of that attention to right here at home.

We have over 30 million people who live on the gulf coast right now, today, this Friday. The work of rebuilding is being thwarted, is being hampered, is being delayed by outmoded, unrealistic Federal regulations and bureaucratic redtape that is choking this recovery.

Now, normally this redtape is a nuisance. We work through it. It is inconvenient. It is a nuisance. But we just sort of move through the redtape of Government. But in this case, it is literally a noose that is around the necks of people, of business owners, large and small, family members—strangling their efforts to recover their communities that were devastated.

Just to put some pieces in the picture I am trying to paint, I would like to just share some details about Cameron Parish. You do not hear much about Cameron Parish because there are only 9,658 people who live there. We hear a lot about New Orleans. We hear a lot about Jefferson Parish. We hear a lot about even St. Bernard Parish. But little Cameron Parish, down on the southwest border, that was directly hit by Rita, the ''forgotten storm.'' We have not. The legislative delegation from Louisiana has not forgotten it, but many others fail to remember it.

Cameron Parish lost five fire stations, four community recreation centers, four public libraries, three maintenance barns, two parish multipurpose buildings, Courthouse Circle; Cameron Parish Police Jury Annex Building—destroyed; Cameron Parish Sheriff's Department Investigative Office—destroyed. The health unit was destroyed. The school board office was destroyed. The mosquito control barn was destroyed. And the waterworks district No. 10 office was destroyed. Virtually every public building was destroyed, except the courthouse, which was built in the early part of the century. It is several stories high, and it sort of shines white on the coast. If you flew over it, you could actually see it. It is quite large, and many people's lives have actually been saved by going to the courthouse during storms, where they have been kept from the high water. But everything else in the parish is gone. This little parish can no more put up a 10-percent match to rebuild four libraries, all their schools, than the man in the moon.

Now, normally, if the hurricane was not so bad, the State of Louisiana, which is a big State—not huge, but we are not small, we are medium-sized—would be strong enough to step up, give Cameron Parish the 10 percent of each of these very important public works for the 10,000 people or so who live there. But the problem is, Katrina and Rita were so devastating to the whole State that our State is not strong enough.

That is why we have a Federal Government. When the State is not strong enough, because of the storms, the Nation steps up. I am asking the President of the United States to step up and use his authority to waive this 10-percent match so the people of Cameron and the people right next door to them on the Texas line who were equally hard hit and the people to the right of them on the map—the good people of Mississippi—there are towns in Mississippi that lost every school, every library. The State of Mississippi will have a difficult time as well. But the State of Louisiana is having an unusually difficult time because of the devastation.

I want to say again—because I think numbers can paint a picture or tell a story better than even words can—the per capita damage to Florida from Hurricane Andrew was $139. The per capita damage to the State of New York was $390 from the attacks on the World Trade Center. These two events were unprecedented and unheard of. Most storms are like $20 per capita, $50 per capita. They hardly ever go over $50 per capita.

When Hurricane Andrew came through, it really woke us up to the poor people of Florida. It wrecked Homestead, FL, and was a great weight for the State of Florida. But we all pitched in and helped, and this match was waived.

When 9/11 hit, it shook the foundations of this Nation. It also shook the great city of New York. But it was waived, and we all pitched in and helped.

Here we have Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and we sit here wondering: Where is the Government? Where is the President? Where is the minority's thinking on this subject? Our per capita damage is $6,700. It defies anything we have ever seen.

Our State has been asking for this 10 percent reduction for 18 months. Do we have to keep asking for it? Do we have to keep supplying data like this? What is it going to take to get them to understand if there was ever a situation where the 10 percent should be waived, if there was ever an example like Cameron Parish, this is it.

So this amendment is pending. It is being opposed by an undisclosed person. But the minority is opposing it. I will meet the minority more than halfway. I am asking the administration, please, over the weekend, to reconsider. Let us get this done on this bill. Every day, every week counts. If we cannot, the majority leader has said—and I, of course, will support the effort, and many of the members of this caucus are supporting it—we will do it on the supplemental. The problem is, it will take us weeks. Perhaps the supplemental will run into a veto threat. Who knows? Because there are lots of issues that are going to come up on that supplemental. But this issue is clear. It could be easily fixed on this bill. I am going to work through the weekend to see if we can find any kind of compromise that could give a green light to the people of Cameron Parish. Let me say that even without that light, we visited Cameron Parish several times. Their little girls' softball team that was in contention when the storm hit went on to win the championship. Without a cafeteria, without a school, without a gym to practice, with most of their teachers' homes underwater and their own homes underwater, and most of them living in trailers or in tents, this team went on to win the championship. So when people say that people in Louisiana don't have resilience, we are being as resilient as we possibly can be under these circumstances. All we are asking is to please look at the data, please consider our case and allow us to get this 10 percent waiver so that the public works can move forward on fire stations, police stations, libraries, and infrastructure, most certainly essential to communities rebuilding. As we rebuild, we are rebuilding on higher ground. We are rebuilding with better building materials. We are mitigating against future storms. We are not building in the old-fashioned ways. But if this 10 percent doesn't get waived, we are not going to be building new or old or otherwise. We won't be building.

As I said, we may not be a fancy coast, but we are America's energy coast. We are proud of the fish that we bring in right off of Cameron Parish. We are proud of the shipping industry. We are proud of the ship channel that brings liquefied natural gas to keep the lights on in this Chamber and sends gas to New York and Philadelphia and California every day.

This is Cameron Parish. They are not sunbathing down in Cameron Parish. Yet we can't find it out of the goodwill of our hearts—we are spending all of this money to rebuild Iraq, and I have 10,000 people down on the coast. Does anybody remember they are Americans, taxpaying Americans with no libraries, no schools, and no possible way to put up their 10 percent match because they lost everything? I would think that somewhere in this trillion-dollar budget and maybe in the heart of the minority they could find some room for the people of Cameron Parish. Please consider our request over this weekend to get this 10 percent waived.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LINCOLN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EPIDEMIC OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, the epidemic of gun violence is endangering many in our communities both large and small. Illegal guns are being used at an increasing rate to harm our children, our neighbors, and our police officers. We must not allow this spiral to continue.

One example of a community heavily affected by gun violence is in Pennsylvania, where in 2004 the State led the Nation in homicide rates among African-American victims. Handguns were used in 81 percent of the State's murders. In Pennsylvania's largest city, Philadelphia, more than 2,000 people were injured by firearms last year alone. According to the Philadelphia police department, this represents an increase of 31 percent in just 3 years. Philadelphia saw 406 people murdered in 2006, up from 380 in 2005.

Just a short trip south of Pennsylvania lies another example of the how guns are affecting our communities. According to the nonprofit organization Ceasefire Maryland, a crime is committed with an assault rifle every 48 hours in the State of Maryland. The Maryland State Legislature is attempting to address this horrifying statistic by considering a bill backed by Governor Martin O'Malley that would ban 45 different assault weapons statewide. This action could serve as an excellent example of a legislature taking a commonsense approach to reducing gun violence. Congress and President Bush have allowed the Federal assault weapons ban to expire.

Month after month, we watch these tragedies unfold on the news and yet Congress has not taken the necessary steps to help control these acts of violence or ease the anxiety that many parents and families feel each day as their loved ones go to school, church, or work. According to the Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence, gun crime rose 49.4 percent nationally between 2004 and 2005. Almost 5.9 million people were victims of gun violence between 1996 and 2005.

The American people have a right to demand that their schools, places of worship, and other public places be better protected from gun violence. Much more can be done to break the cycle of gun violence that plagues our communities. I urge my colleagues to take up and pass commonsense legislation that will help address this problem.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:30 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 700. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 700. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to revise United States policy on Iraq.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 987. An act to endorse further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and to facilitate the timely admission of new members to NATO, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–905. A communication from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Membership in a Registered Futures Association'' (RIN3038–AC29) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–906. A communication from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conflicts of Interest in Self-Regulation and Self-Regulatory Organizations'' (RIN3038–AC28) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–907. A communication from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Advertising by Commodity Pool Operators, Commodity Trading Advisors, and the Principals Thereof'' (RIN3038–AC35) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–908. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Entry of Certain Cement Products from Mexico Requiring a Commerce Department Import License'' (RIN1505–AB68) received on March 6, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–909. A communication from the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation entitled ''National Park Centennial Challenge Fund Act''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–910. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation entitled ''Nuclear Fuel Management and Disposal Act''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–911. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri'' (FRL No. 8284–8) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–912. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Iowa; Interstate Transport of Pollution'' (FRL No. 8285–1) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–913. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kansas; Interstate Transport of Pollution'' (FRL No. 8286–3) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–914. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri'' (FRL No. 8286–1) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–915. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Polymer of 2-Ethyl-2-(Hydroxymethyl)-1 ,3-Propanediol, Oxirane, Methyloxirane, 1,2-Epoxyalkanes; Tolerance Exemption'' (FRL No. 8116–9) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–916. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prothioconazole; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL No. 8113–6) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–917. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''State-Administered Programs'' (RIN1890–AA13) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–918. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Final Rule Relating to Time and Order of Issuance of Domestic Relations Orders'' (RIN1210–AB15) received on March 7, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIDEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 377. A bill to establish a United States-Poland parliamentary youth exchange program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–33).

S. 494. A bill to endorse further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and to facilitate the timely admission of new members to NATO, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–34).

S. 676. A bill to provide that the Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank or the Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank may serve on the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation (Rept. No. 110–35).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 832. A bill to provide for the sale of approximately 25 acres of public land to the Turnabout Ranch, Escalante, Utah, at fair market value; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 833. A bill to make the United States competitive in a global economy; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 834. A bill to require annual testimony before Congress by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, relating to efforts to promote transparency in financial reporting; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 835. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, as the ''Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. VOINOVICH):

S. 836. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for sewer overflow control grants; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 837. A bill to develop a generation of school leaders who are committed to, and effective in, increasing student achievement and to ensure that all low-income, under-performing schools are led by effective school leaders who are well-prepared to foster student success; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. Res. 102. A resolution supporting the goals of ''International Women's Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. CLINTON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. COLEMAN):

S. Res. 103. A resolution commending the Kingdom of Lesotho, on the occasion of International Women's Day, for the enactment of a law to improve the status of married women and ensure the access of married women to property rights; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. Res. 104. A resolution commending the national explosives detection canine team program for 35 years of service to the safety and security of the transportation systems within the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. Con. Res. 17. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Capitol grounds for Live Earth Concert; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. Con. Res. 18. A concurrent resolution honoring the life of Ernest Gallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 169

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to clarify Federal authority relating to land acquisition from willing sellers for the majority of the trails in the System, and for other purposes.

S. 430

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 430, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 573

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases in women.

S. 626

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 626, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for arthritis research and public health, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to amend section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the payment of the death gratuity with respect to members of the Armed Forces without a surviving spouse who are survived by a minor child.

S. 725

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 725, a bill to amend the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 to reauthorize and improve that Act.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 727, a bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving professional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education.

S. 793

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 793, a bill to provide for the expansion and improvement of traumatic brain injury programs.

S. 831

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 831, a bill to authorize States and local governments to prohibit the investment of State assets in any company that has a qualifying business relationship with Sudan.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously.

S. RES. 82

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 82, a resolution designating August 16, 2007 as ''National Airborne Day''.

AMENDMENT NO. 312

At the request of Mr. VITTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 312 proposed to S. 4, a bill to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 393

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 393 intended to be proposed to S. 4, a bill to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 430

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 430 intended to be proposed to S. 4, a bill to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 431

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 431 intended to be proposed to S. 4, a bill to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 435

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 435 intended to be proposed to S. 4, a bill to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 440

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 440 intended to be proposed to S. 4, a bill to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 832. A bill to provide for the sale of approximately 25 acres of public land to the Turnabout Ranch, Escalante, Utah, at fair market value; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation that would correct a property trespass question involving a 25-acre parcel of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land in Garfield County, UT. The parcel is part of the Turnabout Ranch, which hosts a successful and popular program to rehabilitate troubled youth.

The trespass conflict is the result of an erroneous survey in January 1999, at the time the Congress approved a major land exchange, P.L. 105–335, between the State of Utah and the BLM and erroneously included a part of the Turnabout Ranch. The land is located along the border of the Grand Staircase Escalante (GSE) Monument. My bill makes a slight boundary change to resolve the trespass question. This would grant the owners of the ranch the opportunity to purchase the erroneously surveyed land at fair market value so that this very important program for at-risk youth can continue unhindered.

Since 1995, Turn-About Ranch has graduated some 500 troubled and at-risk teenagers through an intense program of training and rehabilitation. The ranch employs about 35 Garfield County residents. The Turn-About Ranch program has strong support from the local community and the Garfield Country Commission.

Historically used for agriculture and grazing purposes, the ranch was purchased by the Townsend Family who leased the land to Turn-About Ranch, Inc., for the exclusive purpose of restoring dignity and self-esteem to wayward teenagers. Because government-owned land administered by the BLM surrounds the private land, the only way to resolve the trespass is for the Congress to pass legislation.

This legislation offers a simple and fair solution to a fairly technical problem on our public lands. I hope Congress can use this legislation to resolve this problem in the very near future.

By Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 833. A bill to make the United States competitive in a global economy; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Competitiveness Through Education, Technology, and Enterprise Act otherwise known as the COMPETE Act. The bill I introduce today is similar to legislation I have introduced in the 109th Congress. I am very pleased to be joined by my very good friend and colleague, Senator MARK PRYOR, who shares my commitment to keeping the U. S. competitive not just for today but for tomorrow as well.

Earlier this week Microsoft's Bill Gates came before the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee to talk about keeping our country competitive. He said that ''the U.S. cannot maintain its economic leadership unless our workforce consists of people who have the knowledge and skills needed to drive innovation.'' Moreover he said that ''we simply cannot sustain an economy based on innovation unless our citizens are educated in math, science and engineering.''

My bill is inspired by the same line of thinking. The COMPETE Act is based on three simple, fundamental ideas: 1. The U.S. needs to remain a leader when it comes to technology and innovation; 2. We must prepare our future workforce and ''up-skill'' our current workforce for our increasingly global and information technology driven economy; and 3. We must better utilize existing private-public partnerships to achieve these goals.

The challenges we face are stark especially when it comes to the future competitiveness of our workforce. Today, China graduates four times as many engineers as the U.S. while the small nation of South Korea graduates just as many as we do. In three short years, Asia will be home to more than 90 percent of the world's scientists and engineers.

According to a recent poll, 84 percent of middle school students preferred to eat their vegetables than do their math homework. As Tom Friedman wrote in his book the World is Flat when he was growing up as a kid his mother used to tell him to eat all his vegetables because kids in China were starving. Today, his mother would say do your homework because the kids in China are starving for our jobs.

As if this were not enough, we also need to concern ourselves with the coming retirement wave of high-skilled workers in the fields of engineering, science, technology and math. According to the National Science Foundation, about a third of American scientists and engineers are over 50 years old.

To encourage and promote our students to seek out these types of careers we need to improve the performance of students in science and math. Several reports have indicated that U.S. students do not perform at the level of their international counterparts in math and science. Our fourth graders compare fairly well internationally, but by high school American students slip to 24th place out of 29 developing nations in math literacy and problem solving.

We must make sure that our educational system is up to the task in preparing our future workforce. To reward elementary and secondary schools for a job well done, COMPETE provides bonus grants to high performing elementary and secondary schools that show the greatest improvement in their State assessments in math and science. COMPETE also increases the alternative percentage limitation for corporate charitable contributions to the mathematics and science partnership program in order to encourage greater support from the corporate world.

To help ensure that more students receive a higher education and have the skills necessary to compete in today's global economy COMPETE puts the Senate on record in support of raising the maximum Pell Grant to $5,400.

In addition to undergraduate education, COMPETE also establishes a matching grant program where Federal and private resources will be used to help graduate students in science, technology, engineering and mathematics meet the cost of getting a graduate degree. This grant program will also support outreach and mentoring activities to increase the participation of underrepresented groups in these fields at every level of education.

To keep today's workforce competitive and prepare our future workforce, COMPETE creates a tax credit to help ''up-skill'' America's workers so that

they can compete in today's increasingly information and technology-driven global economy. COMPETE also creates a workforce development grant pilot program to encourage leading innovative small businesses to provide short-term workforce training opportunities for college students who major in the fields of science, technology, engineering and math. Our employers need more than just raw materials. They need a highly skilled workforce that provides extra value to their products and services.

Finally in order to ensure our leadership in innovation, COMPETE makes the research and development credit permanent. We must look at ways to ensure the ability of American companies to stay at the forefront of the technological revolution. Temporarily extending the R&D tax credit makes it difficult for our businesses to undertake research and development activities necessary for our continued long-term competitiveness in the global economy.

Earlier this week, bipartisan comprehensive competitiveness legislation known as the America Competes Act was introduced. I am a proud original cosponsor of this bill which seeks to respond to the recommendations made by the National Academies' ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm'' report and the Council on Competitiveness'' ''Innovate America'' report.

In an effort to contribute to this important discussion I am introducing COMPETE, which complements the America Competes Act through its emphasis on innovation and workforce development and public-private education partnership in the areas of science, technology, engineering and math.

We must realize the fact that our competitiveness relative to the global economy is in real danger. This situation is smoldering—it's not a five-alarm fire yet—I just hope we don't act too late. If you throw a frog into boiling water, it jumps out. If you throw a frog into warm water, it will sit there comfortably until its internal organs overheat and it dies. Let's not let ourselves wake up in a few years to see that our global competitiveness has slipped away.

I am committed to working on this issue now. While the challenges to our leadership in the global economy are indeed significant, I am confident and optimistic that we will successfully address challenges to our leadership in the global economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 833

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act may be cited as the ''Competitiveness through Education, Technology, and Enterprise Act of 2007'' or the ''COMPETE Act of 2007''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title.

TITLE I—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES

Sec. 101. Permanent extension of research credit.

TITLE II—WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES

Sec. 201. Credit for information and communications technology education and training program expenses.
Sec. 202. Eligible educational institution.
Sec. 203. SBIR–STEM Workforce Development Grant Pilot Program.

TITLE III—PUBLIC PARTNERSHIP PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Alternative percentage limitation for corporate charitable contributions to the mathematics and science partnership program.

TITLE IV—EDUCATION PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Federal Pell Grants.
Sec. 402. Matching funds program to promote American competitiveness through graduate education.
Sec. 403. Mathematics and science partnership bonus grants.

TITLE I—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES

SEC. 101. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF RESEARCH CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsection (h).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 45C(b) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES

SEC. 201. CREDIT FOR INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 30D. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM EXPENSES.

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to 50 percent of information and communications technology education and training program expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer for the benefit of—

''(A) in the case of a taxpayer engaged in a trade or business, an employee of the taxpayer, or

''(B) in the case of a taxpayer who is an individual not so engaged, such individual.

''(2) COORDINATION OF CREDITS.—Credit shall be allowable to the employer with respect to an employee only to the extent that the employee assigns some or all of the limitation applicable to such employee under subsection (b) to such employer.

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of expenses with respect to any individual which may be taken into account under subsection (a) for the taxable year shall not exceed $4,000.

''(2) INCREASE IN CREDIT AMOUNT FOR PARTICIPATION IN CERTAIN PROGRAMS AND FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—Paragraph (1) shall be applied by substituting '$5,000' for '$4,000' in the case of expenses—

''(A) with respect to a program operated—

''(i) by an employer who has 200 or fewer employees for each business day in each of 20 or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year,

''(ii) in an empowerment zone or enterprise community designated under part I of subchapter U or a renewal community designated under part I of subchapter X,

''(iii) in a school district in which at least 50 percent of the students attending schools in such district are eligible for free or reduced-cost lunches under the school lunch program established under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act,

''(iv) in an area designated as a disaster area by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 321 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act or by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act in the taxable year or the 4 preceding taxable years,

''(v) in a rural enterprise community designated under section 766 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681–37),

''(vi) in an area designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as a Rural Economic Area Partnership Zone, or

''(vii) in an area over which an Indian tribal government (as defined in section 7701(a)(40)) has jurisdiction, or

''(B) in the case of an individual with a disability.

''(c) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM EXPENSES.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'information technology education and training program expenses' means expenses paid or incurred by reason of the participation of the taxpayer (or any employee of the taxpayer) in any information and communications technology education and training program. Such expenses shall include expenses paid in connection with—

''(A) course work,

''(B) certification testing,

''(C) programs carried out under the Act of August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.) which are registered by the Department of Labor, and

''(D) other expenses that are essential to assessing skill acquisition.

''(2) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term 'information technology education and training program' means a training program in information and communications technology workplace disciplines or other skill sets which is provided in the United States by an accredited college, university, private career school, postsecondary educational institution, a commercial information technology provider, or an employer-owned information technology training organization.

''(3) COMMERCIAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING PROVIDER.—The term 'commercial information technology training provider' means a private sector organization providing an information and communications technology education and training program.

''(4) EMPLOYER-OWNED INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING ORGANIZATION.—The term 'employer-owned information technology training organization' means a private sector organization that provides information technology training to its employees using internal training development and delivery personnel. The training programs must use industry-recognized training disciplines and evaluation methods, comparable to institutional and commercial training providers.

''(d) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—

''(1) DISALLOWANCE OF OTHER CREDITS AND DEDUCTIONS.—No deduction or credit shall be allowed under any other provision of this chapter for expenses taken into account in determining the credit under this section.

''(2) REDUCTION FOR HOPE AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDITS.—The amount taken into account under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the information technology education and training program expenses taken into account in determining the credits under section 25A.

''(e) CERTAIN RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—For purposes of this section, rules similar to the rules of section 45A(e)(2) and subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 52 shall apply.

''(f) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess (if any) of—

''(1) the regular tax for the taxable year reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under the subpart A and the previous sections of this subpart, over

''(2) the tentative minimum tax for the taxable year.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 30D. Information and communications technology education and training program expenses.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 202. ELIGIBLE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 25A(f)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to eligible educational institution) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) ELIGIBLE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'eligible educational institution' means—

''(A) an institution—

''(i) which is described in section 101(b) or 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and

''(ii) which is eligible to participate in a program under title IV of such Act, or

''(B) a commercial information and communications technology training provider (as defined in section 30D(c)(3)).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The second sentence of section 221(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''section 25A(f)(2)'' and inserting ''section 25A(f)(2)(A)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 203. SBIR–STEM WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT GRANT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

(2) the term ''eligible entity'' means a grantee under the SBIR Program that provides an internship program for STEM college students;

(3) the terms ''Phase I'' and ''Phase II'' mean Phase I and Phase II grants under the SBIR Program, respectively;

(4) the term ''pilot program'' means the SBIR–STEM Workforce Development Grant Pilot Program established under subsection (b);

(5) the term ''SBIR Program'' has the meaning given that term in section 9(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)); and

(6) the term ''STEM college student'' means a college student in the field of science, technology, engineering, or math.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—From amounts made available to carry out this section, the Administrator shall establish an SBIR–STEM Workforce Development Grant Pilot Program to encourage the business community to provide workforce development opportunities to STEM college students, by providing an SBIR bonus grant to eligible entities.

(c) AWARDS.—A bonus grant to an eligible entity under the pilot program shall be in an amount equal to 10 percent of either a Phase I or Phase II grant, as applicable, with a total award maximum of not more than $10,000 per year.

(d) EVALUATION.—Following the fifth year of funding under this section, the Administrator shall submit a report to Congress on the results of the pilot program.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(1) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

(2) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

(3) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2009;

(4) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2010; and

(5) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.

TITLE III—PUBLIC PARTNERSHIP PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. ALTERNATIVE PERCENTAGE LIMITATION FOR CORPORATE CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 170(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (related to percentage limitations) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a corporation which makes an eligible mathematics and science contribution—

''(i) the limitation under paragraph (2) shall apply separately with respect to all such contributions and all other charitable contributions, and

''(ii) paragraph (2) shall be applied with respect to all eligible mathematics and science contributions by substituting '15 percent' for '10 percent'.

''(B) ELIGIBLE MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE CONTRIBUTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'eligible mathematics and science contribution' means a charitable contribution (other than a contribution of used equipment) to a qualified partnership for the purpose of an activity described in section 2202(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

''(ii) QUALIFIED PARTNERSHIP.—The term 'qualified partnership' means an eligible partnership (within the meaning of section 2201(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), but only to the extent that such partnership does not include a person other than a person described in paragraph (1)(A).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to contributions made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—EDUCATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the maximum Federal Pell Grant should be increased to—

(1) $4,600 for academic year 2008–2009;

(2) $4,800 for academic year 2009–2010;

(3) $5,000 for academic year 2010–2011;

(4) $5,200 for academic year 2011–2012; and

(5) $5,400 for academic year 2012–2013.

SEC. 402. MATCHING FUNDS PROGRAM TO PROMOTE AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS THROUGH GRADUATE EDUCATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to promote American economic competitiveness and job creation by—

(1) assisting graduate students studying the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(2) advancing education in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(3) stimulating greater links between private industry and graduate education; and

(4) enabling the Office of Science of the Department of Energy to establish a matching funds program for eligible institutions of higher education.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''eligible institution of higher education'' means an institution of higher education, as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001), that offers an established program of post-baccalaureate study leading to a graduate degree in the sciences, technology, engineering, or mathematics.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

(c) GRANTS.—

(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary, acting through the Undersecretary for Energy, Science, and Environment, is authorized to award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible institutions of higher education to enable the eligible institutions of higher education to carry out the authorized activities described in subsection (e).

(2) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED.—In order to receive a grant under this subsection, an eligible institution of higher education shall agree to provide matching funds, toward the cost of the authorized activities to be assisted under the grant, in an amount equal to 25 percent of the funds received under the grant.

(3) AWARD CONSIDERATIONS.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(A) the demonstrated commitment of the eligible institution of higher education to providing matching funds (including tuition remission, tuition waivers, and other types of institutional support) toward the cost of the authorized activities to be assisted under the grant;

(B) the demonstrated capacity of the eligible institution of higher education to raise matching funds from private sources;

(C) the demonstrated ability of the eligible institution of higher education to work with private corporations and organizations to promote economic competitiveness and job creation;

(D) the demonstrated ability of the eligible institution of higher education to increase the number of graduates of the eligible institution of higher education's graduate programs in the sciences, technology, engineering, or mathematics with the interdisciplinary background and the technical, professional, and personal skills needed to contribute to American competitiveness and job creation in the future;

(E) the potential for the grant assistance to increase the number of graduates of the eligible institution of higher education's graduate programs in the sciences, technology, engineering, or mathematics; and

(F) the demonstrated track record of the eligible institution of higher education in outreach and mentoring activities that have the expressed purpose of recruiting and retaining women, recognized minorities, and individuals with disabilities in the sciences, technology, engineering, or mathematics.

(4) AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall award each grant under this subsection in an amount that is not more than $1,000,000 for each fiscal year.

(5) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure—

(A) an equitable geographic distribution of the grants; and

(B) an equitable distribution of the grants among public and private eligible institutions of higher education.

(d) APPLICATIONS.—Each eligible institution of higher education desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. Each such application shall describe—

(1) the authorized activities under subsection (e) for which assistance is sought;

(2) the source and amount of the matching funds to be provided; and

(3) the amount of funds raised by the eligible institution of higher education from private sources that will be allocated and spent to carry out the authorized activities described in subsection (e).

(e) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES; AGREEMENT.—Each eligible institution of higher education desiring a grant under this section shall enter into a written agreement with the Secretary under which the eligible institution of higher education agrees to use all of the grant funds—

(1) to provide stipends or other financial assistance (such as tuition assistance and related expenses) for students who are enrolled in graduate programs in the sciences, technology, engineering, or mathematics at the eligible institution of higher education, as described in the application submitted under subsection (d); and

(2) to support outreach and mentoring activities to increase the participation of underrepresented groups in the sciences, technology, engineering, or mathematics at all levels or any level of education, including elementary, secondary, and post-secondary education, as described in the application submitted under subsection (d).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(1) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

(2) $60,000,000 for fiscal year 2009;

(3) $70,000,000 for fiscal year 2010;

(4) $80,000,000 for fiscal year 2011; and

(5) $90,000,000 for fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 403. MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP BONUS GRANTS.

Part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6661 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 2204. MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP BONUS GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—From amounts appropriated under subsection (d), the Secretary shall award a grant—

''(1) for each of the school years 2007–2008 through 2016–2017, to each of the 5 elementary schools and each of the 5 secondary schools in each State, whose students demonstrate the most improvement in mathematics, as measured by the improvement in the students' average score on the State's assessments in mathematics for the school year for which the grant is awarded, as compared to the school year preceding the school year for which the grant is awarded; and

''(2) for each of the school years 2011–2012 through 2016–2017, to each of the 5 elementary schools and each of the 5 secondary schools in each State, whose students demonstrate the most improvement in science, as measured by the improvement in the students' average score on the State's assessments in science for the school year for which the grant is awarded, as compared to the school year preceding the school year for which the grant is awarded.

''(b) GRANT AMOUNT.—The amount of each grant awarded under this section shall be $500,000.

''(c) APPLICABILITY.—Sections 2201, 2202, and 2203 shall not apply to this section.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $130,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011, and $260,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2012 through 2017.''.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 834. A bill to require annual testimony before Congress by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, relating to efforts to promote transparency in financial reporting; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that would take a small but significant step toward identifying and repairing some of the regulatory problems currently found in our country's financial markets.

In 2002, our financial markets were in serious trouble. In the wake of Enron and other prominent accounting scandals, the public's confidence in the markets was low. Investors expressed their lack of confidence by taking their money out of the stock market, and the market indices plummeted. In response to this crisis—and that is exactly what it was, a crisis—Congress passed the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.

The law did what it was designed to do—re-establish faith in our financial markets—but it came at a cost. Complying with several of the bill's provisions has increased significantly the costs of doing business as a public corporation. Many large corporations continue to spend millions of dollars every year in order to comply with the Sarbanes-Oxley law. This, they can afford. However, many smaller firms have found the costs of compliance with the Act to be crushing, burdensome, and negatively affecting their ability to compete in a global marketplace.

The result of this problem is twofold. First, a good number of smaller, publicly traded firms have been taken private by investors, with others expected to meet this same fate. Second, we have seen fewer companies going public, at least in the United States. During the year 2000, 50 percent of all new Initial Public Offerings, IPOs, were done in the United States. By 2006 that number had fallen below 10 percent. In 2006, Hong Kong supplanted New York as the number one market for stock offerings world-wide.

A number of my colleagues have pointed out that the dearth of IPOs threatens our standing as the premier financial market in the world. In the short term, we worry about this costing us prestige and jobs, but the real costs are much, much greater. Businesses that want to keep growing eventually need to become publicly-traded corporations in order to raise sufficient capital. With the costs of crossing that threshold greatly higher than they were a few years ago, many companies either delay or forego becoming a publicly traded corporation. Companies that become or remain privately-held firms eventually run into capital constraints of some sort that limit their growth.

The resulting cost to our economy is a financial market where it is more difficult for corporations to raise sufficient capital to expand capacity or increase productivity, ultimately resulting in slower economic growth. Given the truly awesome problems we face in the upcoming years with regard to our unfunded entitlement obligations, we are going to need every bit of economic growth we can muster to satisfy them. Even those who are ambivalent about the benefits of economic growth on the standard of living of all Americans should appreciate its importance in meeting our future obligations.

The bill I am introducing today would help us to identify and, I hope, ultimately address, many of the regulatory problems facing our financial markets. Specifically, it requires the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Chairman of the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Chairman of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board to annually testify to the relevant Senate and House committees on their efforts to reduce complexity in financial reporting and to provide more accurate and clear financial information to investors. I expect that this requirement would result in more awareness of these problems by policymakers in the Legislative and Executive Branches, as well as in the private sector, along with suggested solutions to these challenges.

While this bill would be a relatively small step, I believe it can help us understand exactly what must be done to address what ails our financial markets and help us achieve a consensus on how to fix these problems.

Mr. President, a nearly identical bill was passed by the House of Representatives recently with no opposition. I urge the leadership of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, along with the members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs to support this bill, and join the House in making this important step toward increasing the efficiency of our financial markets.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 834

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Promoting Transparency in Financial Reporting Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Transparent and clear financial reporting is integral to the continued growth and

strength of our capital markets and the confidence of investors.

(2) The increasing detail and volume of accounting, auditing, and reporting guidance pose a major challenge.

(3) The complexity of accounting and auditing standards in the United States has added to the costs and effort involved in financial reporting.

SEC. 3. ANNUAL TESTIMONY ON REDUCING COMPLEXITY IN FINANCIAL REPORTING.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board shall annually provide oral testimony by their respective chairpersons, or a designee thereof, beginning in 2007, and for 5 years thereafter, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives on their efforts to reduce the complexity in financial reporting, so that investors are provided with more accurate and clear financial information. That testimony shall address—

(1) complex and outdated accounting standards;

(2) improving the understandability, consistency, and overall usability of the existing accounting and auditing literature;

(3) developing principles-based accounting standards;

(4) encouraging the use and acceptance of interactive data; and

(5) promoting disclosures in ''plain English''.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 835. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, as the ''Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a bill to rename the Federal building in Memphis as the Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building. My colleague Senator CORKER is a cosponsor. It is the same legislation that was introduced in the House of Representatives by our new Representative STEVE COHEN, and it is cosponsored by the rest of the House delegation, both Republicans and Democrats.

Representative COHEN's bill, H.R. 753, was approved by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on March 1 and awaits further action by the full House.

Judge Horton has a remarkable legacy. He was the first African-American federal district court judge appointed in Tennessee since Reconstruction. He was recommended by former Senator Jim Sasser and appointed by President Carter on May 12, 1980.

I remember those days of transition very well. It was in that same year that I was Governor of Tennessee. I appointed the first African-American supreme court justice in Tennessee, Judge George Brown, who served with distinction.

At that time, there had not been an African-American chancellor, which is one of our lower court's State judges. I appointed Irwin Kilcrease to that position, and he served with a distinguished record and retired only within the last couple of years.

Judge Horton was a real pioneer who came at a time of transition in Memphis, where he lived, and in our State's history. He served as chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Tennessee from January 1, 1987, until December 31, 1993.

Odell Horton was born in Bolivar, TN, just outside of Memphis, on May 13, 1929. He said he grew up in a ''typically rural Southern and typically segregated [environment], with all of the attendant consequences of that''.

At about the same time, growing up maybe 40 miles away was a young man named Alex Haley who would sit on the front porch of his grandparents' home and listen to his great-aunt tell stories of Kunta Kinte, which ultimately became the story of ''Roots.''

Odell Horton's father was a laborer. His mother took in laundry. His first job at the age of 6 was delivering laundry for his mom. He and his three siblings also picked cotton, stacked lumber, and took other odd jobs.

After high school, he enlisted in the Marine Corps. He enrolled in Morehouse College using the GI bill. He served with the Marines during the Korean war. He graduated from the U.S. Navy School of Journalism.

After the Marines, he earned a law degree from Howard University, and after graduating from Howard Law School in 1956, he moved to Memphis and rented a one-room office on Beale Street—the music street of Memphis—and opened his own law practice.

He did that for 5 years. He served as an assistant U.S. attorney after that.

In 1968, he was director of the city's hospitals, making him the only Black division director at city hall at that time.

He served as judge on the Shelby County Criminal Court. He was a commentator on a local television station. He ran for district attorney general in 1974, narrowly losing the primary, at that time considered a very strong showing by an African-American candidate in a county that today has an African-American mayor of Memphis and an African-American mayor of Shelby County.

He was a U.S. Bankruptcy Court judge before being appointed as a U.S. district judge by President Carter.

He was married to his wife Evie for 50 years, with two sons, Odell, Jr., and Christopher. He died on February 22, 2006.

I commend Representative COHEN for his bill to rename the Clifford Davis Federal Building to the Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building. Representative Davis was a Congressman who served in the House of Representatives from 1940 to 1965. He was one of those five Congressmen in the U.S. Capitol when four Puerto Rican nationalists opened fire from the visitors' balcony in the Chamber. He was shot in the leg at the time.

Keeping both names on the Federal building is symbolic of the transition that took place in Memphis and across the South during Odell's lifetime and my lifetime and reminds us that our country is committed to equal opportunity, but it has been and is and will be for a long time a work in progress.

Odell Horton is one of the finest examples of that work in progress. Having his name on a Federal building will remind all of us of that.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, today I am pleased to cosponsor a bill to rename the Memphis Federal Building in order to commemorate a great Tennessean, the Honorable Odell Horton.

Judge Horton, born in Bolivar, TN, on May 13, 1929, was the son of a laborer and a laundress. After high school he performed two tours as a U.S. marine, including service in the Korean war. He was a graduate of Morehouse College, the United States Navy School of Journalism, and Howard University School of Law.

Horton's distinguished legal career began in 1956 in a one room office at 145 Beale Street, where he remained in private practice for 6 years. In 1962 he began service as an assistant U.S. attorney in Memphis. He remained in this position until he was appointed to the Shelby County Criminal Court, where he was later elected without opposition. Judge Horton also served in the capacity as the city of Memphis' director of Hospital and Health Services, where he ordered the desegregation of the Bowld Hospital in 1968. In 1970, Judge Horton left public service to serve as the President of LeMoyne-Owen College, a historically African-American liberal arts college.

In 1976, he began service as a U.S. bankruptcy judge until 1980 when he became the first African-American since Reconstruction to be appointed to a Tennessee Federal judicial appointment. He was a well regarded and respected judge who served as the chief judge for the Western District from 1987 through 1993. On May 16, 1995, Judge Horton took senior status and 2 years later closed his office.

He and his wife Evie were married for over 50 years and had two sons, Odell, Jr. and Christopher. Unfortunately, Judge Horton left us on February 22, 2006. His colleagues remember him as a thorough, patient judge who brought a pleasant demeanor to the bench. Judge Horton was a man who admirably served his country and State. He was a great Tennessean and it is my honor today to cosponsor a bill to memorialize his contribution to our country and the State of Tennessee.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 837. A bill to develop a generation of school leaders who are committed to, and effective in, increasing student achievement and to ensure that all low-income, under-performing schools are led by effective school leaders who are well-prepared to foster student success; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to help

ensure that State and local educational agencies implement an effective certification process for school leaders. My legislation will address the need to effectively train and retain school leaders to prepare our children to compete in the global economy.

The Fordham Foundation conducted a study on the effectiveness of current state licensing procedures and noted that they have ''little relevance to the task at hand [and] discourage the leaders we need from entering our public schools.'' As a result, school leaders, particularly those in under-performing schools, are often unprepared to foster student success. That is why I am sponsoring the Improving the Leadership and Effectiveness of Administrators for Districts (I LEAD) Act.

As the number of openings for school leaders is expected to increase by 20 percent in the next five years, districts will find it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain effective principals. We need to ensure outgoing school leaders are replaced with effective, well-trained school leaders who are prepared to raise student achievement.

The I LEAD Act would allow State and local educational agencies to evaluate the effectiveness of their current school leadership licensure requirements by examining the impact on student achievement, graduation rates, parental involvement, and safety within their schools. It also provides grants to implement a plan to recruit and effectively train school leaders by providing on-the-job experience during the licensure process, financial incentives, ongoing professional development, and mentors during their first two years on the job.

Under this bill, the Department of Education would conduct a study on the effectiveness of these grants on student achievement. Upon successful implementation of new procedures, state education agencies may apply for additional grant money through the Department for assistance in replicating the success of this ''model leadership zone'' throughout the state. Grants would also be used to reform the state certification process.

School leaders have a significant impact on student achievement. An effective and capable school leader can make the difference in providing the tools and instructional support staff needed to foster the type of school environment conducive to student academic success. This legislation would ensure that our principals are given the training and support they need to foster student success.

The I LEAD Act addresses the need to effectively train and retain school leaders to prepare our children to compete in the global economy. I am hopeful that my Senate colleagues from both sides of the aisle will join me today to move this legislation to the floor without delay.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 102—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF ''INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY''

Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 102

Whereas there are more 3,000,000,000 women in the world, representing 49.7 percent of the world's population;

Whereas women continue to play the predominant role in caring for families within the home, as well as increasingly supporting their families economically by working outside the home;

Whereas women worldwide participate in diplomacy and politics, contribute to the growth of economies, and improve the quality of the lives of their families, communities, and countries;

Whereas women leaders have recently made significant strides, including through the 2007 election of Representative Nancy Pelosi as the first female Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the 2006 election of Michelle Bachelet as the first female President of Chile, the 2006 election of Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf as President of Liberia and the first female President in the history of Africa, and the 2005 election of Angela Merkel as the first female Chancellor of Germany and who will also serve in 2007 as the second woman to chair a G-8 summit;

Whereas women now account for 80 percent of the world's 70,000,000 micro-borrowers, 75 percent of the 28,000 United States loans supporting small business in Afghanistan are given to women, and 11 women are chief executive officers of Fortune 500 companies in the United States;

Whereas, in the United States, women are graduating from high school and earning bachelor's degrees and graduate degrees at rates greater than men, with 88 percent of women between the ages of 25 and 29 having obtained high school diplomas and 31 percent of women between the ages of 25 of 29 having earned bachelor's degrees;

Whereas even with the tremendous gains for women during the past 20 years, women still face political and economic obstacles, struggle for basic rights, face discrimination, and are targets of gender-based violence all over the world;

Whereas women remain vastly underrepresented worldwide in national and local legislatures, accounting on average for less than 10 percent of the seats in legislatures in most countries, and in no developing region do women hold more than 8 percent of legislative positions;

Whereas women work two-thirds of the world's working hours and produce half of the world's food, yet earn only 1 percent of the world's income and own less than 1 percent of the world's property;

Whereas, in the United States between 1995 and 2000, female managers earned less than their male counterparts in the 10 industries that employ the vast majority of all female employees;

Whereas, of the 1,300,000,000 people living in poverty around the world, 70 percent are women;

Whereas, according to the United States Agency for International Development, two-thirds of the 876,000,000 illiterate individuals worldwide are women, two-thirds of the 125,000,000 school-aged children who are not attending school worldwide are girls, and girls around the world are less likely to complete school than boys;

Whereas women account for half of all cases of HIV/AIDS worldwide, approximately 42,000,000 cases, and in countries with a high prevalence of HIV, young women are at a higher risk than young men of contracting HIV;

Whereas each year over 500,000 women globally die during childbirth or pregnancy;

Whereas domestic violence causes more deaths and disabilities among women between the ages of 15 and 44 than cancer, malaria, traffic accidents, and war;

Whereas worldwide at least 1 out of every 3 women and girls has been beaten in her lifetime, and usually the abuser is a member of the victim's family or is someone else known to the victim;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, at least 1 out of every 6 women and girls in the United States has been sexually abused in her lifetime;

Whereas, in the Unites States, one-third of the women murdered each year are killed by current or former husbands or boyfriends;

Whereas 130,000,000 girls and young women worldwide have been subjected to female genital mutilation and it is estimated that 10,000 girls are at risk of being subjected to the practice in the United States;

Whereas, according to the Congressional Research Service and the Department of State, illegal trafficking in women and children for forced labor, domestic servitude, or sexual exploitation involves between 600,000 and 900,000 women and children each year, of whom 17,500 are transported into the United States;

Whereas between 75 and 80 percent of the world's 27,000,000 refugees are women and children;

Whereas, in Iraq, women are increasingly becoming the targets of violence by Islamic extremists and street gangs;

Whereas, in Darfur, a growing number of women and girls are being raped, mainly by militia members who use sexual violence as a weapon of war;

Whereas, in Afghanistan, Safia Ama Jan, the former Director of Women's Affairs, became the first female assassinated since the fall of the Taliban; and

Whereas March 8 of each year has been known as ''International Women's Day'' for the last century, and is a day on which people, often divided by ethnicity, language, culture, and income, come together to celebrate a common struggle for women's equality, justice, and peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of ''International Women's Day'';

(2) recognizes and honors the women in the United States and in other countries who have fought and continue to struggle for gender equality and women's rights;

(3) reaffirms its commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, and to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic rights of women and girls both in the United States and in other countries; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women's Day with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 103—COMMENDING THE KINGDOM OF LESOTHO, ON THE OCCASION OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY, FOR THE ENACTMENT OF A LAW TO IMPROVE THE STATUS OF MARRIED WOMEN AND ENSURE THE ACCESS OF MARRIED WOMEN TO PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. CLINTON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. COLEMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 103

Whereas International Women's Day, observed on March 8 each year, has become a day on which people come together to recognize the accomplishments of women and to reaffirm their commitment to continue the struggle for equality, justice, and peace;

Whereas the Kingdom of Lesotho is a parliamentary constitutional monarchy that has been an independent country since 1966;

Whereas Lesotho is a low income country with a gross national income per capita of $960 and 50 percent of the population lives below the poverty line;

Whereas, in Lesotho, the HIV prevalence is estimated at 23 percent for the total adult population and 56 percent for pregnant women between the ages of 25 and 29, and the current average life expectancy at birth is estimated to be 34.4 years;

Whereas the Kingdom of Lesotho, referred to by some as the ''Kingdom in the Sky'', was a strong public supporter of the end of apartheid in South Africa and the Government of Lesotho granted political asylum to a number of refugees from South Africa during the apartheid era;

Whereas the Government of Lesotho has demonstrated a strong commitment to ruling justly, investing in people, ensuring economic freedom, and controlling corruption;

Whereas the Government of Lesotho has been named eligible by the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) for a Compact of financial assistance that, as currently proposed, would strongly focus on improving and safeguarding the health of the people of Lesotho, in addition to supporting projects for sustainable water resource management and private sector development;

Whereas historically a married woman in Lesotho was considered a legal minor during the lifetime of her husband, was severely restricted in economic activities, was unable to enter into legally binding contracts without her husband's consent, and had no standing in civil court;

Whereas legislation elevating the legal status of married women and providing property and inheritance rights to women in Lesotho was introduced as early as 1992;

Whereas for years women's groups, nongovernmental organizations, the Federation of Women Lawyers, officials of the Government of Lesotho, and others in Lesotho have pushed for passage of legislation strengthening rights of married women;

Whereas in a letter to the Government of Lesotho in September 2006, the chief executive officer of the MCC stated that gender inequality is a constraint on economic growth and poverty reduction and is related to the high prevalence of HIV/AIDS, and that inattention to issues of gender inequality could undermine the potential impact of the Compact proposed to be entered into between the MCC and the Government of Lesotho;

Whereas the Legal Capacity of Married Persons Act was passed by the Parliament of Lesotho and enacted into law in November 2006;

Whereas the MCC has already provided assistance to further full and meaningful implementation of the new law;

Whereas the MCC has promulgated and is currently implementing a new gender policy to integrate gender into all phases of the development and implementation of the Compact between the MCC and the Government of Lesotho; and

Whereas the MCC's advocacy of gender equity played a supportive role in the enactment of the Legal Capacity of Married Persons Act in the Kingdom of Lesotho: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges the observance of March 8, 2007, as International Women's Day;

(2) applauds the enactment of the Legal Capacity of Married Persons Act by the Kingdom of Lesotho;

(3) lauds the Kingdom of Lesotho for demonstrating its commitment to improve gender equity;

(4) encourages the Kingdom of Lesotho to continue its effort to ensure gender equity; and

(5) commends the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) for developing and implementing policies to advance gender equity in the Kingdom of Lesotho and other countries eligible for financial assistance from the MCC.

SENATE RESOLUTION 104—COMMENDING THE NATIONAL EXPLOSIVES DETECTION CANINE TEAM PROGRAM FOR 35 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 104

Whereas the national explosives detection canine team program was created as a result of a bomb being placed on a Trans World Airlines jet bound for Los Angeles from John F. Kennedy International Airport on March 9, 1972;

Whereas Brandy, a bomb sniffing dog assigned to the New York City Police Department, searched the plane and found the explosive device just 12 minutes before it was set to detonate;

Whereas President Richard Nixon directed the Secretary of Transportation to use innovative means to combat the problems plaguing civil aviation;

Whereas the Federal Aviation Administration canine explosives detection team program was created to deter and detect the introduction of explosive devices into the national transportation system;

Whereas the national explosives detection program provides premier explosives detection canine team capabilities, through partnerships established with State and local law enforcement agencies;

Whereas the national explosives detection canine team program has expanded significantly over recent years as a result of recommendations by the White House Commission on Aviation Safety and Security, the Security Baseline Working Group of the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, the tragic events of September 11, 2001, and the targeted bombings of mass transit systems in London, India, and Madrid;

Whereas the national explosives detection canine team program has grown from 40 teams at 20 airports to over 425 teams at over 75 airports and 13 mass transit systems;

Whereas the national explosives detection canine team program has deployed highly trained explosives detection canine teams as a proven deterrent to terrorism directed towards transportation systems;

Whereas the national explosives detection canine team program provides a timely and mobile response support to facilities, rail stations, airports, aircraft, passenger terminals, seaports and surface carriers;

Whereas the transportation systems of the United States have benefited greatly from the partnership that exists between the national explosives detection canine team program and State and local law enforcement agencies and key industry stakeholders;

Whereas the operations branch of the national explosives detection canine team program is responsible for day-to-day operational issues for operations at specified transportation systems;

Whereas the canine training and evaluation branch of the national explosives detection canine team program is responsible for the procurement, training, and evaluation of assigned handlers and canines attending the National Explosives Detection Canine Training Facility, at Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas;

Whereas the explosives branch of the national explosives detection canine team program is responsible for explosive training and procurement, preparation, and distribution and associated explosives training and related issues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national explosives detection canine team program be commended for 35 years of service and dedication to the safety and security of the citizens of the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR LIVE EARTH CONCERT

Mr. REID (for himself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 17

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR LIVE EARTH CONCERT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Live Earth organization and the Alliance for Climate Protection (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsors''), may sponsor the Live Earth Concert (in this resolution referred to as the ''event'') on the Capitol Grounds.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on July 7, 2007, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsors shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

(a) STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.—Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsors may cause to be placed on the Capitol grounds such stage, seating, booths, sound amplification and video devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event, including equipment for the broadcast of the event over radio, television, and other media outlets.

(b) ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.—The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board may make any additional arrangements as may be required to carry out the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193d; 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, displays, advertisements, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds in connection with the event.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18—HONORING THE LIFE OF ERNEST GALLO

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 18

Whereas Ernest Gallo was born March 18, 1909, in Jackson, California, the son of Italian immigrants, graduated from Modesto High School in 1927, earned a degree from Modesto Junior College, and married Amelia Franzia, daughter of the founders of Franzia Winery, in 1931;

Whereas Ernest Gallo, with his brother Julio Gallo, founded E & J. Gallo Winery at the end of the Prohibition Era in 1933, with only $5,900 in savings and a winemaking pamphlet from the Modesto Public Library;

Whereas the Gallo brothers took their small family-owned winery and turned it into the world's second largest winery by volume, selling an estimated 75,000,000 cases a year worldwide under approximately 100 different labels;

Whereas Ernest Gallo began his illustrious career at a young age, working in his parents' vineyard while attending Modesto High School and demonstrating his entrepreneurial spirit early in life by traveling at the age of 17 to complete his first business deal;

Whereas Ernest Gallo, demonstrating great vision, anticipated the growth of the wine industry and developed the first-of-its kind vertically integrated company, with vineyards stretching across California, an on-site bottling plant, and an art department to design bottles and labels, changing the face of California's wine industry;

Whereas the Gallo Winery employs 4,600 people in the State of California, providing critical highly-skilled employment opportunities in the San Joaquin Valley and greatly contributing to the economic strength of the State;

Whereas Ernest Gallo and the Gallo Winery were bestowed countless awards for achievement in winemaking, including—

(1) in 1964, the American Society of Enologists Merit Award, the wine industry's highest honor, for outstanding leadership in the wine industry;

(2) the Gold Vine Award from the Brotherhood of the Knights of the Vine wine fraternity;

(3) the 1983 Distinguished Service Award from The Wine Spectator; and

(4) the Winery of the Year Award in both 1996 and 1998 by the San Francisco International Wine Competition; and

Whereas Ernest Gallo was widely known for his generous philanthropic work in the City of Modesto and throughout the state of California, including an endowment for the Gallo Center for the Arts in Modesto, the establishment of the Ernest Gallo Clinic and Research Center at the University of California at San Francisco for research into genetic, biochemical, and neurobiological aspects of alcohol abuse, and countless other healthcare and educational endeavors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress honors the life of Ernest Gallo, a pioneer in the field of winemaking, dedicated philanthropist, and community leader.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 442. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 364 submitted by Mrs. HUTCHISON and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 443. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 411 submitted by Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 444. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 398 submitted by Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, and Ms. CANTWELL) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 445. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 295 proposed by Ms. LANDRIEU to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 446. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 294 proposed by Mr. COBURN to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 447. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 321 proposed by Ms. LANDRIEU to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 448. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 337 submitted by Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON) to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 449. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 383 proposed by Mr. BIDEN to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 450. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 389 proposed by Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. BURR) to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 451. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 325 proposed by Mr. COBURN to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 452. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 361 submitted by Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 453. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 411 submitted by Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 454. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 325 proposed by Mr. COBURN to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 455. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 456. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 457. Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 442. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 364 submitted Mrs. HUTCHISON and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___ ENHANCEMENT OF DOMESTIC NURSING SUPPLY

(a) ENHANCEMENT OF DOMESTIC NURSING SUPPLY.—

(1) Each employer who files a petition for one or more aliens to enter the United States to perform labor as a nurse for whom labor certification is required under INA §212(a)(5)(A) shall pay to the Secretary of Homeland Security a fee of $1,500 for each alien for whom a petition is approved.

(2) There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a separate account which shall be known as the ''Domestic Nursing Enhancement Account.'' Notwithstanding any other section of this title, there shall be

deposited as offsetting receipts into the account all fees collected under paragraph (1) above.

(3) GRANTS.—Part D of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296p) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 832. CAPITATION GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose described in subsection (b), the Secretary, acting through the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall award a grant each fiscal year in an amount determined in accordance with subsection (c) to each eligible school of nursing that submits an application in accordance with this section.

''(b) PURPOSE.—A funding agreement for a grant under this section is that the eligible school of nursing involved will expend the grant to increase the number of nursing faculty and students at the school, including by hiring new faculty, retaining current faculty, purchasing educational equipment and audiovisual laboratories, enhancing clinical laboratories, repairing and expanding infrastructure, or recruiting students.

''(c) GRANT COMPUTATION.—

''(1) AMOUNT PER STUDENT.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount of a grant to an eligible school of nursing under this section for a fiscal year shall be the total of the following:

''(A) $1,800 for each full-time or part-time student who is enrolled at the school in a graduate program in nursing that—

''(i) leads to a master's degree, a doctoral degree, or an equivalent degree; and

''(ii) prepares individuals to serve as faculty through additional course work in education and ensuring competency in an advanced practice area.

''(B) $1,405 for each full-time or part-time student who—

''(i) is enrolled at the school in a program in nursing leading to a bachelor of science degree, a bachelor of nursing degree, a graduate degree in nursing if such program does not meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), or an equivalent degree; and

''(ii) has not more than 3 years of academic credits remaining in the program.

''(C) $966 for each full-time or part-time student who is enrolled at the school in a program in nursing leading to an associate degree in nursing or an equivalent degree.

''(2) LIMITATION.—In calculating the amount of a grant to a school under paragraph (1), the Secretary may not make a payment with respect to a particular student—

''(A) for more than 2 fiscal years in the case of a student described in paragraph (l)(A) who is enrolled in a graduate program in nursing leading to a master's degree or an equivalent degree;

''(B) for more than 4 fiscal years in the case of a student described in paragraph (1)(A) who is enrolled in a graduate program in nursing leading to a doctoral degree or an equivalent degree;

''(C) for more than 3 fiscal years in the case of a student described in paragraph (1)(B); or

''(D) for more than 2 fiscal years in the case of a student described in paragraph (1)(C).

''(d) ELIGIBILITY.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible school of nursing' means a school of nursing that—

''(1) is accredited by a nursing accrediting agency recognized by the Secretary of Education;

''(2) has a passage rate on the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses of not less than 80 percent for each of the 3 school years preceding submission of the grant application; and

''(3) has a graduation rate (based on the number of students in a class who graduate relative to, for a baccalaureate program, the number of students. who were enrolled in the class at the beginning of junior year or, for an associate degree program, the number of students who were enrolled in the class at the end of the first year) of not less than 80 percent for each of the 3 school years preceding submission of the grant application.

''(e) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may award a grant under this section to an eligible school of nursing only if the school gives assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that, for each school year for which the grant is awarded, the school will comply with the following:

''(1) The school will maintain a passage rate on the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses of not less than 80 percent.

''(2) The school will maintain a graduation rate (as described in subsection (d)(3)) of not less than 80 percent.

''(3)(A) Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the first-year enrollment of full-time nursing students in the school will exceed such enrollment for the preceding school year by 5 percent or 5 students, whichever is greater.

''(B) Subparagraph (A) does not apply to the first school year for which a school receives a grant under this section.

''(C) With respect to any school year, the Secretary may waive application of subparagraph (A) if—

''(i) the physical facilities at the school involved limit the school from enrolling additional students; or

''(ii) the school has increased enrollment in the school (as described in subparagraph (A)) for each of the 2 preceding school years.

''(4) Not later than 1 year after receipt of the grant, the school will formulate and implement a plan to accomplish at least 2 of the following:

''(A) Establishing or significantly expanding an accelerated baccalaureate degree nursing program designed to graduate new nurses in 12 to 18 months.

''(B) Establishing cooperative intradisciplinary education among schools of nursing with a view toward shared use of technological resources, including information technology.

''(C) Establishing cooperative interdisciplinary training between schools of nursing and schools of allied health, medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, public health, or veterinary medicine, including training for the use of the interdisciplinary team approach to the delivery of health services.

''(D) Integrating core competencies on evidence-based practice, quality improvements, and patient-centered care.

''(E) Increasing admissions, enrollment, and retention of qualified individuals who are financially disadvantaged.

''(F) Increasing enrollment of minority and diverse student populations.

''(G) Increasing enrollment of new graduate baccalaureate nursing students in graduate programs that educate nurse faculty members.

''(H) Developing post-baccalaureate residency programs to prepare nurses for practice in specialty areas where nursing shortages are most severe.

''(I) Increasing integration of geriatric content into the core curriculum.

''(J) Partnering with economically disadvantaged communities to provide nursing education.

''(K) Expanding the ability of nurse managed health centers to provide clinical education training sites to nursing students.

''(5) The school will submit an annual report to the Secretary that includes updated information on the school with respect to student enrollment, student retention, graduation rates, passage rates on the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses, the number of graduates employed as nursing faculty or nursing care providers within 12 months of graduation, and the number of students who are accepted into graduate programs for further nursing education.

''(6) The school will allow the Secretary to make on-site inspections, and will comply with the Secretary's requests for information, to determine the extent to which the school is complying with the requirements of this section.

''(f) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall evaluate the results of grants under. this section and submit to the Congress—

''(1) not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, an interim report on such results; and

''(2) not later than the end of fiscal year 2017, a final report on such results.

''(g) APPLICATION.—To seek a grant under this section, a school of nursing shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

''(h) FUNDING.—Amounts deposited into the Domestic Nursing Enhancement Account established by the Improving America's Security Act of 2007 shall remain available to the Secretary until expended for the costs of carrying out this section.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For any additional costs of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—For the costs of administering this section, including the costs of evaluating the results of grants and submitting reports to the Congress, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.''.

SEC. ____. GLOBAL HEALTHCARE COOPERATION.

(a) GLOBAL HEALTHCARE COOPERATION.—Title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 317 the following:

"SEC. 317A. TEMPORARY ABSENCE OF ALIENS PROVIDING HEALTHCARE IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall allow an eligible alien and the spouse or child of such alien to reside in a candidate country during the period that the eligible alien is working as a physician or other healthcare worker in a candidate country. During such period the eligible alien and such spouse or child shall be considered—

''(1) to be physically present and residing in the United States for purposes of naturalization under section 316(a); and

''(2) to meet the continuous residency requirements under section 316(b).

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(I) CANDIDATE COUNTRY.—The term 'candidate country' means a country that the Secretary of State determines is—

''(A) eligible for assistance from the International Development Association, in which the per capita income of the country is equal to or less than the historical ceiling of the International Development Association for the applicable fiscal year, as defined by the International Bank. for Reconstruction and Development;

''(B) classified as a lower middle income country in the then most recent edition of the World Development Report for Reconstruction and Development published by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and having an income greater

than the historical ceiling for International Development Association eligibility for the applicable fiscal year; or

''(C) qualifies to be a candidate country due to special circumstances, including natural disasters or public health emergencies.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ALIEN.—The term 'eligible alien' means an alien who—

''(A) has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; and

''(B) is a physician or other healthcare worker.

''(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult with the Secretary of State in carrying out this subsection.

''(d) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of State shall publish—

''(1) not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, a list of candidate countries; and

''(2) an immediate amendment to such list at any time to include any country that qualifies as a candidate country due to special circumstances under subsection (b)(I)(C).''.

(b) RULEMAKING.—

(1) REQUIPMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to carry out the amendments made by this section.

(2) CONTENT.—The regulations required by paragraph (1) shall—

(A) permit an eligible alien (as defined in section 317A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a)) and the spouse or child of the eligible alien to reside in a foreign country to work as a physician or other healthcare worker as described in subsection (a) of such section 317A for not less than a 12-month period and not more than a 24-month period, and shall permit the Secretary to extend such period for an additional period not to exceed 12 months, if the Secretary determines that such country has a continuing need for such a physician or other healthcare worker;

(B) provide for the issuance of documents by the Secretary to such eligible alien, and such spouse or child, if appropriate, to demonstrate that such eligible alien, and such spouse or child, if appropriate, is authorized to reside in such country under such section 317A; and

(C) provide for an expedited process through which the Secretary shall review applications for such an eligible alien to reside in a foreign country pursuant to subsection (a) of such section 317A if the Secretary of State determines a country is a candidate country pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(C) of such section 317A.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Immigration and Nationality Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 101(a)(13)(C)(ii) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(13)(C)(ii)) is amended by adding at the end ''except in the case of an eligible alien, or the spouse or child of such alien, authorized to be absent from the United States pursuant to section 317A''.

(2) Section 211 (b) (8 U.S.C. 1181 (b)) is amended by inserting, ''including an eligible alien authorized to reside in a foreign country pursuant to section 317A and the spouse or child of such eligible alien, if appropriate, after 101(a)(27)(A),''.

(3) Section 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I)) is amended by inserting ''other than an eligible alien authorized to reside in a foreign country pursuant to section 317A and the spouse or child of such eligible alien, if appropriate,'' after ''Act,''.

(4) Section 319(b)(I)(B) (8 U.S.C. 1430(b)(I)(B)) is amended by inserting ''an eligible alien who is residing or has resided in a foreign country pursuant to section 317A'' before ''and'' at the end.

(5) The table of contents is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 317 the following:

''SEC. 317A. Temporary absence of aliens providing healthcare in developing countries.''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section.

SEC. ___. ATTESTATION BY HEALTHCARE WORKERS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR ATTESTATION.—Section 212(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) HEALTHCARE WORKERS WITH OTHER OBLIGATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing labor as a physician or other healthcare worker is inadmissible unless the alien submits to the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of State, as appropriate, an attestation that the alien is not seeking to enter the United States for such purpose during any period in which the alien has an outstanding obligation to the government of the alien's country of origin or the alien's country of residence.

''(ii) OBLIGATION DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term 'obligation' means an obligation incurred as part of a valid, voluntary individual agreement in which the alien received financial assistance to defray the costs of education or training to qualify as a physician or other healthcare worker in consideration for a commitment to work as a physician or other healthcare worker in the alien's country of origin or the alien's country of residence.

''(iii) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive a finding of inadmissibility under clause (i) if the Secretary determines that—

''(I) the obligation was incurred by coercion or other improper means;

''(II) the alien and the government of the country to which the alien has an outstanding obligation have reached a valid, voluntary agreement, pursuant to which the alien's obligation has been deemed satisfied, or the alien has shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the alien has been unable to reach such an agreement because of coercion or other improper means; or

''(III) the obligation should not be enforced due to other extraordinary circumstances, including undue hardship that would be suffered by the alien in the absence of a waiver.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall become effective 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall begin to carry out the subparagraph (E) of section 212(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)), as added by subsection (a), not later than the effective date described in paragraph (1), including the requirement for the attestation and the granting of a waiver described in such subparagraph, regardless of whether regulations to implement such subparagraph have been promulgated.

SA 443. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 411 submitted by Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 7 of the matter proposed, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION.—A Democracy Fellow may not be assigned to any congressional office until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that the request of the Commander of the United States Central Command for the Department of State for personnel and foreign service officers has been fulfilled.

SEC. 1612A. TRANSPARENCY OF UNITED STATES BROADCASTING TO ASSIST IN OVERSIGHT AND ENSURE PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY IN INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTS.

(a) TRANSCRIPTS.—The Broadcasting Board of Governors shall transcribe into English all original broadcasting content.

(b) PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY.—The Broadcasting Board of Governors shall post all English transcripts from its broadcasting content on a publicly available website within 30 days of the original broadcast.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ''broadcasting content'' includes programming produced or broadcast by United States international broadcasters including the following:

(1) Voice of America.
(2) Alhurra.
(3) Radio Sawa.
(4) Radio Farda.
(5) Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty.
(6) Radio Free Asia.
(7) The Office of Cuba Broadcasting.

SA 444. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 398 submitted by Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, and Ms. CANTWELL) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 8, strike lines 8 through 13 and insert the following:

SEC. ___. LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS OF STATES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, law enforcement personnel of a State, or a political subdivision of a State, have the inherent authority of a sovereign entity to investigate, apprehend, arrest, detain, or transfer to Federal custody (including the transportation across State lines to detention centers) an alien for the purpose of assisting in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States in the normal course of carrying out the law enforcement duties of such personnel. This State authority has never been displaced or preempted by a Federal law.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require law enforcement personnel of a State or a political subdivision to assist in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States.

SEC. ___. LISTING OF IMMIGRATION VIOLATORS IN THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER DATABASE.

(a) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the head of the National Crime Information Center of the Department of Justice the information that the Secretary has or maintains related to any alien—

(A) against whom a final order of removal has been issued;

(B) who enters into a voluntary departure agreement, or is granted voluntary departure by an immigration judge, whose period for departure has expired under subsection (a)(2) of section 240B of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229c), subsection (b)(2) of such section 240B, or who has violated a condition of a voluntary departure agreement under such section 240B;

(C) whom a Federal immigration officer has confirmed to be unlawfully present in the United States; or

(D) whose visa has been revoked.

(2) REMOVAL OF INFORMATION.—The head of the National Crime Information Center should promptly remove any information provided by the Secretary under paragraph (1) related to an alien who is granted lawful authority to enter or remain legally in the United States.

(3) PROCEDURE FOR REMOVAL OF ERRONEOUS INFORMATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the head of the National Crime Information Center of the Department of Justice, shall develop and implement a procedure by which an alien may petition the Secretary or head of the National Crime Information Center, as appropriate, to remove any erroneous information provided by the Secretary under paragraph (1) related to such alien. Under such procedures, failure by the alien to receive notice of a violation of the immigration laws shall not constitute cause for removing information provided by the Secretary under paragraph (1) related to such alien, unless such information is erroneous. Notwithstanding the 180-day time period set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall not provide the information required under paragraph (1) until the procedures required by this paragraph are developed and implemented.

(b) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER DATABASE.—Section 534(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) acquire, collect, classify, and preserve records of violations of the immigration laws of the United States; and''.

SA 445. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 295 proposed by Ms. LANDRIEU to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 2, strike ''**FEDERAL SHARE**'' and all that follows through the end of the amendment and insert the following:

EMERGENCY AND MAJOR DISASTER FRAUD PENALTIES.

(a) FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH MAJOR DISASTER OR EMERGENCY BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1040. Fraud in connection with major disaster or emergency benefits

''(a) Whoever, in a circumstance described in subsection (b) of this section, knowingly—

''(1) falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device any material fact; or

''(2) makes any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation,

in any matter involving any benefit authorized, transported, transmitted, transferred, disbursed, or paid in connection with a major disaster declaration under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170) or an emergency declaration under section 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5191), or in connection with any procurement of property or services related to any emergency or major disaster declaration as a prime contractor with the United States or as a subcontractor or supplier on a contract in which there is a prime contract with the United States, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both.

''(b) A circumstance described in this subsection is any instance where—

''(1) the authorization, transportation, transmission, transfer, disbursement, or payment of the benefit is in or affects interstate or foreign commerce;

''(2) the benefit is transported in the mail at any point in the authorization, transportation, transmission, transfer, disbursement, or payment of that benefit; or

''(3) the benefit is a record, voucher, payment, money, or thing of value of the United States, or of any department or agency thereof.

''(c) In this section, the term 'benefit' means any record, voucher, payment, money or thing of value, good, service, right, or privilege provided by the United States, a State or local government, or other entity.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1040. Fraud in connection with major disaster or emergency benefits.''.

(b) INCREASED CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR ENGAGING IN WIRE, RADIO, AND TELEVISION FRAUD DURING AND RELATION TO A PRESIDENTIALLY DECLARED MAJOR DISASTER OR EMERGENCY.—Section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting: ''occurs in relation to, or involving any benefit authorized, transported, transmitted, transferred, disbursed, or paid in connection with, a presidentially declared major disaster or emergency (as those terms are defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)), or'' after ''If the violation''.

(c) INCREASED CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR ENGAGING IN MAIL FRAUD DURING AND RELATION TO A PRESIDENTIALLY DECLARED MAJOR DISASTER OR EMERGENCY.—Section 1341 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting: ''occurs in relation to, or involving any benefit authorized, transported, transmitted, transferred, disbursed, or paid in connection with, a presidentially declared major disaster or emergency (as those terms are defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)), or'' after ''If the violation''.

(d) DIRECTIVE TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this subsection, the United States Sentencing Commission forthwith shall—

(A) promulgate sentencing guidelines or amend existing sentencing guidelines to provide for increased penalties for persons convicted of fraud or theft offenses in connection with a major disaster declaration under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170) or an emergency declaration under section 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5191); and

(B) submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives an explanation of actions taken by the Commission pursuant to subparagraph (A) and any additional policy recommendations the Commission may have for combating offenses described in that subparagraph.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Sentencing Commission shall—

(A) ensure that the sentencing guidelines and policy statements reflect the serious nature of the offenses described in paragraph (1) and the need for aggressive and appropriate law enforcement action to prevent such offenses;

(B) assure reasonable consistency with other relevant directives and with other guidelines;

(C) account for any aggravating or mitigating circumstances that might justify exceptions, including circumstances for which the sentencing guidelines currently provide sentencing enhancements;

(D) make any necessary conforming changes to the sentencing guidelines; and

(E) assure that the guidelines adequately meet the purposes of sentencing as set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code.

(3) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY AND DEADLINE FOR COMMISSION ACTION.—The Commission shall promulgate the guidelines or amendments provided for under this subsection as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than the 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Reform Act of 1987, as though the authority under that Act had not expired.

SA 446. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 294 proposed by Mr. COBURN to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 15___. LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Law Enforcement Assistance Force to facilitate the contributions of retired law enforcement officers and agents during major disasters.

(b) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—An individual may participate in the Law Enforcement Assistance Force if that individual—

(1) has experience working as an officer or agent for a public law enforcement agency and left that agency in good standing;

(2) holds current certifications for firearms, first aid, and such other skills determined necessary by the Secretary;

(3) submits to the Secretary an application, at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, that authorizes the Secretary to review the law enforcement service record of that individual; and

(4) meets such other qualifications as the Secretary may require.

(c) LIABILITY; SUPERVISION.—Each eligible participant shall, upon acceptance of an assignment under this section—

(A) be detailed to a Federal, State, or local government law enforcement agency; and

(B) work under the direct supervision of an officer or agent of that agency.

(d) MOBILIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event of a major disaster, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local government law enforcement agencies, may request eligible participants to volunteer to assist the efforts of those agencies responding to such emergency and assign each willing participant to a specific law enforcement agency.

(2) ACCEPTANCE.—If the eligible participant accepts an assignment under this subsection, that eligible participant shall agree to remain in such assignment for a period equal to not less than the shorter of—

(A) the period during which the law enforcement agency needs the services of such participant;

(B) 30 days;

(C) such other period of time agreed to between the Secretary and the eligible participant.

(3) REFUSAL.—An eligible participant may refuse an assignment under this subsection without any adverse consequences.

(e) EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible participant shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while carrying out an assignment under subsection (d).

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Expenses incurred under paragraph (1) shall be paid from amounts appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(f) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The availability of eligible participants of the Law Enforcement Assistance Force shall continue for a period equal to the shorter of—

(1) the period of the major disaster; or

(2) 1 year.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''eligible participant'' means an individual participating in the Law Enforcement Assistance Force;

(2) the term ''Law Enforcement Assistance Force'' means the Law Enforcement Assistance Force established under subsection (a); and

(3) the term ''major disaster'' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SA 447. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 321 proposed by Ms. LANDRIEU to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 15___. LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Law Enforcement Assistance Force to facilitate the contributions of retired law enforcement officers and agents during major disasters.

(b) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—An individual may participate in the Law Enforcement Assistance Force if that individual—

(1) has experience working as an officer or agent for a public law enforcement agency and left that agency in good standing;

(2) holds current certifications for firearms, first aid, and such other skills determined necessary by the Secretary;

(3) submits to the Secretary an application, at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, that authorizes the Secretary to review the law enforcement service record of that individual; and

(4) meets such other qualifications as the Secretary may require.

(c) LIABILITY; SUPERVISION.—Each eligible participant shall, upon acceptance of an assignment under this section—

(A) be detailed to a Federal, State, or local government law enforcement agency; and

(B) work under the direct supervision of an officer or agent of that agency.

(d) MOBILIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event of a major disaster, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local government law enforcement agencies, may request eligible participants to volunteer to assist the efforts of those agencies responding to such emergency and assign each willing participant to a specific law enforcement agency.

(2) ACCEPTANCE.—If the eligible participant accepts an assignment under this subsection, that eligible participant shall agree to remain in such assignment for a period equal to not less than the shorter of—

(A) the period during which the law enforcement agency needs the services of such participant;

(B) 30 days;

(C) such other period of time agreed to between the Secretary and the eligible participant.

(3) REFUSAL.—An eligible participant may refuse an assignment under this subsection without any adverse consequences.

(e) EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible participant shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while carrying out an assignment under subsection (d).

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Expenses incurred under paragraph (1) shall be paid from amounts appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(f) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The availability of eligible participants of the Law Enforcement Assistance Force shall continue for a period equal to the shorter of—

(1) the period of the major disaster; or

(2) 1 year.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''eligible participant'' means an individual participating in the Law Enforcement Assistance Force;

(2) the term ''Law Enforcement Assistance Force'' means the Law Enforcement Assistance Force established under subsection (a); and

(3) the term ''major disaster'' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SA 448. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 337 submitted by Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON) to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 15___. LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Law Enforcement Assistance Force to facilitate the contributions of retired law enforcement officers and agents during major disasters.

(b) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—An individual may participate in the Law Enforcement Assistance Force if that individual—

(1) has experience working as an officer or agent for a public law enforcement agency and left that agency in good standing;

(2) holds current certifications for firearms, first aid, and such other skills determined necessary by the Secretary;

(3) submits to the Secretary an application, at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, that authorizes the Secretary to review the law enforcement service record of that individual; and

(4) meets such other qualifications as the Secretary may require.

(c) LIABILITY; SUPERVISION.—Each eligible participant shall, upon acceptance of an assignment under this section—

(A) be detailed to a Federal, State, or local government law enforcement agency; and

(B) work under the direct supervision of an officer or agent of that agency.

(d) MOBILIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event of a major disaster, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local government law enforcement agencies, may request eligible participants to volunteer to assist the efforts of those agencies responding to such emergency and assign each willing participant to a specific law enforcement agency.

(2) ACCEPTANCE.—If the eligible participant accepts an assignment under this subsection, that eligible participant shall agree to remain in such assignment for a period equal to not less than the shorter of—

(A) the period during which the law enforcement agency needs the services of such participant;

(B) 30 days; or

(C) such other period of time agreed to between the Secretary and the eligible participant.

(3) REFUSAL.—An eligible participant may refuse an assignment under this subsection without any adverse consequences.

(e) EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible participant shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while carrying out an assignment under subsection (d).

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Expenses incurred under paragraph (1) shall be paid from amounts appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(f) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The availability of eligible participants of the Law Enforcement Assistance Force shall continue for a period equal to the shorter of—

(1) the period of the major disaster; or

(2) 1 year.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''eligible participant'' means an individual participating in the Law Enforcement Assistance Force;

(2) the term ''Law Enforcement Assistance Force'' means the Law Enforcement Assistance Force established under subsection (a); and

(3) the term ''major disaster'' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SA 449. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 383 proposed by Mr. BIDEN to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 15___. LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Law Enforcement Assistance Force to facilitate the contributions of retired law enforcement officers and agents during major disasters.

(b) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—An individual may participate in the Law Enforcement Assistance Force if that individual—

(1) has experience working as an officer or agent for a public law enforcement agency and left that agency in good standing;

(2) holds current certifications for firearms, first aid, and such other skills determined necessary by the Secretary;

(3) submits to the Secretary an application, at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, that authorizes the Secretary to review the law enforcement service record of that individual; and

(4) meets such other qualifications as the Secretary may require.

(c) LIABILITY; SUPERVISION.—Each eligible participant shall, upon acceptance of an assignment under this section—

(A) be detailed to a Federal, State, or local government law enforcement agency; and

(B) work under the direct supervision of an officer or agent of that agency.

(d) MOBILIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event of a major disaster, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local government law enforcement agencies, may request eligible participants to volunteer to assist the efforts of those agencies responding to such emergency and assign each willing participant to a specific law enforcement agency.

(2) ACCEPTANCE.—If the eligible participant accepts an assignment under this subsection, that eligible participant shall agree to remain in such assignment for a period equal to not less than the shorter of—

(A) the period during which the law enforcement agency needs the services of such participant;

(B) 30 days; or

(C) such other period of time agreed to between the Secretary and the eligible participant.

(3) REFUSAL.—An eligible participant may refuse an assignment under this subsection without any adverse consequences.

(e) EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible participant shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while carrying out an assignment under subsection (d).

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Expenses incurred under paragraph (1) shall be paid from amounts appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(f) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The availability of eligible participants of the Law Enforcement Assistance Force shall continue for a period equal to the shorter of—

(1) the period of the major disaster; or

(2) 1 year.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''eligible participant'' means an individual participating in the Law Enforcement Assistance Force;

(2) the term ''Law Enforcement Assistance Force'' means the Law Enforcement Assistance Force established under subsection (a); and

(3) the term ''major disaster'' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SA 450. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 389 proposed by Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. BURR) to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 15___. LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Law Enforcement Assistance Force to facilitate the contributions of retired law enforcement officers and agents during major disasters.

(b) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—An individual may participate in the Law Enforcement Assistance Force if that individual—

(1) has experience working as an officer or agent for a public law enforcement agency and left that agency in good standing;

(2) holds current certifications for firearms, first aid, and such other skills determined necessary by the Secretary;

(3) submits to the Secretary an application, at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, that authorizes the Secretary to review the law enforcement service record of that individual; and

(4) meets such other qualifications as the Secretary may require.

(c) LIABILITY; SUPERVISION.—Each eligible participant shall, upon acceptance of an assignment under this section—

(A) be detailed to a Federal, State, or local government law enforcement agency; and

(B) work under the direct supervision of an officer or agent of that agency.

(d) MOBILIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event of a major disaster, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local government law enforcement agencies, may request eligible participants to volunteer to assist the efforts of those agencies responding to such emergency and assign each willing participant to a specific law enforcement agency.

(2) ACCEPTANCE.—If the eligible participant accepts an assignment under this subsection, that eligible participant shall agree to remain in such assignment for a period equal to not less than the shorter of—

(A) the period during which the law enforcement agency needs the services of such participant;

(B) 30 days; or

(C) such other period of time agreed to between the Secretary and the eligible participant.

(3) REFUSAL.—An eligible participant may refuse an assignment under this subsection without any adverse consequences.

(e) EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible participant shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while carrying out an assignment under subsection (d).

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Expenses incurred under paragraph (1) shall be paid from amounts appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(f) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The availability of eligible participants of the Law Enforcement Assistance Force shall continue for a period equal to the shorter of—

(1) the period of the major disaster; or

(2) 1 year.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''eligible participant'' means an individual participating in the Law Enforcement Assistance Force;

(2) the term ''Law Enforcement Assistance Force'' means the Law Enforcement Assistance Force established under subsection (a); and

(3) the term ''major disaster'' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such

sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SA 451. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 325 proposed by Mr. COBURN to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, strike line 8 and all that follows and insert the following:

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for grants under section 1809 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by this Act, the Secretary shall not award any grants or distribute any grant funds on or after October 1, 2008, under any grant program under this Act or an amendment made by this Act, until the Secretary submits a report to the appropriate committees that—

(A) contains a certification that the Department has, for each program and activity of the Department (except for the grant program under section 1809 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by this Act), performed and completed a risk assessment to determine programs and activities that are at significant risk of making improper payments; and

(B) for each program and activity of the Department, describes the actions to be taken to achieve compliance with the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note), including benchmarks and an estimated date of such compliance.

(2) ESTIMATES OF IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall not award any grants or distribute any grant funds on or after October 1, 2010, under any grant program under this Act or an amendment made by this Act, until the Secretary submits a report to the appropriate committees that contains a certification that the Department has, for each program and activity of the Department, estimated the total number of improper payments for each program and activity determined to be at significant risk of making improper payments.

SA 452. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 361 submitted by Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

TITLE XVI—ADVANCEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC VALUES

SECTION 1601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Advance Democratic Values, Address Non-democratic Countries, and Enhance Democracy Act of 2007'' or the ''ADVANCE Democracy Act of 2007''.

SEC. 1602. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that in order to support the expansion of freedom and democracy in the world, the foreign policy of the United States should be organized in support of transformational diplomacy that seeks to work through partnerships to build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that will respect human rights and respond to the needs of their people and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system.

SEC. 1603. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It should be the policy of the United States—

(1) to promote freedom and democracy in foreign countries as a fundamental component of the foreign policy of the United States;

(2) to affirm internationally recognized human rights standards and norms and to condemn offenses against those rights;

(3) to use instruments of United States influence to support, promote, and strengthen democratic principles, practices, and values, including the right to free, fair, and open elections, secret balloting, and universal suffrage;

(4) to protect and promote fundamental freedoms and rights, including the freedom of association, of expression, of the press, and of religion, and the right to own private property;

(5) to protect and promote respect for and adherence to the rule of law;

(6) to provide appropriate support to nongovernmental organizations working to promote freedom and democracy;

(7) to provide political, economic, and other support to countries that are willingly undertaking a transition to democracy;

(8) to commit to the long-term challenge of promoting universal democracy; and

(9) to strengthen alliances and relationships with other democratic countries in order to better promote and defend shared values and ideals.

SEC. 1604. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ANNUAL REPORT ON ADVANCING FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY.—The term ''Annual Report on Advancing Freedom and Democracy'' refers to the annual report submitted to Congress by the Department of State pursuant to section 665(c) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–228; 22 U.S.C. 2151n note), in which the Department reports on actions taken by the United States Government to encourage respect for human rights and democracy.

(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term ''Assistant Secretary'' means the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

(3) COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES AND COMMUNITY.—The terms ''Community of Democracies'' and ''Community'' mean the association of democratic countries committed to the global promotion of democratic principles, practices, and values, which held its First Ministerial Conference in Warsaw, Poland, in June 2000.

(4) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of State.

(5) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term ''Under Secretary'' means the Under Secretary of State for Democracy and Global Affairs.

Subtitle A—Liaison Officers and Fellowship Program to Enhance the Promotion of Democracy

SEC. 1611. DEMOCRACY LIAISON OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall establish and staff Democracy Liaison Officer positions, under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary, who may be assigned to the following posts:

(1) United States missions to, or liaison with, regional and multilateral organizations, including the United States missions to the European Union, African Union, Organization of American States and any other appropriate regional organization, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United Nations and its relevant specialized agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(2) Regional public diplomacy centers of the Department.

(3) United States combatant commands.

(4) Other posts as designated by the Secretary of State.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each Democracy Liaison Officer should—

(1) provide expertise on effective approaches to promote and build democracy;

(2) assist in formulating and implementing strategies for transitions to democracy; and

(3) carry out other responsibilities as the Secretary of State and the Assistant Secretary may assign.

(c) NEW POSITIONS.—The Democracy Liaison Officer positions established under subsection (a) should be new positions that are in addition to existing officer positions with responsibility for other human rights and democracy related issues and programs.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section may be construed as removing any authority or responsibility of a chief of mission or other employee of a diplomatic mission of the United States provided under any other provision of law, including any authority or responsibility for the development or implementation of strategies to promote democracy.

SEC. 1612. DEMOCRACY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall establish a Democracy Fellowship Program to enable Department officers to gain an additional perspective on democracy promotion abroad by working on democracy issues in congressional committees with oversight over the subject matter of this title, including the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and in nongovernmental organizations involved in democracy promotion.

(2) EXCEPTION.—A Democracy Fellow may not be assigned to any congressional office until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that the request of the Commander of the United States Central Command for the Department of State for personnel and foreign service officers has been fulfilled.

(b) SELECTION AND PLACEMENT.—The Assistant Secretary shall play a central role in the selection of Democracy Fellows and facilitate their placement in appropriate congressional offices and nongovernmental organizations.

Subtitle B—Annual Report on Advancing Freedom and Democracy

SEC. 1621. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) REPORT TITLE.—Section 665(c) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–228; 22 U.S.C. 2151n note) is amended in the first sentence by inserting ''entitled the Advancing Freedom and Democracy Report'' before the period at the end.

(b) SCHEDULE FOR SUBMISSION.—If a report entitled the Advancing Freedom and Democracy Report pursuant to section 665(c) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by subsection (a), is submitted under such section, such report

shall be submitted not later than 90 days after the date of submission of the report required by section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d)).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 665(c) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–228; 2151n note) is amended by striking ''30 days'' and inserting ''90 days''.

SEC. 1622. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TRANSLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS REPORTS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should continue to ensure and expand the timely translation of Human Rights and International Religious Freedom reports and the Annual Report on Advancing Freedom and Democracy prepared by personnel of the Department of State into the principal languages of as many countries as possible. Translations are welcomed because information on United States support for universal enjoyment of freedoms and rights serves to encourage individuals around the globe seeking to advance the cause of freedom in their countries.

Subtitle C—Advisory Committee on Democracy Promotion and the Internet Website of the Department of State

SEC. 1631. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DEMOCRACY PROMOTION.

Congress commends the Secretary of State for creating an Advisory Committee on Democracy Promotion, and it is the sense of Congress that the Committee should play a significant role in the Department's transformational diplomacy by advising the Secretary of State regarding United States efforts to promote democracy and democratic transition in connection with the formulation and implementation of United States foreign policy and foreign assistance.

SEC. 1632. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE INTERNET WEBSITE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of State should continue and further expand the Secretary's existing efforts to inform the public in foreign countries of the efforts of the United States to promote democracy and defend human rights through the Internet website of the Department of State;

(2) the Secretary of State should continue to enhance the democracy promotion materials and resources on that Internet website, as such enhancement can benefit and encourage those around the world who seek freedom; and

(3) such enhancement should include where possible and practical, translated reports on democracy and human rights prepared by personnel of the Department, narratives and histories highlighting successful nonviolent democratic movements, and other relevant material.

Subtitle D—Training in Democracy and Human Rights; Promotions

SEC. 1641. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TRAINING IN DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of State should continue to enhance and expand the training provided to foreign service officers and civil service employees on how to strengthen and promote democracy and human rights; and

(2) the Secretary of State should continue the effective and successful use of case studies and practical workshops addressing potential challenges, and work with non-state actors, including nongovernmental organizations that support democratic principles, practices, and values.

SEC. 1642. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ADVANCE DEMOCRACY AWARD.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of State should further strengthen the capacity of the Department to carry out result-based democracy promotion efforts through the establishment of awards and other employee incentives, including the establishment of an annual award known as Outstanding Achievements in Advancing Democracy, or the ADVANCE Democracy Award, that would be awarded to officers or employees of the Department; and

(2) the Secretary of State should establish the procedures for selecting recipients of such award, including any financial terms, associated with such award.

SEC. 1643. PROMOTIONS.

The precepts for selection boards responsible for recommending promotions of foreign service officers, including members of the senior foreign service, should include consideration of a candidate's experience or service in promotion of human rights and democracy.

SEC. 1644. PROGRAMS BY UNITED STATES MISSIONS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND ACTIVITIES OF CHIEFS OF MISSION.

It is the sense of Congress that each chief of mission should provide input on the actions described in the Advancing Freedom and Democracy Report submitted under section 665(c) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–228; 22 U.S.C. 2151n note), as amended by section 1621, and should intensify democracy and human rights promotion activities.

SEC. 1645. TRANSPARENCY OF UNITED STATES BROADCASTING TO ASSIST IN OVERSIGHT AND ENSURE PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY IN INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTS.

(a) TRANSCRIPTS.—The Broadcasting Board of Governors shall transcribe into English all original broadcasting content.

(b) PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY.—The Broadcasting Board of Governors shall post all English transcripts from its broadcasting content on a publicly available website within 30 days of the original broadcast.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ''broadcasting content'' includes programming produced or broadcast by United States international broadcasters including the following:

(1) Voice of America.
(2) Alhurra.
(3) Radio Sawa.
(4) Radio Farda.
(5) Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty.
(6) Radio Free Asia.
(7) The Office of Cuba Broadcasting.

Subtitle E—Alliances With Democratic Countries

SEC. 1651. ALLIANCES WITH DEMOCRATIC COUNTRIES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE FOR THE COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES.—The Secretary of State should, and is authorized to, establish an Office for the Community of Democracies with the mission to further develop and strengthen the institutional structure of the Community of Democracies, develop interministerial projects, enhance the United Nations Democracy Caucus, manage policy development of the United Nations Democracy Fund, and enhance coordination with other regional and multilateral bodies with jurisdiction over democracy issues.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR DEMOCRATIC TRANSITION.—It is the sense of Congress that the International Center for Democratic Transition, an initiative of the Government of Hungary, serves to promote practical projects and the sharing of best practices in the area of democracy promotion and should be supported by, in particular, other European countries with experiences in democratic transitions, the United States, and private individuals.

Subtitle F—Funding for Promotion of Democracy

SEC. 1661. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED NATIONS DEMOCRACY FUND.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States should work with other countries to enhance the goals and work of the United Nations Democracy Fund, an essential tool to promote democracy, and in particular support civil society in their efforts to help consolidate democracy and bring about transformational change.

SEC. 1662. THE HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY FUND.

The purpose of the Human Rights and Democracy Fund should be to support innovative programming, media, and materials designed to uphold democratic principles, support and strengthen democratic institutions, promote human rights and the rule of law, and build civil societies in countries around the world.

SA 453. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 411 submitted by Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 7 of the matter proposed, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION.—A Democracy Fellow may not be assigned to any congressional office until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that the request of the Commander of the United States Central Command for the Department of State for personnel and foreign service officers has been fulfilled.

SEC. 1612A. TRANSPARENCY OF UNITED STATES BROADCASTING TO ASSIST IN OVERSIGHT AND ENSURE PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY IN INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTS.

(a) TRANSCRIPTS.—The Broadcasting Board of Governors shall transcribe into English all original broadcasting content.

(b) PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY.—The Broadcasting Board of Governors shall post all English transcripts from its broadcasting content on a publicly available website within 30 days of the original broadcast.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ''broadcasting content'' includes programming produced or broadcast by United States international broadcasters including the following:

(1) Voice of America.
(2) Alhurra.
(3) Radio Sawa.
(4) Radio Farda.
(5) Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty.
(6) Radio Free Asia.
(7) The Office of Cuba Broadcasting.

SA 454. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 325 proposed by Mr. COBURN to the amendment SA 275 proposed by Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. COLLINS) to the bill S. 4, to make the United States

more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 5, strike all through page 3, line 4, and insert the following:

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

(b) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate committees that—

(1) details the actions the Department is taking to comply with the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note); and

(2) includes—

(A) goals and timelines for compliance with the requirements of that Act; and

(B) recommendations for improving compliance with that Act.

(c) REPORT BY OMB.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit a report to the appropriate committees that includes—

(1) a discussion of the problems agencies have had in complying with the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) with respect to programs involving non-Federal funds recipients, including grant programs;

(2) a description of the actions the Office of Management and Budget has taken to assist agencies in coming into compliance with that Act with respect to the programs involving non-Federal funds recipients; and

(3) recommendations for improving the compliance of agencies with that Act.

SA 455. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. COMPENSATION FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS TAKEN HOSTAGE BY TERRORISTS OR STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with such procedures as the President may by regulation establish, the President or his designee shall receive the claims of, and pay compensation to, any national of the United States, or to the estate of any such national, who—

(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act has a claim pending in a court of the United States against a foreign state seeking compensation for injuries caused by an act of hostage-taking or has obtained a judgment on such a claim that has not been fully satisfied;

(2) at any time on or after August 2, 1990, and while not serving on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, was taken hostage by a terrorist party; or

(3) was a representative plaintiff or class member in Case Number 1:00CV03110(EGS) in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or a plaintiff in Case Number 1:00CV00716 (HHK) in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(b) LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF AWARD.—The amount that may be awarded to any person seeking compensation under this section shall not exceed $500,000, adjusted to reflect the annual percentage change in the Consumer Price Index, from the date on which the hostage-taking occurred to the date on which compensation is paid.

(c) TYPE OF AWARD.—Subject to the limit in subsection (b), any person seeking compensation for hostage-taking under this section shall be awarded the following amounts with respect to which the United States shall enjoy full subrogation rights in the event such person obtains any recovery in litigation or otherwise as a result of such hostage-taking:

(1) In the case of any person who has been issued a final judgment for compensatory damages, the unsatisfied amount of such judgment.

(2) In the case of any person who survived his captivity and who has not been issued a final judgment for compensatory damages, $10,000 per day for each day that such person was held or, if he died or was tortured during the course of his captivity, the maximum amount in subsection (b).

(d) PROHIBITION ON CIVIL ACTIONS AGAINST FOREIGN STATES.—A person who has accepted compensation under subsection (c)(2) may not commence or maintain in a court of the United States a civil action seeking compensation for such injuries or damages associated with such hostage taking against a foreign state or its agencies or instrumentalities.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HOSTAGE TAKING.—The term ''hostage taking'' has the meaning given that term in Article 1 of the International Convention Against the Taking of the Hostages and includes any act that caused a person to be in ''hostage status'' within the meaning of section 599C(d)(1) of Public Law 101–513.

(2) TERRORIST PARTY.—The term ''terrorist party'' has the meaning given that term in the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (section 201(d)(4) of Public Law 107–297) and includes any person, organization, or foreign state that was designated as such either at the time or as a result of the act of hostage-taking for which compensation is sought.

(f) FUNDING.—Funds sufficient to pay persons to whom compensation is due under this section shall be made available from the Hostage Victims Fund, into which the President shall direct deposits, in proportions the President so allocates in the discretion of the President, from—

(1) the ''blocked assets'' of terrorist parties, as that term is defined in the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (section 201(d)(2) of Public Law 107–297);

(2) amounts received by the United States by reason of any legal action taken by the United States against any person relating to improper conduct in connection with the Oil for Food Program of the United Nations, including any fines, forfeitures, or disgorgements of amounts received through any activity related to said Program; or

(3) amounts received as a result of any fine or forfeiture obtained from any person or entity in connection with a violation of—

(A) the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App 5(b));

(C) the United and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT) Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–56; 115 Stat. 272);

(D) the Bank Secrecy Act (codified at title 12 U.S.C. 1829 (b) and 1951–1959 and 31 U.S.C. 5311–5313 and 5316–5332);

(E) the Export Administration Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2401–2410); or

(F) any regulations promulgated under an Act listed in subparagraphs (A) through (E).

(g) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF IRANIAN HOSTAGE TAKING IN TEHRAN.—In addition to any amounts that may be awarded under subsection (c), the President or his designee shall from monies deposited for Iran in the Iran Foreign Military Sales Fund account within the Foreign Military Sales Fund (including any amounts accrued as interest thereon)—

(1) pay any person who qualifies for payment under subsection (a)(3) who was taken hostage by the Islamic Republic of Iran on November 4, 1979 or who was taken hostage by Hezbollah on December 4, 1984 and flown to Tehran additional compensation of $500,000, adjusted to reflect the annual percentage change in the Consumer Price Index, from the date on which the hostage taking occurred to the date on which the compensation is paid; and

(2) pay any person who was, at the time of such hostage-taking, the spouse or child of such person, 50 percent of the total amount of compensation paid to the hostage.

SA 456. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert ''The Secretary shall include levees in the Department's list of critical infrastructure sectors''.

SA 457. Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 54, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 57, line 9, and insert the following:

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary, through the Administrator, may award grants to State, local, and tribal governments for the purposes of this title.

''(b) PROGRAMS NOT AFFECTED.—This title shall not be construed to affect any authority to award grants under any of the following Federal programs:

''(1) The firefighter assistance programs authorized under section 33 and 34 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229 and 2229a).

''(2) The Urban Search and Rescue Grant Program authorized under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

''(3) Grants to protect critical infrastructure, including port security grants authorized under section 70107 of title 46, United States Code, and the grants authorized in title XIII and XIV of the Improving America's Security Act of 2007.

''(4) The Metropolitan Medical Response System authorized under section 635 of the

Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 723).

''(5) Grant programs other than those administered by the Department.

''(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The grant programs authorized under this title shall supercede all grant programs authorized under section 1014 of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 3714).

''(2) PROGRAM INTEGRITY.—Each grant program under this title, section 1809 of this Act, or section 662 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 763) shall include, consistent with the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note), policies and procedures for—

''(A) identifying activities funded under any such grant program that are susceptible to significant improper payments; and

''(B) reporting the incidence of improper payments to the Department.

''(3) ALLOCATION.—Except as provided under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the allocation of grants authorized under this title shall be governed by the terms of this title and not by any other provision of law.

''(d) MINIMUM PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall—

''(A) establish minimum performance requirements for entities that receive homeland security grants;

''(B) conduct, in coordination with State, regional, local, and tribal governments receiving grants under this title, section 1809 of this Act, or section 662 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 763), simulations and exercises to test the minimum performance requirements established under subparagraph (A) for—

On page 66, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section—

''(1) for fiscal year 2007, such sums as are necessary;

''(2) for each of fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010, $1,278,639,000; and

''(3) for fiscal year 2011, and each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as are necessary.

On page 77, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 80, line 7, and insert the following:

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section—

''(1) for fiscal year 2007, such sums as are necessary;

''(2) for each of fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010, $913,180,500; and

''(3) for fiscal year 2011, and each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as are necessary.

''SEC. 2005. TERRORISM PREVENTION.

On page 84, strike line 19 and insert the following:

''SEC. 2006. RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.

On page 85, line 25, strike ''611(j)(8)'' and insert ''611(j)(9)''.

On page 86, line 2, strike ''5196(j)(8))'' and insert ''5196(j)(9))''.

On page 87, strike line 22 and insert the following:

''SEC. 2007. ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION.

On page 89, line 7, strike ''under this title'' and insert ''under section 2003 or 2004''.

On page 91, strike line 16 and insert the following:

''SEC. 2008. ACCOUNTABILITY.

On page 94, lines 13 and 14, strike ''the Homeland Security Grant Program'' and insert ''grants made under this title''.

On page 97, strike lines 7 and 8 and insert the following:

''SEC. 2009. AUDITING.

''(a) AUDITS OF GRANTS.—

On page 104, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 105, line 9, and insert the following:

''(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'Emergency Management Performance Grants Program' means the Emergency Management Performance Grants Program under section 662 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 763; Public Law 109-295).

''SEC. 2010. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

''It is the sense of the Senate that, in order to ensure that the Nation is most effectively able to prevent, prepare for, protect against, respond to, recovery from, and mitigate against all hazards, including natural disasters, acts of terrorism, and other man-made disasters—

''(1) the Department should administer a coherent and coordinated system of both terrorism-focused and all-hazards grants, the essential building blocks of which include—

''(A) the Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program established under this title (including funds dedicated to law enforcement terrorism prevention activities);

''(B) the Emergency Communications Operability and Interoperable Communications Grants established under section 1809; and

''(C) the Emergency Management Performance Grants Program authorized under section 662 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 763); and

''(2) to ensure a continuing and appropriate balance between terrorism-focused and all-hazards preparedness, the amounts appropriated for grants under the Urban Area Security Initiative, State Homeland Security Grant Program, and Emergency Management Performance Grants Program in any fiscal year should be in direct proportion to the amounts authorized for those programs for fiscal year 2008 under the amendments made by titles II and IV, as applicable, of the Improving America's Security Act of 2007.''.

On page 106, strike lines 1 through 9, and insert the following:

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by striking the items relating to title XVIII and sections 1801 through 1806, as added by the SAFE Port Act (Public Law 109–347; 120 Stat. 1884), and inserting the following:

''TITLE XIX—DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

''Sec. 1901. Domestic Nuclear Detection Office.
''Sec. 1902. Mission of Office.
''Sec. 1903. Hiring authority.
''Sec. 1904. Testing authority.
''Sec. 1905. Relationship to other Department entities and Federal agencies.
''Sec. 1906. Contracting and grant making authorities.

''TITLE XX—HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS

''Sec. 2001. Definitions.
''Sec. 2002. Homeland Security Grant Program.
''Sec. 2003. Urban Area Security Initiative.
''Sec. 2004. State Homeland Security Grant Program.
''Sec. 2005. Terrorism prevention.
''Sec. 2006. Restrictions on use of funds.
''Sec. 2007. Administration and coordination.
''Sec. 2008. Accountability.
''Sec. 2009. Auditing.
''Sec. 2010. Sense of the Senate.''.

TITLE III—COMMUNICATIONS OPERABILITY AND INTEROPERABILITY

On page 126, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

TITLE IV—EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS PROGRAM

SEC. 401. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS PROGRAM.

Section 622 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 763) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 622. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) POPULATION.—The term 'population' means population according to the most recent United States census population estimates available at the start of the relevant fiscal year.

''(2) STATE.—The term 'State' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101).

''(b) IN GENERAL.—There is an Emergency Management Performance Grants Program to make grants to States to assist State, local, and tribal governments in preparing for, responding to, recovering from, and mitigating against all hazards.

''(c) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State may apply for a grant under this section, and shall submit such information in support of an application as the Administrator may reasonably require.

''(2) ANNUAL APPLICATIONS.—Applicants for grants under this section shall apply or reapply on an annual basis for grants distributed under the program.

''(d) ALLOCATION.—Funds available under the Emergency Management Performance Grants Program shall be allocated as follows:

''(1) BASELINE AMOUNT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each State shall receive an amount equal to 0.75 percent of the total funds appropriated for grants under this section.

''(B) TERRITORIES.—American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the Virgin Islands each shall receive an amount equal to 0.25 percent of the amounts appropriated for grants under this section.

''(2) PER CAPITA ALLOCATION.—The funds remaining for grants under this section after allocation of the baseline amounts under paragraph (1) shall be allocated to each State in proportion to its population.

''(3) CONSISTENCY IN ALLOCATION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), in any fiscal year in which the appropriation for grants under this section is equal to or greater than the appropriation for Emergency Management Performance Grants in fiscal year 2007, no State shall receive an amount under this section for that fiscal year less than the amount that State received in fiscal year 2007.

''(e) ALLOWABLE USES.—Grants awarded under this section may be used to prepare for, respond to, recover from, and mitigate against all hazards through—

''(1) any activity authorized under title VI or section 201 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5195 et seq. and 5131);

''(2) any activity permitted under the Fiscal Year 2007 Program Guidance of the Department for Emergency Management Performance Grants; and

''(3) any other activity approved by the Administrator that will improve the emergency management capacity of State, local, or tribal governments to coordinate, integrate, and enhance preparedness for, response to, recovery from, or mitigation against all-hazards.

''(f) COST SHARING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (i), the Federal share of the costs of an activity carried out with a grant under this section shall not exceed 50 percent.

''(2) IN-KIND MATCHING.—Each recipient of a grant under this section may meet the matching requirement under paragraph (1) by making in-kind contributions of goods or services that are directly linked with the purpose for which the grant is made.

''(g) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—The Administrator shall not delay distribution of grant funds to States under this section solely because of delays in or timing of awards of other grants administered by the Department.

''(h) LOCAL AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In allocating grant funds received under this section, a State shall take into account the needs of local and tribal governments.

''(2) INDIAN TRIBES.—States shall be responsible for allocating grant funds received under this section to tribal governments in order to help those tribal communities improve their capabilities in preparing for, responding to, recovering from, or mitigating against all hazards. Tribal governments shall be eligible for funding directly from the States, and shall not be required to seek funding from any local government.

''(i) EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTERS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may award grants to States under this section to plan for, equip, upgrade, or construct all-hazards State, local, or regional emergency operations centers.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—No grant awards under this section (including for the activities specified under this subsection) shall be used for construction unless such construction occurs under terms and conditions consistent with the requirements under section 611(j)(9) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5196(j)(9).

''(3) COST SHARING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the costs of an activity carried out with a grant under this subsection shall not exceed 75 percent.

''(B) IN KIND MATCHING.—Each recipient of a grant for an activity under this section may meet the matching requirement under subparagraph (A) by making in-kind contributions of goods or services that are directly linked with the purpose for which the grant is made.

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section—

''(1) for fiscal year 2007, such sums as are necessary;

''(2) for each of fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010, $913,180,500; and

''(3) for fiscal year 2011, and each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as are necessary.''.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S.J. RES. 9

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I understand that S.J. Res. 9 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9) to revise United States policy on Iraq.

Mr. BROWN. I now object to any further proceeding with respect to this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The measure will be placed on the calendar.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public law 101–509, the reappointment of Guy Rocha of Nevada to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY 2007

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 102, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 102) supporting the goals of International Woman's Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 102

Whereas there are more 3,000,000,000 women in the world, representing 49.7 percent of the world's population;

Whereas women continue to play the predominant role in caring for families within the home, as well as increasingly supporting their families economically by working outside the home;

Whereas women worldwide participate in diplomacy and politics, contribute to the growth of economies, and improve the quality of the lives of their families, communities, and countries;

Whereas women leaders have recently made significant strides, including through the 2007 election of Representative Nancy Pelosi as the first female Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the 2006 election of Michelle Bachelet as the first female President of Chile, the 2006 election of Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf as President of Liberia and the first female President in the history of Africa, and the 2005 election of Angela Merkel as the first female Chancellor of Germany and who will also serve in 2007 as the second woman to chair a G–8 summit;

Whereas women now account for 80 percent of the world's 70,000,000 micro-borrowers, 75 percent of the 28,000 United States loans supporting small business in Afghanistan are given to women, and 11 women are chief executive officers of Fortune 500 companies in the United States;

Whereas, in the United States, women are graduating from high school and earning bachelor's degrees and graduate degrees at rates greater than men, with 88 percent of women between the ages of 25 and 29 having obtained high school diplomas and 31 percent of women between the ages of 25 of 29 having earned bachelor's degrees;

Whereas even with the tremendous gains for women during the past 20 years, women still face political and economic obstacles, struggle for basic rights, face discrimination, and are targets of gender-based violence all over the world;

Whereas women remain vastly underrepresented worldwide in national and local legislatures, accounting on average for less than 10 percent of the seats in legislatures in most countries, and in no developing region do women hold more than 8 percent of legislative positions;

Whereas women work two-thirds of the world's working hours and produce half of the world's food, yet earn only 1 percent of the world's income and own less than 1 percent of the world's property;

Whereas, in the United States between 1995 and 2000, female managers earned less than their male counterparts in the 10 industries that employ the vast majority of all female employees;

Whereas, of the 1,300,000,000 people living in poverty around the world, 70 percent are women;

Whereas, according to the United States Agency for International Development, two-thirds of the 876,000,000 illiterate individuals worldwide are women, two-thirds of the 125,000,000 school-aged children who are not attending school worldwide are girls, and girls around the world are less likely to complete school than boys;

Whereas women account for half of all cases of HIV/AIDS worldwide, approximately 42,000,000 cases, and in countries with a high prevalence of HIV, young women are at a higher risk than young men of contracting HIV;

Whereas each year over 500,000 women globally die during childbirth or pregnancy;

Whereas domestic violence causes more deaths and disabilities among women between the ages of 15 and 44 than cancer, malaria, traffic accidents, and war;

Whereas worldwide at least 1 out of every 3 women and girls has been beaten in her lifetime, and usually the abuser is a member of the victim's family or is someone else known to the victim;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, at least 1 out of every 6 women and girls in the United States has been sexually abused in her lifetime;

Whereas, in the United States, one-third of the women murdered each year are killed by current or former husbands or boyfriends;

Whereas 130,000,000 girls and young women worldwide have been subjected to female genital mutilation and it is estimated that 10,000 girls are at risk of being subjected to the practice in the United States;

Whereas, according to the Congressional Research Service and the Department of State, illegal trafficking in women and children for forced labor, domestic servitude, or sexual exploitation involves between 600,000 and 900,000 women and children each year, of whom 17,500 are transported into the United States;

Whereas between 75 and 80 percent of the world's 27,000,000 refugees are women and children;

Whereas, in Iraq, women are increasingly becoming the targets of violence by Islamic extremists and street gangs;

Whereas, in Darfur, a growing number of women and girls are being raped, mainly by militia members who use sexual violence as a weapon of war;

Whereas, in Afghanistan, Safia Ama Jan, the former Director of Women's Affairs, became the first female assassinated since the fall of the Taliban; and

Whereas March 8 of each year has been known as ''International Women's Day'' for the last century, and is a day on which people, often divided by ethnicity, language, culture, and income, come together to celebrate a common struggle for women's equality, justice, and peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of ''International Women's Day'';

(2) recognizes and honors the women in the United States and in other countries who have fought and continue to struggle for gender equality and women's rights;

(3) reaffirms its commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, and to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic rights of women and girls both in the United States and in other countries; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women's Day with appropriate programs and activities.

COMMENDING THE KINGDOM OF LESOTHO

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 103, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 103) commending the Kingdom of Lesotho on the occasion of International Women's Day, for the enactment of a law to improve the status of married women and ensure the access of married women to property rights.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I rise today, International Women's Day, in support of this resolution celebrating some of the progress that we and other nations are making in fostering improvement in the status of women. The resolution commends the Kingdom of Lesotho for enacting the Legal Capacity of Married Persons law which elevates the status of married women and provides them with property rights. Prior to this law, married women in Lesotho were considered legal minors, denying them the right to enter into binding contracts or have standing in civil court.

International Women's Day is a day on which we reaffirm the commitment to the struggle by women worldwide for peace, justice, and equality before the law. We also take this opportunity to recognize how far we have come since the first International Women's Day was celebrated in the United States in 1909 when American women were still fighting for the right to vote and a role in the political process.

Today we are able to celebrate the many accomplishments by women worldwide in the areas of health, science, education, and politics. In the past year, we have seen the appointment of our first female Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI. President Bush's cabinet now includes a record number of women—Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings, Secretary of Labor Elaine Chao, and Secretary of Transportation Mary Peters. Women now comprise a record percentage of the 110th Congress, including 16 senators and 71 representatives. Women are gaining seats in parliaments worldwide. For example, last November Lateefa al-Qauod became the first woman to be elected to Bahrain's parliament and became one of the first women to serve in an elected parliament in the Gulf region.

The U.S. is rededicating itself to improving the status of women worldwide. For example, the Millennium Challenge Corporation announced a new policy in December 2006 stating that countries receiving financial assistance would be responsible for extensive planning to ensure that all programs benefit both men and women. This required gender analysis would factor in social, economic, and cultural barriers faced by women and men when engaging in economic activity and would result in better-designed international development projects.

The Kingdom of Lesotho is a small country surrounded by South Africa. Lesotho faces serious challenges—50 percent of the population lives below the poverty line and 23 percent of the population is infected with HIV. Given its commitment to good governance and investment in its people, Lesotho has qualified for financial assistance through the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). MCC assistance is pending the finalization of Lesotho's Compact which is expected to focus on improving health care and water resource management.

The MCC helped catalyze the passage of the Legal Capacity of Married Persons law in Lesotho by stressing that potential MCC financing would be more effective if gender equity were addressed. Subsequently, Lesotho passed the Legal Capacity of Married Persons legislation. Under this new legislation, women are considered equal partners in marriage and are able to enter into binding contracts and have a standing in civil court. We applaud the Kingdom of Lesotho for demonstrating such a commitment to justice, equality, and fighting corruption at every level.

The problems faced by women today require a continuation of our commitment to end them. International Women's Day is a day for us to declare our determination to advance the rights of women worldwide, but also to recognize the many accomplishments made by women on a global scale.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 103) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 103

Whereas International Women's Day, observed on March 8 each year, has become a day on which people come together to recognize the accomplishments of women and to reaffirm their commitment to continue the struggle for equality, justice, and peace;

Whereas the Kingdom of Lesotho is a parliamentary constitutional monarchy that has been an independent country since 1966;

Whereas Lesotho is a low income country with a gross national income per capita of $960 and 50 percent of the population lives below the poverty line;

Whereas, in Lesotho, the HIV prevalence is estimated at 23 percent for the total adult population and 56 percent for pregnant women between the ages of 25 and 29, and the current average life expectancy at birth is estimated to be 34.4 years;

Whereas the Kingdom of Lesotho, referred to by some as the ''Kingdom in the Sky'', was a strong public supporter of the end of apartheid in South Africa and the Government of Lesotho granted political asylum to a number of refugees from South Africa during the apartheid era;

Whereas the Government of Lesotho has demonstrated a strong commitment to ruling justly, investing in people, ensuring economic freedom, and controlling corruption;

Whereas the Government of Lesotho has been named eligible by the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) for a Compact of financial assistance that, as currently proposed, would strongly focus on improving and safeguarding the health of the people of Lesotho, in addition to supporting projects for sustainable water resource management and private sector development;

Whereas historically a married woman in Lesotho was considered a legal minor during the lifetime of her husband, was severely restricted in economic activities, was unable to enter into legally binding contracts without her husband's consent, and had no standing in civil court;

Whereas legislation elevating the legal status of married women and providing property and inheritance rights to women in Lesotho was introduced as early as 1992;

Whereas for years women's groups, nongovernmental organizations, the Federation of Women Lawyers, officials of the Government of Lesotho, and others in Lesotho have pushed for passage of legislation strengthening rights of married women;

Whereas in a letter to the Government of Lesotho in September 2006, the chief executive officer of the MCC stated that gender inequality is a constraint on economic growth and poverty reduction and is related to the high prevalence of HIV/AIDS, and that inattention to issues of gender inequality could undermine the potential impact of the Compact proposed to be entered into between the MCC and the Government of Lesotho;

Whereas the Legal Capacity of Married Persons Act was passed by the Parliament of Lesotho and enacted into law in November 2006;

Whereas the MCC has already provided assistance to further full and meaningful implementation of the new law;

Whereas the MCC has promulgated and is currently implementing a new gender policy to integrate gender into all phases of the development and implementation of the Compact between the MCC and the Government of Lesotho; and

Whereas the MCC's advocacy of gender equity played a supportive role in the enactment of the Legal Capacity of Married Persons Act in the Kingdom of Lesotho: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges the observance of March 8, 2007, as International Women's Day;

(2) applauds the enactment of the Legal Capacity of Married Persons Act by the Kingdom of Lesotho;

(3) lauds the Kingdom of Lesotho for demonstrating its commitment to improve gender equity;

(4) encourages the Kingdom of Lesotho to continue its effort to ensure gender equity; and

(5) commends the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) for developing and implementing policies to advance gender equity in the Kingdom of Lesotho and other countries eligible for financial assistance from the MCC.

DESIGNATING THE UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AT SOUTH FEDERAL PLACE IN SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO, AS THE ''SANTIAGO E. CAMPOS UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE''

DESIGNATING THE FEDERAL BUILDING LOCATED AT 400 MARYLAND AVENUE SOUTHWEST IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS THE ''LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BUILDING''

DESIGNATING THE UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE LOCATED AT 555 INDEPENDENCE STREET IN CAPE GIRARDEAU, MISSOURI, AS THE ''RUSH HUDSON LIMBAUGH, SR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE''

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed en bloc to the consideration of the following two bills which have been received from the House and are at the desk: H.R. 544 and H.R. 584; that the Environment and Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 342, and that the Senate then proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the bills by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 544) to designate the U.S. Courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the ''Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse. ''

A bill (H.R. 584) to designate the federal building located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwest in the District of Columbia as the ''Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building.''

A bill (H.R. 342) to designate the U.S. Courthouse located at 555 Independence Street in Cape Girardeau, MO, as the ''Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills, en bloc.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to support H.R. 584, a bill to name the Department of Education headquarters in Washington, DC, as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building. I am the Senate sponsor of the bill, and Senator CORNYN is the cosponsor.

Lyndon Johnson was the first President to be elected from the State of Texas, and a man, who throughout his over three decades in public life, contributed immensely to improving and enhancing education for all Americans.

President Johnson was born in Stonewall, TX on August 27, 1908. After graduating from high school, and spending a year as an elevator operator, he began his career in the field of education. In 1927, he borrowed $75, and started attending the Southwest Texas State Teachers College in San Marcos.

After graduating in 1930, he devoted a year to teaching mostly Mexican children at the Welhausen School in Cotulla, ninety miles south of San Antonio. Decades later, when he was in the White House, President Johnson reminisced: ''I shall never forget the faces of the boys and the girls in that little Welhausen Mexican School, and I remember even yet the pain of realizing and knowing then that college was closed to practically every one of those children because they were too poor. And I think it was then that I made up my mind that this Nation could never rest while the door to knowledge remained closed to any American.''

Lyndon Baines Johnson never did rest—and after serving as a teacher, a principal, and as head of the Texas National Youth Administration, in 1937, he ran for, and won, a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives.

He was subsequently re-elected to the U.S. House in every election up until 1948, when he was elected to the United States Senate. Later, in 1961, he resigned from the U.S. Senate to become Vice President; and on November 22, 1963, a date that none of us will ever forget, Lyndon Johnson became the 36th President of the United States.

In 1965, President Johnson signed two landmark education bills: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (which authorized the first real Federal assistance to grade school education) and The Higher Education Act (which funded scholarships to undergraduate students).

In the same year, President Johnson launched Project Head Start as an eight-week summer program to provide preschool children from low-income families with a comprehensive program to meet their emotional, social, health, nutritional, and psychological needs.

During his six-year presidency, Lyndon B. Johnson signed a combined total of over 60 education bills. In a very real sense, he was America's first ''Education President.''

After leaving office, President Johnson continued his involvement in education by teaching students while he wrote his memoirs.

President Johnson passed away on January 22, 1973, and even though it's been 34 years since his passing, he still doesn't have a Federal building in the District of Columbia named after him.

I believe it is time that President Johnson's distinguished service, and particularly, his outstanding work on behalf of education, be recognized in our Nation's capital.

Naming the Department of Education headquarters in Washington, DC, as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building is a fitting honor for this smalltown Texas teacher who, after decades of service, went on to become our ''Education President.''

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read the third time, passed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc; that the consideration of these items appear separately in the RECORD, and that any statements thereon be printed in the RECORD as if read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bills (H.R. 544, H.R. 584, and H.R. 342) were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Monday, March 12; that on Monday following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. On behalf of the leader, I remind Members that on Monday, March 12, there will be no rollcall votes, as has been previously announced.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007, AT 2:30 P.M.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, and the Republican leader has no further business, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:11 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 12, 2007, at 2:30 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PAYING TRIBUTE TO LANCE CORPORAL RAUL S. BRAVO, JR.

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of LCpl Raul S. Bravo, Jr. who died on Saturday, March 3, 2007, of injuries sustained in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Lance Corporal Bravo, who was on his second tour of duty in Iraq, was killed by a roadside bomb during combat operations in the city of Qaim, Anbar province, Iraq. Lance Corporal Bravo was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 4th Marines, 1st Marine Division, Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center.

Lance Corporal Bravo, a 2004 graduate of Elko High School, was a hero whose desire to serve his country will forever make an impact on his family, his community and his country. He joined the United States Marine Corps to serve his country in the global war on terror. He will not only be remembered for his sacrifice and willing service, but for the extraordinary person that he was. His warmth and optimism brightened the lives of his family and friends.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor the life of LCpl Raul S. Bravo, Jr. who made the ultimate sacrifice for his country while fighting the war on terror and defending democracy and freedom.

IN RECOGNITION OF MACARIA MABINI

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the amazing life of Macaria Mabini on the occasion of her 90th birthday, and to thank her for all her contributionsn to northeast Ohio.

Born in the Philippines on March 10, 1917 as the granddaughter of Apolinario Mabini, the first prime minister of the Philippines, Macaria was destined for a life of distinction. She was a studious and talented youth, committed to her studies and her musical development as a pianist. Macaria received her bachelor of arts degree as well as her master of education from National University in Manila, but her irrepressible wanderlust and curiosity about the world left her craving more. In 1954, that curiosity—and the SS *Wilson*—brought her to the United States. After arriving in the United States, Macaria quickly invested herself in her new community. She obtained her second master's degree, in guidance counseling from John Carroll University and dedicated herself to giving voice to the voiceless and power to the powerless. Macaria helped couples mend broken relationships and empowered them to make healthier decisions; she came to the aid of people battling abuse and addiction; and, in founding the Giving Tree, she provided solace for men and women in recovery.

Macaria's dedication to her fellow brothers and sisters has hardly waned; indeed the scope ofher work has increased. With the Association of Philippine Physicians in Ohio, she now returns annually to her homeland to administer medical care to the underserved and rural populations of the Philippines.

Amazingly, in retirement Macaria still finds time to satisfy that wanderlust that brought her to northeast Ohio over 50 years ago. She makes an annual pilgrimage to the Shrine of St. Anne de Beaupre in Quebec, and can claim pilgrimages to Lourdes, Fatima, and the summit of Medjugorje among her accomplishments as well.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Macaria Mabini on her 90th birthday, and to celebrate a lifetime of pouring herself out for her fellow brothers and sisters. May her constant affirmation of the human spirit serve as inspiration for us all.

INTRODUCTION OF CREDIT CARD ACCOUNTABILITY, RESPONSIBILITY, AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2007 OR ''CREDIT CARD ACT OF 2007''

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today I am again introducing legislation to add some common-sense rules to the laws governing issuance of credit cards. The bill is cosponsored by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CLEAVER. I am grateful for his assistance and support.

Americans benefit from the widespread availability of consumer credit, and their use of that credit has been important to our economy. But there are some warning signs that signal a need for some additional legislation.

Overall, during the last decade, total credit-card debt rose by about 70 per cent, and this clearly has an effect on consumers. Some polls have reported that about 70 percent of surveyed families said the quality of their lives is adversely affected by the extent of their debts, and young people are more worried about going deeply into debt than about a terrorist attack.

For many Americans, consumer credit is more than a convenience. It is something that many people need to use to pay for their everyday needs. For them, it is a necessity. And, of course, another word for credit is debt.

In a recent report on family finances, the Federal Reserve said that from the third quarter of 2001 to the same period in 2004, inflation-adjusted household debt increased by more than 26 percent. During the same period, when incomes remained about the same, more families carried a credit-card balance and the average balance owed on a card rose nearly 16 percent, to $5,100.

Some have argued that much of this debt was caused by recklessness and an erosion of financial responsibility. That was one of the main arguments advanced in support of the recently-passed legislation to revise the bankruptcy laws. But while there was something to that argument, it was not the whole story and it put too much emphasis on borrowers alone.

Instead of just focusing on borrowers, Congress should also do more to promote responsibility by those who provide the credit—and one place to start is with credit card companies.

For example, let's talk about interest rates. Credit is not free, and it should not be. But consumers should be treated fairly.

We have all seen print ads and commercials that advertise very low interest rates, but don't make clear that these rates can change, sometimes without warning, and that higher rates can apply even if a consumer gets a warning and then acts to cancel a card.

The bill would address that by requiring that a credit card company provide advance notice of any increase (unless the increase results from the expiration of an introductory rate for new accounts or a change in another rate to which the credit-card rate is indexed) and notice of the right to avoid paying the higher rate by canceling the card before the new rate takes effect. And it says that if the consumer does cancel the card in time, any remaining amounts owed on that card will be subject to the terms and conditions that applied at the time of cancellation.

Similarly, the bill would require that card holders be more fully informed about the relationship between the monthly minimum payments and the full amounts owing on their cards and what monthly payment would be required to eliminate the outstanding balance in 36 months if they do not their cards to make additional purchases.

Further, the bill would require that card holders be given clear notice of any fees, other charges, or increases in interest rates that would result from their making late payments.

For payments made by mail, card holders would have to be given a reasonable time for their payments to be received and would have be to told the date on which a mailed payment must be postmarked in order to avoid fees, charges, or increased interest rates.

And if a card issuer accepts payments made in person, a payment made at least one day before the due date would mean that no late-payment penalties would be in order.

The bill also would bar charging fees or other penalties because a card holder pays more than the monthly minimum or pays in full an existing account balance or because a card holder does not use the card during some particular period of time.

It would bar imposing a fee for a charge that would mean a card holder has gone over the total credit authorized on a card if the card

issuer has authorized that charge either in advance or at the time of a purchase.

And the bill would prohibit the use of ''universal default'' clauses—provisions that allow card issuers to impose a new, higher interest rate on a credit card account if there has been any change for the worse in the cardholder's credit score—even if the change is unrelated to the credit card account. Under ''universal default,'' a card holder can be saddled with such an increased rate not only for being late on big-ticket items such as a car or a mortgage payment, but for something as relatively minor as being late (even once) on some other credit card, or a utility payment, carrying too much debt overall, having ''too much'' available credit and open trade lines, making ''too many'' credit inquiries, or getting a new mortgage or car loan.

The bill also would limit issuance of credit cards to people under the age of 18. People under that age applying for a credit card will need one of three things—the signature of a parent or guardian willing to take responsibility for the applicant's debts; information indicating that the applicant has some other means of repaying any debt; or a certification that the applicant has completed a credit counseling course by a qualified nonprofit budget and credit counseling agency. These requirements would apply to issuance of both regular credit cards and college ''affinity cards.''

And, finally, the bill increases the amounts people injured by violations of the rules can collect from card issuers.

Madam Speaker, this bill is similar to one I introduced in the 109th Congress. It would take some simple, common-sense steps to stop abusive practices, educate cardholders, and stiffen the penalties for violations. I think it deserves to be enacted.

For the benefit of our colleagues, I am attaching an outline of the bill's provisions.

OUTLINE OF THE BILL

Section One provides a short title and table of contents. The short title is ''Credit Card Accountability, Responsibility, and Disclosure Act of 2007 or 'Credit CARD Act of 2007' ''

Section Two authorizes the Federal Reserve's Board of Governors to issue rules or publish model forms to implement the bill and the changes it makes in existing law

TITLE I

Title I amends the Truth in Lending Act regarding certain credit-card rates and fees.

Section 101 requires at least 15 days' notice of certain increases in interest rates and requires card holders to be told of their right to cancel an account before the increases take effect.

Section 102 imposes a freeze on interest-rate terms and fees applicable to accounts closed or cancelled before a scheduled rate increase.

Section 103 bars charging penalty fees for—(1) on-time payments; (2) either full payment of a balance owed or a payment larger than the minimum required amount; or (3) non-use of a card for any particular period of time.

Section 104 bars imposing fees for a purchase that exceeds a credit card's limit if the lender approves the charge in advance or at the time the card holder makes the purchase.

Section 105 bars ''universal default,'' meaning the practice of imposing a higher interest rate on a credit card because of a change in a cardholder's credit score even if that change is unrelated to the credit card account.

TITLE II

Title II amends the Truth in Lending Act's provisions regarding disclosures to card holders.

Section 201 specifies information that must be provided regarding outstanding balances, required monthly minimum payments, grace periods for avoiding additional charges, and the monthly payments needed to pay off the balance in 36 months.

Section 202 requires that card holders be told the date by which mailed payments must be postmarked to avoid late fees, whether (and by how much) interest rates will be increased because of one or more late payments, whether (and if so, where) a payment can be made in person and when it must be made to avoid late fees (which must be no sooner than one business day before the payment is due).

TITLE III

Title III adds provisions to the Truth in Lending Act dealing with issuing credit cards to people under age 18 and amends the Act's provisions regarding penalties.

Section 301 requires that a credit card can be issued to someone under 18 only if the application includes either (1) the signature of a parent, legal guardian, spouse, or other person willing and able to be jointly liable for amounts charged on the card before the card holder becomes 18; or (2) financial information showing the applicant has enough independent means to be able to repay amounts charged on the card; or (3) proof that the applicant has completed a credit-counseling course by a nonprofit budget and credit counseling agency meeting certain specified requirements.

Section 302 allows borrowers injured by violations of credit-card rules to collect increased amounts from card issuers. Current law says they can recover at least $200 but no more than $2,000. This section would increase that to at least $500 or twice the amount of an improper finance charge (whichever is higher), with an overall limit of $5,000 for isolated violations or appropriately higher amounts for established patterns or practices of violations.

Section 303 makes the rules specified in section 301 for regular credit cards apply as well to college ''affinity cards'' (a card with the logo or name of an institution of higher education in addition to that of the lender) issued to someone under age 18.

HONORING THE FAIR OAKS VOLUNTEER FIRE AND RESCUE COMPANY

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Fair Oaks Volunteer Fire and Rescue Company, FOVFR, as it celebrates its 50th anniversary.

Since its inception in 1957, FOVFR has achieved great success. Working alongside career personnel, the company has provided high quality fire, medical, emergency, and support services.

In my experiences with the company, I have seen its unwavering dedication to the Fairfax County community as well as its volunteers' strong values of unity, performance and personalized delivery.

While FOVFR has admirably served the Fairfax County community for 50 years, their efforts in 2006 were especially notable. During the past year, volunteers spent 9,613 hours actively responding to emergency situations. Volunteer stand-by units supported the Marine Corps Marathon, the Annual National Down Syndrome Society's Buddy Walk, various high school band competitions and more.

Company statistics show a growing need for FOVFR's excellent services. Response levels for basic life support, canteen and command level services all were elevated last year, in certain cases by as much as 30 percent. I am confident that FOVFR will continue to rise to the occasion to meet the needs of their local community in the years to come.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the men and women who serve in the Fair Oaks Fire and Rescue Company. Their efforts, made on behalf of the citizens of Fairfax County, are selfless acts of heroism and truly merit our highest praise. I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding this group of remarkable citizens and congratulate them on their 50th anniversary.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY STATEMENT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, On March 8, men and women around the world celebrated International Women's Day. Women have certainly made enormous strides but as we celebrate the recent successes of women in leadership here in the United States and abroad, we must not forget the many women and girls who are struggling to assert their human rights.

The reality is that women and girls continue to suffer from discrimination and violence and face enormous obstacles in their ability to succeed in any arena. The reality is that women are still not equal to men.

Women work two-thirds of the world's working hours and produce half of the world's food, yet earn only 1 percent of the world's income, and own less than 1 percent of the world's property.

Harmful traditional practices in many nations, such as dowry murder, honor killings and female genital mutilation continue without signs of abatement. An estimated five thousand women are murdered by family members each year and 2 million girls and women a year are at risk of female genital mutilation.

Trafficking has become a worldwide crisis which involves between 1 and 2 million women and children each year.

While many young women are taking advantage of increased opportunities and graduating from higher education in record numbers, there are many girls around the world whose choices are severely restricted because of their gender. Girls in various countries face severe violence, forced early marriage, and dangerous childbirth.

Early marriage almost always ends formal educational opportunities for girls and it is estimated that in the next decade, 100 million girls will be married before the age of 18. In Africa, more than half of girls do not complete primary school education. Due to early childbirth and poor maternal healthcare, there are

approximately 100,000 new cases of obstetric fistula among young women every year.

Women around the world look to the United States for leadership and assistance in advancing women's rights in their communities. We should be doing more to help them. In recognition of this need, I plan to reintroduce the International Women's Freedom Act, which is modeled after the successful International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (IRFA). IRFA established the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, which over the past 7 years, has drawn attention to the importance of protecting religious freedom around the world. The Commission's annual report and recommendations has had an impact on the protection of human rights around the world, with many of the Commission's recommendations being taken up by the President, the Congress, and the State Department.

The International Women's Freedom Act will, like IRFA, establish an office in the State Department and a U.S. Commission, which will focus on International Women's Rights. The Commission will draft an annual report on violations of women's human rights abroad and the legislation will force the U.S. to consider these violations when determining foreign policy.

There are many women who we salute on International Women's Day for breaking barriers. But let us also acknowledge the women who face hurdles which seem insurmountable. Those women who live in desperate poverty, who don't have basic health care, and who fear violence from their own family members are the women we need to think about today.

As a superpower, as a country of compassionate concerned citizens, as human beings; let's commit ourselves to doing something about the state of the world's most vulnerable women as we celebrate International Women's Day.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF DEL NORTE COUNTY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the County of Del Norte, the very northwest corner of the 1st Congressional District and the State of California.

Del Norte County features an extraordinary landscape that includes majestic redwoods and spectacular coastline. It is home to Redwood National and State Parks, the sparkling waters of the wild and scenic Smith River and the Smith River National Recreation Area. The residents are extraordinary and rugged individuals, who work hard and who value the very special place in which they live.

The county was created by the California Legislature in 1857, which transformed a portion of former Klamath County, California, into a new political entity known as Del Norte County.

The Yurok and Tolowa peoples have called the region home for thousands of years and continue to play a vital role in the life of Del Norte County. Their skills in woodworking and basketry were exceptional and form the basis of a thriving cultural and artistic community.

The first timber mill was brought by ship to Del Norte County in 1853, and over the next 100 plus years produced lumber that was used to build the state and realize the dreams of all Californians. The rich ocean environment has created a dynamic fishing industry and the mild climate and fertile fields of the Smith River plain grow the Nation's supply of Easter lilies. The county is blessed with two historic lighthouses, Battery Point and Point St. George. The county seat of Crescent City has the distinction of being the only city in the continental United States to be struck by a tsunami wave, on March 28, 1964. Despite the destruction of over 150 businesses, the hearty character of local residents was on display during the rapid reconstruction of the town, earning the name, "Comeback Town USA".

Madam Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we recognize the County of Del Norte on the occasion of their 150th anniversary, and congratulate the residents of Del Norte County on all that they have achieved.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO NILA SPEER

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Nila Speer, a member of a pioneering Las Vegas family, who passed away on February 19, 2007 at the age of 87.

Throughout her 87 years, Mrs. Speer was a dedicated member of the community and witnessed the City of Las Vegas develop into a major metropolitan area. Her civic commitment was evident in the many community organizations in which she was involved. Among the many organizations Nila was involved in were the Beta Sigma Phi Sorority, of which she was a charter member, and the Mesquite Club.

Nila influenced the lives of countless young girls as director of the local Girl Scout Council and as PTA President of Mayfair Elementary School, Crestwood Elementary School and John C. Fremont Junior High School. As a politically active member of the community, Nila campaigned for numerous candidates and was most proud of her efforts for former Governor and U.S. Senator Richard Bryan. In addition to her civic work, Nila was also a devoted Sunday school teacher at the First Methodist Church.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor the life and memory of Nila Speer. Her dedication to the community was commendable and the Las Vegas community will miss this significant resident.

IN RECOGNITION OF DETECTIVE JAMES METZLER

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor James Metzler, a devoted police officer for the Cleveland Police Department for 25 years. Mr. Metzler is an exemplar for this community in his efforts to make Cleveland a safer and more vibrant city.

Mr. Metzler was appointed to the Cleveland Police Department on June 15, 1981. After graduating from the police academy, Mr. Metzler was assigned to Basic Patrol in the Forth District. Detective Metzler's commitment to his community shone through in his work, as he ascended the ranks. He later joined the First District Basic Patrol and eventually the First District Detective Bureau, before being dispatched to the Homicide Unit.

Police officers have the awesome responsibility of maintaining peace and order within the community. On a daily basis, they have to display courage and just decision-making. Throughout his career, Detective Metzler embraced this responsibility. He led by example and defined what it meant to wear a badge. Detective Metzler personified integrity, hard work, and dedication.

For 25 years, Detective Metzler served Cleveland with distinction, with unyielding pride, and with an abiding concern for the welfare of our community. In an age that has seen the disintegration of the community, Detective Metzler's unwavering commitment to the fabric of Cleveland has left us safer, healthier, and better equipped to face our challenges.

Madame Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring a true American hero, Detective James Metzler, and in celebrating his life of serving others and striving to make Cleveland a better place. We all owe a debt of gratitude to James Metzler.

INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL LANDS RESTORATION, ENHANCEMENT, PUBLIC EDUCATION, AND INFORMATION RESOURCES ACT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide additional resources for use by the Federal land-managing agencies to restore lands damaged as a result of improper activities and to promote public education about the use of the Federal lands. My Colorado colleague, Representative TANCREDO, is again cosponsoring the legislation. I greatly appreciate his support.

The bill is based on one part of a bill introduced by Representative TANCREDO that I cosponsored in the 108th and 109th Congresses. Our purpose is to improve the ability of the land-managing agencies—the Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Interior Department as well as the Forest Service in the Agriculture Department—to adequately enforce the rules that apply to uses of the lands they manage.

In the 108th Congress, Mr. TANCREDO and I worked with the Resources Committee's Chairman, Ranking Member, and other Members, to develop a substitute that included a number of improvements in the bill. The Resources Committee approved that substitute, which included provisions similar to those in the bill I am introducing today. However, after the Resources Committee completed its work,

the measure was reviewed by the Judiciary Committee, which made further changes before the bill went to the House floor.

The most significant change was deletion of the provisions of the bill that allowed the agencies to retain fines paid for violations of land-use regulations and to use those funds for repairing damages to the lands and for public education. I regretted that change because in addition to more adequate authority to enforce regulations, the land-managing agencies need more resources—more money and more people—if we want them to do a better job.

The House passed the bill as revised by the Judiciary Committee, but the 108th Congress adjourned before the Senate could complete action on it. Accordingly, in the 109th Congress Mr. TANCREDO reintroduced the House-passed bill and I cosponsored it, and I introduced a separate bill which he cosponsored. We are repeating that pattern of cooperation today.

The Tancredo-Udall bill of the 108th Congress would have allowed the land-managing agencies to use money from fines to help pay for some of the restoration work caused by violations of regulations and for public education.

The bill I am introducing today is similar. It would allow agencies to use money collected as fines to be used for repairing damage caused by the actions that lead to the fines or by similar actions. It would also allow them to use the money to increase public awareness of regulations and other requirements regarding use of Federal lands. And it provides that any of the money not needed for those purposes would be credited to the Crime Victims Fund in the Treasury.

Madam Speaker, this is a modest bill but an important one. I think it deserves the support of our colleagues and I will do all I can to achieve its enactment into law.

HONORING SALLY B. ORMSBY

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations 2006 Fairfax County Citizen of the Year, Sally B. Ormsby.

For the past 40 years Sally B. Ormsby has been a dedicated community activist fighting on behalf of her neighbors in Mantua and the residents of Fairfax County, Virginia. Her community activism started through focused pursuits on parent-teacher associations and garden clubs, but blossomed into larger roles that ultimately changed the face of the community in which she lived.

Most notably, in 1990, when a local underground oil spill rocked the foundation and stability of her local Mantua community, she rallied her neighbors, calmed fears and sought logical and appropriate remedies to the issues at hand. In the midst of the community outrage that followed concerning associated health risks and collapsing home values, Sally's steady hand played a key role in addressing the containment, control, and remediation of the affected grounds. This highlights just one of her many crowning achievements where her hard work and dedication overcame immense obstacles for the betterment of Fairfax County.

Over the years she has served as president of the Federation of Fairfax County Citizens Associations, chair of the Providence District Council of Civic Associations, president of the Woodson High School PTA, appointee to the Committee on Revenue Expenditures, a member of the board of directors of the League of Women Voters and president of the Mantua Civic Association, to name a few.

Sally has always been able and willing to step forward when duty called, to work toward the positive resolution of pressing local issues. Her leadership is most evident in the face of crisis where her ethos of service acts as a beacon guiding her fellow citizens towards their collective end goal.

While compiling this impressive legacy of service, Sally has been a dedicated wife to her husband, Dr. W. Clayton Ormsby, and loving mother to her two children, Alison and Tyler.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to commend and congratulate Sally on her impressive record of service to Fairfax County. I call upon my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Sally B. Ormsby, the 2006 Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations Citizen of the Year.

REINTRODUCTION OF ''VOTERS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT''

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, today, I, along with Representative PETRI (R–WI), reintroduce legislation to subject operators of push polls or phone banks to the same disclosure requirements as other types of political communication. It will not ban push polls or phone banking—it will simply create a level playing field for all types of political communication. Under this bill, any person conducting these types of calls would be required to disclose to each recipient of a call the identity of the organization paying for the call. In addition, the bill would require that campaigns and other organizations that conduct advocacy phone calls report to the Federal Election Commission (FEC) the number of households they have contacted and the script they used in making the calls. The bill would not interfere with legitimate polling, conducted either by candidates or independent organizations, as it would only apply to phone banks in which more than 1,500 households are contacted within the 25 days preceding a federal election.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF LEO T. McCARTHY AND EXPRESSING PROFOUND SORROW ON HIS DEATH

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to extend my deep sympathies to the family of the honorable Leo T. McCarthy, including his loving wife, Jackie Lee Burke, his four wonderful children, Sharon, Conna, Adam and Niall, and his 11 grandchildren.

Leo McCarthy's passing is a great loss for the state of California. He was a champion of equality and social justice. He was a model of public service, both as a legislator and a citizen.

Leo McCarthy dedicated his life to improving the lives of his fellow Californians.

In the California State Assembly, Leo McCarthy reformed the institution by bringing increased openness and accountability to the legislative process.

As a three-term Lieutenant Governor, Leo McCarthy took on some of our state's most challenging social issues. He implemented programs that empowered our state's impoverished and disenfranchised citizens and aided those who could not stand for themselves. These programs have greatly increased the quality of life in California, and each day numerous Californians benefit from his wisdom and leadership.

Leo McCarthy was also a champion of the environment. He led the enactment of the California Coastal Act, which has helped conserve California's precious coastal resources and further protect our coast from offshore drilling.

Leo McCarthy was also a model politician. I had a great deal of respect for the honesty and fairness he brought to the political process. I admired how he instilled the values of public service and social justice into future generations. The Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good at the University of San Francisco is an example of how his legacy will benefit our state for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, Leo McCarthy's contributions to our state are immeasurable. He was a friend to me and all of California, and his presence will be missed even as his legacy endures.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO PASTOR NATHANIEL WHITNEY

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Pastor Nathaniel Whitney.

Pastor Whitney was born in Tallulah, Louisiana on June 23, 1926 and was the twelfth of fourteen children. In 1944, at the age of 18, Nathaniel enlisted in the United States Army where he nobly served his country in both the Pacific and Atlantic theaters. Following 30 months of service in the armed forces, Nathanial was honorably discharged.

In 1951, Nathanial relocated to Las Vegas with his wife Carolyn. After arriving in Las Vegas, Nathaniel became involved with the Carver Baptist Church until 1965 when he became pastor of the Evergreen Missionary Baptist Church. In addition to dedicating himself to his church, Nathaniel was very involved in a number of community and outreach organizations; such as, the National Baptist Convention, the National Baptist Congress of Christian Education, the Pride of the West District

Association, the Ministers Alliance, and the local chapter of the NAACP.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor the life and memory of Pastor Nathaniel Whitney. His dedication to both the Las Vegas and Baptist community is commendable and should serve as an example to us all. Pastor Whitney will be deeply missed by the countless lives he touched.

IN RECOGNITION OF DETECTIVE JAMES GAJOWSKI

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a role model who committed 27 years to the Cleveland Police Department, James Gajowski, and to recognize his efforts toward making Cleveland a safer place.

Mr. Gajowski was appointed to the Cleveland Police Department on July 29, 1979. After graduating from the police academy, Mr. Gajowski's first beat was the Third District Basic Patrol. As his career progressed, he served in the Third District Detective Bureau as well as the Third District Strike Force Unit. Eventually Detective Gajowski ascended to the Homicide Unit, in which he served with distinction and dedication.

One of duties of police officers is to place others' well being before their own. They are the first to respond in times of peril, and as a community we ask them to risk their lives continually in order to preserve the peace and safety of our own. For 27 years, Detective Gajowski did just that, standing guard in our great city so that we might sleep well, that we might live in peace.

Although police officers are an indispensable component to living in a civil society, they frequently go underappreciated and overlooked. Detective Gallows served with distinction and served with pride, but never demanded attention or recognition. The safety and well being of Cleveland was reward enough.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring James Gajowski for his life long commitment to law enforcement and public service, and giving him the recognition he so richly deserves. Through his commitment to justice, Mr. Gajowski set a shining example for all to follow.

INTRODUCTION OF PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION LEGISLATION

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to authorize the Interior Department to participate in the implementation of the Platte River Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Species in the Central and Lower Platte River Basin.

Its purpose is to continue a cooperative effort involving the Federal Government and the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming (and other entities and groups) aimed at recovery of endangered species in ways that will not involve the creation of Federal water rights or requiring the grant of water rights to Federal entities. Information about the background of the legislation and the program follows:

BILL TO AUTHORIZE PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

BACKGROUND

Since 1997, the States of Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming have worked with water users, conservation groups and the Interior Department to develop way to allow continued water use and development along the Platte River to comply with the Endangered Species Act.

In late 2006 the 3 States and the Interior Department signed the final agreement for a basin-wide Recovery Program to benefit three endangered species (interior least tern, whooping crane, and pallid sturgeon) and one threatened species (piping plover) referred to as the ''target species.'' The Federal government is to pay half the cost—and the bill would authorize appropriation of those federal funds. The total authorization would be $157.14 million plus any needed inflation adjustments.

RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Program is designed to secure defined benefits for the target species and their associated habitats while also providing ESA compliance for existing and certain new water-related activities in the Platte River basin. It is to be incremental, with the First Increment coming over the next 13 years. It would be implemented by a Governance Committee with membership including representatives of the three states, the Interior Department, water users, and environmental groups.

While the Program is designed to provide ESA compliance for existing and certain new water related activities throughout the Platte River basin upstream of the confluence of the Platte and the Loup Rivers (in Nebraska), the land acquisition and management for the target bird species will occur in the central Platte River region (Lexington to Chapman, Nebraska), and Program water activities would be designed to provide benefits for the target bird species in the central Platte River region and for the pallid sturgeon in the lower Platte River region (below the confluence with the Elkhorn River).

ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAM

The Program has three main elements: (1) increasing stream flows in the central Platte River during relevant time periods through retiming and water conservation/supply projects; (2) enhancing, restoring and protecting habitat lands for the target bird species; and (3) accommodating certain new water related activities. It will achieve these results through an adaptive management approach employing scientific monitoring and research to evaluate the management actions and species habitat needs. These elements will be implemented according to underlying principles that require interests in land to be acquired only from willing participants and avoid increasing tax burdens to local citizens by paying taxes or their equivalent on Program lands. Program lands will be held by a land holding entity (rather than by the federal or state governments) and will be managed under a ''good neighbor'' policy.

WATER

The Program's long-term objective for water is to provide sufficient water to and through the central Platte River habitat area to assist in improving and maintaining habitat for the target species using incentive based water projects. During the First Increment (13 years) the Program's objective is to retime and improve flows in the central Platte River to reduce shortages to target flows by an average of 130,000 to 150,000 acre-feet per year at Grand Island.

LAND

During the First Increment, the Program's objective is to protect, restore, and maintain 10,000 acres of habitat. The Program's long-term objective for land is to acquire land interests, restore where appropriate, and maintain and manage approximately 29,000 acres of suitable habitat along the central Platte River between Lexington and Chapman, Nebraska. Land acquired during the Program's First Increment will be credited to this long-term objective as will certain lands that meet criteria established by the Governance Committee but are managed by other entities such as environmental organizations or utility and irrigation districts.

FUTURE WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND NEW DEPLETIONS

One Program purpose is to mitigate the adverse impacts of certain new water related activities through the implementation of state and federal depletions plans. This will allow continued growth and water development to occur in the Platte River basin along with improving conditions for the target species.

HONORING LEE A. RAU

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Lee A. Rau, recipient of the 2006 Citation of Merit by the Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Association.

A resident of Reston, Virginia, since the 1960s, Mr. Rau has worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life of Fairfax County residents. Possessing a true passion for the less fortunate, Mr. Rau has addressed the growing problem of housing affordability in Northern Virginia by offering his legal expertise to a variety of community projects.

Throughout his career as a notable public servant, Mr. Rau has been involved with myriad civic organizations including Reston Association, Lake Anne Village Center Revitalization Project, Reston Interfaith, Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority, Greater Reston Arts Council, and the High Rise Affordability Panel established by Hunter Mill District Supervisor Cathy Hudgins. Through this work, Mr. Rau is able to assist Fairfax County in meeting affordable housing goals: increasing the supply, encouraging their provision, conserving stable neighborhoods and revitalizing older neighborhoods.

While actively engaged in civic activity throughout Fairfax County, Mr. Rau has also served on an extensive list of professional associations such as the American Bar Association, Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, United States Chamber of Commerce Council on Antitrust Policy, D.C. Bar Energy Study Group, and the Constitutional and Administrative Law Advisory Committee of the National Chamber Litigation Center, Inc.

Mr. Rau was named the 1990 Restonian of the Year; was awarded the Best of Reston Award in 1996, and is more than deserving of this Citation of Merit. His commitment to his

community and to making the county a better place to live for all of its residents is to be commended.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I applaud Lee Rau for his public service and receipt of the Citation of Merit by the Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Association. I call upon my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on this distinguished achievement.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO SUSAN BONNEY

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Susan Bonney for her exceptional work at William B's Steakhouse formerly located in the Stardust.

Susan Bonney had worked for the Stardust for over 7 years. Over the course of her career with Boyd Gaming she catered to the needs of the high-end clientele at William B's until the close of this legendary property on November 1, 2006. Following the closure of William B's, Susan decided to stay with the Boyd Gaming Corp., because of its family-like style of business. Susan subsequently became the restaurant manager for the Orleans Hotel and Casino, continuing her distinguished career to providing great service and respect to the guests of the hotel while making their time in Las Vegas memorable. Susan has also recently been recognized by Casino Magazine for her many years of exceptional service.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor Susan Bonney. Her professional successes and exemplary record of service are commendable. I applaud Susan for her leadership and wish her continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF RICHARD J. WILD

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Richard J. Wild upon his retirement as athletic director of Saint Ignatius of Antioch School, and to celebrate over 30 years of service to the Church as well as the surrounding community.

Rich began his avocation in the 1970s as an engaged parent, hoping to be more involved in the development of his children. As his children grew and moved on, Rich recognized the importance of the athletic program to the St. Ignatius parish as well as the community as a whole. In 1979, Rich agreed to become the Activities and Athletic Director; he quickly set out to revitalize the program and ensure that all youth who wanted to participate in sports had a place to go.

The early years of Rich's tenure were challenging. As the parish community shrunk and enrollment at the school shrunk, St. Ignatius faced the dim proposition of cutting back programming or eliminating whole sports. However, Rich refused to accept the idea that limiting access to athletics was the only course of action. Instead, Rich developed an innovative athletic program that adapted to the changing parish environment and expanded its reach to the whole community. As a result, the St. Ignatius athletic program thrived while serving more youth.

Today, the St. Ignatius of Antioch parish athletic program serves 345 youth from over fifty schools. Rich Wild has taken a parish-based program and, with three decades worth of compassion, commitment, and unfailing determination, has turned it into a community institution.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Rich Wild on the occasion of his retirement, and in celebrating his dedication to St. Ignatius of Antioch parish. As Rich enters into the next phase of his life accompanied by his loving wife Georgia, three children and seven grandchildren, the fruits of his labor will be enjoyed for generations to come.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL R. SMITH, SR.

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak about Daniel R. "Dan" Smith, Sr., a truly remarkable man who will be celebrating his 75th birthday this Sunday, March 11.

Born in Winsted, CT, on March 11, 1932, Dan is one of a few surviving African-American children of a slave. His father, Abram Smith, was born in 1863. Age 70 when Dan was born, he died when Dan was 6. Dan's mother, Clara Wheeler Smith, was a young bride. A domestic worker, she raised her 8 children plus other foster children.

Dan graduated from Gilbert High School in Winsted, Connecticut. He entered the U.S. Army and served in Korea as a medic, operating room technician, in the Korean War. He also was trained as a water safety instructor and after returning home from Korea, he performed heroic actions during the 1955 Winsted flood, diving into a raging river and saving a man's life.

Dan attended Springfield College, in Massachusetts, where he majored in general studies with minors in psychology and sociology. He was elected student body president and graduated in 1960.

During the 1960s he had a broad range of professional experiences. Building on his education and experiences as a medic in the Army, he served as a social worker at Norwich State Hospital, a 3,000 bed psychiatric hospital in Connecticut, and at the Seaside Regional Center for the mentally retarded in Waterford, Connecticut.

One of Dan's many loves is animals, especially dogs. During high school he had worked for a veterinarian and learned to be a dog trainer. He took additional pre-med courses and was accepted into the Veterinary School of Tuskegee Institute, Alabama.

This was during the height of the Civil Rights movement, however, and the pull of public service was strong. Dan left his studies to become executive director of an anti-poverty program launched by Sargent Shriver in Lowndes County, Alabama, one of the Civil Rights' "hot beds." The church in which his program was housed was burned by arsonists, but he had carefully saved all his documentation, and was able to start again almost immediately. He participated in many Civil Rights activities and nearly lost his life at the hands of the KKK. He was with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., on the march from Selma to Montgomery.

As a result of his excellent administration of the anti-poverty program, Mr. Smith was given the opportunity to enter the Federal Government at the national office of VISTA in Washington, DC. He later moved to the Office of Health Affairs in the Office of Economic Opportunity, OEO.

While at OEO he served as Assistant Chief of Program Development, and developed a national program of Neighborhood Health Centers, NHCs, that provided ambulatory health care for low income communities throughout the United States, using a medical team approach. He was responsible for developing NHCs in Bedford Stuyvesant, San Francisco's Chinatown, and St. Louis, Missouri. He also established and served as Chief of OEO's Consumer Affairs office, where he designed a pilot multi-dimensional training program.

In 1972, Dan became the National Director and Chief of the Area Health Education Program (AHEC), a medical health education program that he designed and implemented at the National Institute of Health. He worked with medical schools throughout the United States to provide more primary care and family practice physicians and related health professionals. At $165 million annually, it became the largest social contract program in the nation. One of the finest of these programs continues today at the University of Colorado's School of Medicine. Acknowledged as the "father" of AHEC, Dan received a distinguished service award for his outstanding management of the program.

During the 1980s Dan was awarded an IPA (Intergovernmental Personnel Agreement) position at Georgetown University Medical School as a Research Associate, where he was involved in research and teaching. He returned to the Federal Government as Director of Bilateral and Sub-Saharan African Programs in the Office of International Health and was responsible for developing Emergency Medical Services programs in Lebanon, Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

Because of his expertise in administrating medical programs, in 1986 the White House officially requested his assistance with the Republic of South Africa to develop a program similar to AHEC. He was subsequently invited by Archbishop Desmond Tutu to attend his Capetown installation as the Episcopal Bishop of South Africa.

Dan later served as Special Projects Manager in the Administrator's Office of the Department of Health and Human Services. He retired from the Federal Government in 1994.

Still working, Dan has established and owns an import/export company, Takoma Enterprises LLC, for which he serves as president and CEO. Active in community and religious organizations, he served on the board of trustees of Springfield College and senior warden of St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Bethesda, MD. An usher at the Washington National Cathedral, Dan served as head usher at the Cathedral, where he has escorted Presidents and other dignitaries at special services, including

the memorial service following the events of September 11, 2001.

Dan has four surviving siblings who still reside in Connecticut: His brother, A. Wilson ''Abe'' Smith, and sisters Marion Hanson, Jenny Brown and Henrietta Reed. He has two adult children from a previous marriage. His daughter April is married to a South African, Andrew Motaung. Both are teachers with advanced degrees. They have a 3½-year-old child, Tselane, and live in Columbia, MD. His son, Daniel Robert Smith, Jr., a graduate of Syracuse University, is an actor who resides in New York City, stage name Robert Mauzell.

In 2002 Dan met Loretta Neumann, a neighbor. It should be noted that Loretta worked for me as a legislative assistant before she retired in 2001 and, during the 1970s and 1980s, she also worked for the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee when it was chaired by my father, Morris K. Udall, and for Representative John F. Seiberling of Ohio, who chaired the Committee's Public Lands and National Parks Subcommittee.

Last but not least, Dan and Loretta were married on October 28, 2006, at the Washington National Cathedral. They reside in the Takoma neighborhood of Washington, DC, and from all reports are truly living happily ever after.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO RANDALL JENSEN

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Randall Jensen, a recent recipient of the Boy Scouts of America's Silver Beaver Award.

Randall, an optometrist who performs Kindergarten eye screenings in the Moapa Valley school system, has been actively involved with the Boy Scouts of America since he was a child. In 1972, he earned the organization's highest Scout achievement when he was made an Eagle Scout. After enjoying the benefits of participating in the Boy Scouts, Randall returned to the organization in 1978 to work as an Assistant Scoutmaster. Today, Randall serves as chairman for the Anasazi District of the Las Vegas Area Council of Boy Scouts. Since volunteering with the Boy Scouts, his work as a Scout leader has driven him to assist youth who struggle fitting in with peer and social groups.

On February 15, 2007, Mr. Jensen was awarded with the Silver Beaver Award in recognition of his distinguished service to the organization. This award has been awarded since 1931 and represents the great work Randall has done with the Boy Scouts.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor Randall Jensen. His dedication to the community through his work with the Boy Scouts is commendable and I congratulate him on being recognized with the Silver Beaver Award.

TRIBUTE TO HEDY M. RATNER

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2007

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to add my voice in honoring Hedy M. Ratner, who will be recognized in Chicago as a ''Women Who Dared'' on March 14, 2007 by the Jewish Women's Foundation, Women's Division of the Jewish United Fund, and the Jewish Women's Archive. I congratulate those organizations for choosing to celebrate Women's History Month by hearing the stories of three fabulous local Jewish women—Judith Panko Reis, the founding Director of the Women With Disabilities Center; Amy Rubin of Jewish Women International; and Hedy Ratner.

My dear friend Hedy Ratner is a force of nature. When she swirls into a room—beautiful, feminine, and powerful—everyone knows that a woman of substance has arrived. A feminist through and through, a fighter for social justice, Hedy has worked for the advancement of women all of her adult life.

In 1986, along with her friend Carol Dougal, Hedy founded the first and now the largest Women's Business Development Center in the United States. ''When we started the Center,'' said Hedy, ''it was an extension of our frustration that women still were not reaching parity in the marketplace.''

As of today, the Center has served tens of thousands of women; facilitated tens of millions of dollars in loans; impacted policies at the Federal, State and local levels; and helped certify countless companies as Women's Business Enterprises. Her straightforward philosophy is summed up when she says, ''It's good business to do business with women.''

Hedy Ratner was appointed by President Clinton to the National Women's Business Council. She helped found and then was appointed by two Illinois Governors to the Illinois Women's Business Ownership Council and the Governor's Commission of the Status of Women in Illinois. Chicago Mayor Richard Daley appointed Hedy as Co-Chair of the Women's Health Task Force. She is also a board member of the Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce and The Chicago Convention and Tourism Bureau, and a founding member of the Coalition for Equal Opportunity and the Alliance of Minority and Female Contractors Association.

All of the prestigious appointments and major accomplishments only hint at the dynamic and inspiring person Hedy Ratner is. Her legions of friends, co-workers and admirers love her enthusiasm, her humor and her generous spirit. She is unstinting in her efforts to encourage and help those around her to be the best that they can be and to achieve their own aspirations.

Hedy Ratner has served as a role model for untold numbers of women who seek to make their mark in business, politics, and the professions. Perhaps it is, in part, because Hedy had her own role model—her mother. About her mother she said, ''She was an immigrant woman, came from poverty, didn't have an opportunity to be really well educated. [She] was a business owner, but she was informally educated. She was an entrepreneur and she was always committed to me, and women in general, being independent.'' Her mother said, ''That's the most important thing you can do: depend on yourself.''

Hedy's Jewish upbringing and pride have contributed mightily to her strength of character, her moral center and her determination to succeed. I had the real pleasure to attend her Bat Mitzvah not too many years ago. Hedy, your mother would be very proud of you for being singled out as outstanding Jewish woman by such prestigious Jewish women's organizations, but she wouldn't have been surprised that you are officially a ''Woman Who Dared.''

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

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVE WELDON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2007

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my full support for alternative water supply initiatives and my opposition to the bill before us. We have an existing program that is able to provide affordable loans to communities to fund such projects—the State Revolving Loan Fund (SRF).

The bill before us is fiscally irresponsible. It takes what was a pilot program enacted several years ago and which was never funded and turns it into a new, permanent $125 million federal grant program with a new bureaucracy to implement it.

We do not need this program. The existing SRF gives taxpayers a much bigger bang for their buck. By establishing a new, permanent grant program, today's bill will divert dollars from the SRF leaving fewer dollars for the SRF to support a broader spectrum of water projects.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ''SECURITY AND FAIRNESS ENHANCEMENT (SAFE) FOR AMERICA ACT''

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the ''Security and Fairness Enhancement (SAFE) for America Act.'' This much-needed legislation eliminates the controversial visa lottery program, through which 50,000 aliens are chosen at random to come and live permanently in the United States based on pure luck. The visa lottery program threatens national security, results in the unfair administration of our Nation's immigration laws, and encourages a cottage industry for fraudulent opportunists.

Because winners of the visa lottery are chosen at random, the visa lottery program presents a serious national security threat. A perfect example of the system gone awry is the case of Hesham Mohamed Ali Hedayet, the Egyptian national who killed two and wounded three during a shooting spree at Los Angeles International Airport in July of 2002. He was allowed to apply for lawful permanent resident

status in 1997 because of his wife's status as a visa lottery winner.

The State Department's Inspector General has even weighed in on the national security threat posed by the visa lottery program. During testimony before the House Committee on the Judiciary in the 109th Congress, the Office of Inspector General stated that the Office "continues to believe that the diversity visa program contains significant risks to national security from hostile intelligence officers, criminals, and terrorists attempting to use the program for entry into the United States as permanent residents."

Even if improvements were made to the visa lottery program, nothing would prevent terrorist organizations or foreign intelligence agencies from planting members in the U.S. by having those members apply for the program. As long as those individuals do not have previous criminal backgrounds, these types of organized efforts would never be detected, even if significant background checks and counter-fraud measures were enacted within the program.

Usually, immigrant visas are issued to foreign nationals that have existing connections with family members lawfully residing in the United States or with U.S. employers. These types of relationships help ensure that immigrants entering our country have a stake in continuing America's success and have needed skills to contribute to our nation's economy. However, under the visa lottery program, visas are awarded to immigrants at random without meeting such criteria.

In addition, the visa lottery program is unfair to immigrants who comply with the United States' immigration laws. The visa lottery program does not expressly prohibit illegal aliens from applying to receive visas through the program. Thus, the program treats foreign nationals that comply with our laws the same as those that blatantly violate our laws. In addition, most family-sponsored immigrants currently face a wait of years to obtain visas, yet the lottery program pushes 50,000 random immigrants with no particular family ties, job skills or education ahead of these family and employer-sponsored immigrants each year with relatively no wait. This sends the wrong message to those who wish to enter our great country and to the international community as a whole.

Furthermore, the visa lottery program is wrought with fraud. A report released by the Center for Immigration Studies states that it is commonplace for foreign nationals to apply for the lottery program multiple times using many different aliases. In addition, the visa lottery program has spawned a cottage industry featuring sponsors in the U.S. who falsely promise success to applicants in exchange for large sums of money. Ill-informed foreign nationals are willing to pay top dollar for the "guarantee" of lawful permanent resident status in the U.S.

The State Department's Office of Inspector General confirms these allegations of widespread fraud in its September 2003 report. Specifically, the report states that the visa lottery program is "subject to widespread abuse" and that "identity fraud is endemic, and fraudulent documents are commonplace." Furthermore, the report also reveals that the State Department found that 364,000 duplicate applications were detected in the 2003 visa lottery alone.

In addition, the visa lottery program is by its very nature discriminatory. The complex formula for assigning visas under the program arbitrarily disqualifies natives from countries that send more than 50,000 immigrants to the U.S. within a 5-year period, which excludes nationals from countries such as Mexico, Canada, China and others.

The visa lottery program represents what is wrong with our country's immigration system. My legislation would eliminate the visa lottery program. The removal of this controversial program will help ensure our Nation's security, make the administration of our immigration laws more consistent and fair, and help reduce immigration fraud and opportunism.

THE INWOOD HOUSE—NYC

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, recently I had the unique opportunity to attend an event in New York City with more than 650 people honoring a life giving operation for young women. In today's cold vast world it is very easy to feel isolated, alone, and forgotten especially if you are a pregnant teen or an expectant teen father. To many, Inwood House is a safe haven in their endless storm. The Inwood House offers housing, medical treatment, resources, and hope to today's otherwise lost teenagers.

The Inwood House was established as a Residence in 1830, to help pregnant girls in New York City rebuild their lives. The young girls were immigrants, alone, and some were exploited. And in those days single pregnant females were often just put in jail. The Inwood House became their savior by giving the girls a safe home, an encouraging community, and most importantly an education. With their newly acquired education the once outcasts of society were able to rejoin the working world with their employable skills. Since the early 1800's, the founders were vocal advocates for the lost youth. When the world wanted to send young unmarried pregnant teens to the penitentiary, the Inwood House stood up and fought for their freedom. They won Court approval to have the girls referred to the Inwood House, rather than being sent away only to be once again shunned by society. The founders believed that each girl was a gift and as a gift each had their own destiny, they simply needed someone to stand strong for them.

The Inwood House has continued its innovated vision. In the early 1900's, when the medical community was desperately trying to get the public aware of sexually transmitted diseases, the Inwood House tackled the issue head on. They conducted community outreach education on how to prevent sexually transmitted diseases. While providing on-going family support services to unwed mothers, the founders helped fund the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies. By accepting young women of all races and religions, the Inwood House defied the segregation of social services that was customary at the time.

Inwood House believes that the root of any solid society is a strong family. To enable young unwed mothers keep their babies, Inwood House raised private funds to create Mother/Baby foster family homes while creating the first City-sponsored program. The program showed great success in achieving self-sufficiency for the young mothers as well as avoiding repeat out-of-wedlock births. Inwood founders also believed in holding everyone responsible for their actions, including male teens.

Teen Choice, created by Inwood House, was the first comprehensive school-based education and counseling program to include boys. By dealing with both sides of the teenage pregnancy epidemic, it allowed awareness to be brought into an educational environment. Being the first to recognize the young unwed father as a potential resource for both the unwed mother and their unborn child, Fathers Count was created. Fathers Count is an educational program aimed to teach young fathers how to manage their parental responsibilities. When children have strong male role models in their lives, the cycle of abandonment is broken, leading both the children and the parents to lead a healthier life.

It was my pleasure, along with Governor Tom Ridge and others, to honor and hear positive successes for this outstanding program, its hard working staff, and the board members of the Inwood House. By providing supportive 24-hour care, support and guidance, including pre-natal care, education, parenting and life skills training, Inwood House is able to give hope for a better life. Wonderful board members such as Barbara Abadi and Linda Lausell Bryant, to just name a few, help to ensure that even today the Residence cares for homeless, pregnant teens in foster care, and continues to ensure that the Inwood House is internationally recognized as a leader and innovator in youth development, teen pregnancy prevention, and family support. Serving over 8,000 young people, Inwood House is able to be a beacon for the lost. It is my pleasure to honor and support such a life giving operation, and wish it continued success as it reaches and addresses the desperate needs of society's forgotten children.

And that is just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING DONALD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR RECEIVING THE NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON AWARD

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Donald Elementary School, located in Flower Mound, Texas, for being awarded the prestigious National Blue Ribbon Award.

The National Blue Ribbon Award is presented to schools that reflect the goals of our Nation's highest education standards. The program requires schools to meet one of two assessment criteria. It recognizes schools with at least 40 percent of their students from disadvantaged backgrounds, who dramatically improve student performance in accordance with state assessment system. It also rewards schools that score in the top 10 percent on state assessments. Donald Elementary's scores on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) test have consistently exceeded the national average in all subjects.

Donald Elementary School was built in 1989. Although relatively new, the school has made a significant impact on the local community and has unique attributes induding a P.E.P. Squad (Parents as Educational Partners Volunteer Program) as well a publishing company, ''Dolphin Tales,'' to assist students in taking their writing to the complete published stage. Donald Elementary received Gold Performance Acknowledgments from the Texas Education Agency in the 2004–2005 school year for attendance and was commended for its work in the fields of Reading/ELA, Mathematics and Science.

The National Blue Ribbon Award acknowledges the hard work of students, staff members, families, and the community in raising student proficiency and closing the achievement gap. I extend my sincerest congratulations to Principal Cheryl J. Close, the Lewisville Independent School District, and the community of Flower Mound. I also want to congratulate the fine students of Donald Elementary for this outstanding achievement.

I wish them the best of luck as they continue to strive for excellence. I am very proud and honored to represent them in the 26th District of Texas.

TRIBUTE TO MR. FRANK AMARAL

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, today I wish to remember and honor a man who was a businessman, community leader and icon in Northern California, Mr. Frank Amaral. After a lifetime of dedication to his family and community, Frank passed away on March 5, 2007. He was 88 years old.

Frank Amaral was one of Nevada City's most successful real estate investors. Mr. Amaral displayed astute skills of negotiation and business savvy, many of which he honed earlier in his career in the lumber industry, working as managing partner of the Oregon Creek Lumber Company in Camptonville, California.

Frank Amaral was also one of Nevada County's early developers and helped transform Grass Valley and Nevada City from unknown destinations to the wonderful communities they are today. However, Frank's success as an adult contrasted with his humble roots.

Born on June 19, 1918, in Orland, California, he was the youngest of four children. Frank's parents, Cardoza Amaral and Rosa Julia Bettencourt Amaral, were Portuguese immigrants from the Azores Islands. Frank lost his father when he was 6.

As a 13-year-old farm laborer who supported his family during the Depression, Frank hated being poor and worked diligently to better his social status.

A rough upbringing did not deter Frank from a long list of impressive life achievements. Mr. Amaral bought the Oregon Creek Lumber Company in 1958 and started buying timberland all throughout Northern California, Oregon and Idaho. At the height of his career in the lumber business, he owned over 100,000 acres of timberland, according to a recent publication.

He also bought local properties during the 1950s. Frank's holdings included property at Jackson Meadows, Milton Reservoir, Lake Olympia, Brunswick sawmill, the Murchie Mine property, Deer Creek Park, Stonebridge and the North Star Mine, which he co-owned.

In 1966, he retired from the lumber business, developing the properties he owned and selling them off as parcels. He diversified his interests, buying farmland in Los Banos and commercial properties in Southern California.

Frank Amaral was also a thoughtful and civic-minded philanthropist who made great contributions to his community and region.

For example, the Nevada County Fairgrounds has seen the impact of Mr. Amaral's work in the community for years. The Amaral Family Festival Center was named in his honor after the family made a large donation for its renovation. But, for years before that, the Amarals donated land, money and time to many causes behind the scenes, proving to many their dedication to helping others.

The site of Nevada County's first Juvenile Hall and the land where the Madelyn Helling Library sits both were gifts from the Amarals.

Most importantly, Frank Amaral was devoted to his family and was committed to acts of charity. For years, Frank and LaVonne Amaral donated money anonymously to local organizations following their Catholic belief that charity should not be publicized.

He is survived by his wife of 64 years, LaVonne, and his two children, Lance Amaral and Julia Amaral.

May he rest in peace.

COMMITTEE FUNDING RESOLUTION

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2007

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague JOE BARTON, Ranking Member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, in requesting the resources necessary to ensure the effective operations of this Committee over the next 2 years.

The budget we have submitted reflects the significant increase in workload for the Committee on Energy and Commerce, as well as the need to attract skilled staff members and provide our personnel with the tools required to perform their jobs. The requested sums are not merely desirable. They are necessary. The Committee has wide jurisdiction and each of its 6 subcommittees has a lengthy ''to do'' list.

One of our top priorities is developing a substantive, balanced, thorough record on climate change. Our comprehensive examination of climate change is already underway. To date, we have conducted 5 hearings on this issue and we expect to conduct 6 more this month. I am pleased to report that a variety of industry leaders and issue experts, including Vice President Gore, who will testify before the Committee on March 21, will continue to provide their insights to the Committee. We are confident that this focus on climate change will produce thoughtful, fair legislation.

Other priorities include addressing issues in energy policy, health care, consumer protection and privacy, environmental programs, telecommunications, and a host of other legislative matters. We are also committed to fulfilling our oversight responsibilities. Already, the Committee has launched inquiries into nuclear security issues, food and drug safety, and the health care situation in New Orleans post-Katrina.

Since the 110th Congress convened in January, we have moved forward quickly on an exceedingly ambitious agenda that covers a wide range of topics of concern to Americans. To date, the Committee has held 19 hearings, in addition to its role in the ''First 100 Hours''—during which this Committee contributed significantly to the Stem Cell Research bill, the prescription drug negotiation legislation, and the implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. In this month alone, the Committee has planned 28 hearings and 6 markups and meetings. We expect a combined total of 42 hearings and meetings before we reach the Spring District Work Period.

In light of this very heavy workload and considering the pressing importance of the issues facing the Committee, I ask that you fund our request for the 110th Congress and thank you for your support.

FIVE OUTSTANDING CITIZENS

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, I rise here today to honor five outstanding citizens of Bayonne for their contributions to preserving their Irish heritage, which have enriched and united our community and earned them the praise of their countrymen. They are all being honored at the 2007 Bayonne St. Patrick's Day Parade.

Mickey McCabe, Grand Marshall 2007, a Bayonne native, is a founding member of the Bayonne St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee. As founder and president of McCabe Ambulance Service and the McCabe Institute of Emergency Preparedness, Mr. McCabe is well aware of the medical emergency needs of his community. Mr. McCabe serves in various state and county agencies including the New Jersey State EMS Homeland Security Task Force Planning Agency.

Virginia ''Ginger'' Boele Kemp, a member of Ireland's 32, is the President and owner of Four Season's Travel. A community activist, Ms. Kemp founded the Bayonne Hometown Fair. A member of the Rotary Club of Bayonne, Ms. Kemp was the club's first woman president. Ginger Kemp helped raise over $30,000 as a member of the Bayonne Tsunami Relief Fund and over $51,000 as co-chair of the Katrina Relief Fund.

Bridget Antczak, County Cork Association Aide, is a lifelong resident of Bayonne. The Environmental Consultant has a rich Irish heritage and is the granddaughter of John O'Connell, who was influential in the building of the County Corkmen's Club. Bridget has been a member of the St. Patrick's Parade Committee since 2004.

Sharon Nadrowsky, Irish American League Aide, serves as the representative to the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee. Mrs. Nadrowski serves on the St. Mary's Star of the Sea Sports Committee. She continues to instill

in her children and her community the traditions of her grandparents, who hail from County Tipperary and County Kilkenny.

Mary O'Connell, born and raised in Bayonne, is past President of the County Donegal Association and remains an aide to the organization. Her mother Nora was born in County Mayo and her paternal grandfather from County Donegal. Mrs. O'Connell also served the patients of the prestigious Hoboken's St. Mary's Hospital for 10 years.

Please join me in honoring these proud members of the Irish Community of Bayonne. Their numerous contributions have enriched the lives of their neighbors, and their love of their heritage continues to preserve the Irish tradition for future generations of Irish-Americans in New Jersey and the United States.

FREEDOM FOR RENÉ MONTES DE OCA MARTIJA

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about René Montes de Oca Martija, a political prisoner in totalitarian Cuba.

Mr. Montes de Oca Martija, Secretary General of the Pro Human Rights Party in Cuba, is a peaceful pro-democracy and human rights activist who has courageously denounced the cruel policies of the dictatorship and demanded freedom for the Cuban people. Although he has been a constant target of the brutal tyrant's machinery of repression, he has remained steadfast in his demands for freedom, democracy, and that the people of Cuba be allowed their inalienable rights.

Mr. Montes de Oca Martija, as early as the age of 8, has been a target of the dictator's villainous regime. On more than one occasion as a child he was persecuted and denied the most basic of human dignity in treatment simply because his mother was a Jehovah's Witness and considered a threat to the totalitarian regime. Although he has been jailed and detained on numerous occasions, Mr. Montes de Oca has always maintained his steadfast opposition to Castro's tyranny.

Most recently, on July 13, 2005, René Montes de Oca Martija was wrongfully arrested during a peaceful demonstration in Havana honoring the victims of the 13 de Marzo tugboat massacre of 1994 in which 72 men, women, and children attempting to flee the Cuban dictatorship in search of freedom, were chased down and attacked by Castro's security thugs, who mercilessly sank the 13 de Marzo. More than half of the unarmed refugees on the tugboat were systematically assassinated by drowning at the direct order of Castro while they were fighting to stay alive in the waters.

On December 13, 2006, Amnesty International reported their concern that Mr. Montes de Oca would not receive a fair trial in totalitarian Cuba since the right to a fair trial is severely limited in Cuba, with the courts and prosecutors under government control. Amnesty International went on to say that they believed that Mr. Montes de Oca had been detained solely for exercising his most basic human rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly.

On February 27, 2007, after being locked in the totalitarian gulag for nearly 2 years, without ever being convicted of any genuine crime, Mr. Montes de Oca Martija was sentenced to 2 years on trumped-up charges of public disorder and locked in a dungeon in deplorable, life threatening conditions.

Mr. Montes de Oca Martija is one of the many heroes of the Cuban pro-democracy movement who are locked in the dungeons of the dictatorship for their beliefs. My Colleagues, we must not stand by in acquiescence while pro-democracy activists are suffering in the depraved prisons of tyrants. We must demand the immediate and unconditional release of René Montes de Oca Martija and every political prisoner in totalitarian Cuba.

DEDICATION OF DR. PILLOW PARK IN NORTH RICHLAND HILLS

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to announce the dedication of Dr. Pillow Park in North Richland Hills, Texas.

This newly refurbished park is named in recognition of Dr. David Pillow who served the city of North Richland Hills and much of north Texas since founding the Pillow-Rush Medical and Surgical Clinic in 1955. As the success of his business grew over the years, additions doubled the size of the hospital. Dr. Pillow also serves as the Medical Director for UT Southwestern University Hospital's Chest Pain Center.

Dr. David Pillow was also the chairman of the board of trustees in 1983, when the North Hills Hospital had its dedication ceremony. On August 28, 2006, the Naming Board of the city of North Richland Hills unanimously approved a resolution for Little Bear Creek Neighborhood Park to officially be named "Dr. Pillow Park."

The new Dr. Pillow Park is a 6.5 acre neighborhood park and has a Texas Mission theme. Included are a hike and bike trail, a covered picnic area, and a playground. I would like to express my best wishes to the Pillow family and the entire North Richland Hills Community on this special occasion. It is an honor to represent a fellow physician in Congress.

PRESERVING PATIENT ACCESS TO INPATIENT REHABILITATION HOSPITALS

HON. JOHN S. TANNER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, today I, along with my colleagues Reps. NITA LOWEY (D–NY), KENNY HULSHOF (R–MO), FRANK LOBIONDO (R–NJ) and with 70 co-sponsors, rise to introduce the Preserving Patient Access to Inpatient Rehabilitation Hospitals Act of 2007 to ensure that the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, does not continue to implement the misguided 75 Percent Rule and unnecessarily compromise the ability of rehabilitation hospitals and units to continue to provide much-need critical rehabilitation care.

The 75 Percent Rule is one of seven criteria inpatient rehabilitation hospitals and units must meet in order to be paid under the inpatient rehabilitation facilities prospective payment system, IRF–PPS, rather than the inpatient prospective payment system, IPPS, under which general acute care hospitals are paid. The rule was first issued in January 1984 pursuant to the Social Security Act Amendments of 1983, and has faced minimal revision to date. Simply put, to qualify as an IRF under the 75 Percent Rule, 75 percent of a facility's patients must be receiving treatment in one of 13 specified conditions. The result is that inpatient rehabilitation hospitals and units are the only Medicare providers that are classified on the basis on patient condition rather than the services provided to patients admitted to their care.

Inpatient rehabilitation hospitals and units provide specialized programs and services for patients who have suffered brain injuries, strokes, spinal cord injuries, and other rehabilitating injuries. However, CMS has consistently refused to update the 75 Percent Rule to reflect medical advances made over the 20 years since the classification criteria were first developed.

It is shocking how many patients have been turned away because of this rule. The 75 Percent Rule functions as a quota system without any foundation in clinical or scientific evidence, which makes it just that much more frustrating to watch the inpatient hospitals and units in my home state struggle to comply with the regulation without jeopardizing patient access to crucial rehabilitative care.

Our legislation will ensure that patients across America will continue to have access to the rehabilitative care they need, and that CMS will take a long, hard look at the impact this policy is having on Medicare beneficiaries and the Medicare system itself. The legislation would freeze the compliance threshold at 60 percent indefinitely, allowing facilities to continue to provide care to Medicare beneficiaries in need of intensive inpatient rehabilitation therapy. The legislation also codifies medical necessity standards and requires CMS to provide Congress with a comprehensive assessment of what is happening to patients that are denied care in this specialized health care setting.

Congress has year after year called on CMS to modernize the 75 Percent Rule. This year we face a time-sensitive imperative. Unless Congress acts by July 1, 2007, the CMS rule automatically imposes a 65 percent compliance threshold. It is abundantly clear that this chamber will have to take legislative action if we hope to stop implementation of this policy and ensure that our constituents have access to intense rehabilitative care in the appropriate inpatient setting.

We urge our colleagues to support this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO THE SOUTH RIVER RURITAN CLUB

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to the South River

Ruritan Club in Edgewater, Maryland. This weekend they are hosting an event to mark their 50th anniversary.

The South River Ruritan Club, a community service organization, was chartered on March 13, 1957, and for 50 years has been providing much needed services to the citizens of Edgewater, Annapolis and southern Maryland.

The club, whose members are all volunteers, have contributed well in excess of half a million dollars in direct financial aid, and countless hours of time, to numerous community service projects.

The club awards local students scholastic and vocational scholarships and provides assistance to local Scout Troops, youth athletics, and other youth-related programs. They conduct an annual essay contest for 5th grade students, and have sponsored students to the National Association of Student Council Conference and Exchange Student programs.

They contribute annually to the local fire and rescue departments, the Maryland and Anne Arundel County police departments, and support environmental programs, including efforts to protect the Chesapeake Bay.

Our active duty military, retired and disabled military, and veterans organizations also benefit from the volunteer efforts of the club. They have sent direct aid to our troops in Iraq, and provide additional financial assistance through the military's Morale and Welfare assistance programs.

Their work also includes assistance in such areas as financial aid to needy families, victims of violent crimes, families displaced by catastrophes such as fires, and hurricanes, and assistance through Habitat for Humanity. They contribute annually to St. Jude Children's Research Hospital and Johns Hopkins Hospital Children's Center and they loan wheelchairs, walkers and other medical assistance equipment to members of the community.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate the South River Ruritan Club on their wonderful record of community service over the last 50 years, and wish them enormous success as they continue their commitment to improving the overall quality of life of the residents of Anne Arundel County and the State of Maryland.

TRIBUTE TO THE UNITED COMMUNITIES OF SAN ANTONIO, INC.'S BROTHERHOOD/SISTERHOOD HUMANITARIAN AWARDS RECIPIENTS

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the United Communities of San Antonio, Inc., and the USCA Humanitarian Awards and Lifetime Humanitarian Award recipients, on the occasion of the celebration of their 53rd Brotherhood/Sisterhood Awards Dinner on March 8, 2007.

The mission of the United Communities of San Antonio, Inc. (USCA) is to create safe and inclusive communities, particularly among our young people, by promoting understanding and respect among all races, religions and cultures through dialogue, education and awareness. This year's USCA Humanitarian Award recipients and Lifetime Humanitarian Award recipient embody the goals of USCA with their numerous civic and professional contributions to the San Antonio community. They are all well known and respected members of their community known for their personal and professional integrity. They are committed to such democratic values as equality of opportunity, tolerance and human rights, values which form the basis for any diverse community. It is for these achievements that I rise today to honor these outstanding members of the San Antonio community.

USCA Humanitarian Award recipient Charlie Amato is the chairman and co-founder of Southwest Business Corporation (SWBC), a recognized leader in the financial services industry. Mr. Amato's civic involvement recognizes the importance of giving back to the community where he has prospered, and he is an active participant in various charities and corporate leadership activities. His community service achievements include serving as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Christus Santa Rosa Health Care Corp., Board Member of the Greater San Antonio Chamber of Commerce and Executive Committee Member of the United Way. Mr. Amato has also been recognized by the Arthritis Foundation as a ''Humanitarian of the Year'' (2002) and the San Antonio Business Journal as ''One of the Most Influential San Antonians'' (2004). He has also been inducted in the San Antonio Business Hall of Fame (2005) and most recently the College of Business Hall of Honor—Sam Houston State University (2006).

USCA Humanitarian Award recipient J. Russell Davis is a founding member and chief executive officer of Davis, Cedillo & Mendoza, Inc., a law firm with a diversified practice. Mr. Davis has distinguished himself through his deep commitment and involvement in the San Antonio community. He has served on the board of directors of such organizations as the Community Guidance Center, the Barshop Jewish Community Center, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the Southwest Texas Public Broadcasting Corporation. His unwavering dedication as a community leader is reflected in his work as the first president of the campus of the San Antonio Jewish Community and as director and later chairman of the Holocaust Memorial of San Antonio. Mr. Davis has also served as director and later president of the Jewish Federation of San Antonio.

USCA Humanitarian Award recipient Aaronetta Hamilton Pierce is president of Premier Artworks, Inc., a company which promotes African-American artists throughout the country in public exhibits, museums, corporations, government buildings, businesses and homes. Mrs. Pierce has distinguished herself through her extraordinary work as an advocate for multi-cultural education and artistic development. In 1985, she became the first African-American woman appointed to the Texas Commission on the Arts. She was also a founding chair of the San Antonio Martin Luther King Jr. Commission. Mrs. Pierce's leadership achievements include serving on the Executive Committee and Board of Trustees for United Way of San Antonio, the University of Texas San Antonio—Development Board and the Texas Cultural Trust Council. Mrs. Pierce has also been inducted into the San Antonio Women's Hall of Fame (1984) and the Texas Women's Hall of Fame (1993).

USCA Lifetime Humanitarian Award recipient Jimmy Toubin is president of Toubin Insurance Company, but his real work is as a distinguished civil leader and a passionate advocate for San Antonio's hungry. Mr. Toubin's notable civic involvement has earned him much deserved recognition. He has been named ''Outstanding Young Man of the Year'' by El Campo, TX Jaycees and was nominated for the Governor's Award for outstanding achievement in the volunteer community in 2001. His community service portfolio includes serving on the board of trustees for Temple Beth-El for 6 years, on the board of the Jewish Federation for 8 years and currently as Vice-President and membership Chairman of Temple Chai Congregation. He also served for 10 years on the United Way of San Antonio review and allocation panel. In recognition of his past service as both a board member and chairman for 2 years, the Board of the Alamo Area Council of Governments Bexar County Agency on Aging elected Mr. Toubin as Emeritus member of the board.

Mr. Toubin's true achievement has been as a tireless advocate against hunger. He is a longtime member and past-president of the San Antonio Food Bank's board of directors. In 2001, it was through his tenacious work to rally Congress and the Department of Agriculture to make available peanut crops to make peanut butter for nonprofit organizations who work with low-income populations. Mr. Toubin also worked as the chairman of the fundraising committee for the San Antonio Food Bank's capital campaign which went on to raise $8.5 million over the course of 2 years for a new warehouse facility. His determination to help the San Antonio Food Bank meet its goals is evident in his work to identify members of the community who could help aid in this effort. Jimmy also helped organize the San Antonio Food Bank's Second Serving Program which makes use of excess prepared foods from hotels, restaurants, and caterers and directly delivers it to agencies that serve hot meals. He has embraced his role of helping San Antonio's hungry so profoundly that Jimmy, like other board members, would sometimes take a hands-on role; he could be found out on a truck with a driver or gleaning in a south Texas field. Jimmy is a person who believes in change and knows what it takes to actually make those changes happen through advocacy and legislative work, and the power of long-term policy efforts.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the United Communities of San Antonio, Inc., as it celebrates and honors the outstanding contributions to the San Antonio community of all of its 2007 Humanitarian Award recipients. Their dedication to the community is remarkable and I wish them all continued success in all their future endeavors.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 2007

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will better prepare our scientists to be professionally competitive

and ensure that the American people benefit more directly from the large annual investment that we make in our research enterprise. I am proud to introduce the Scientific Communications Act of 2007. This program will train young scientists to more effectively communicate scientific and other technical topics to policymakers. The improvement in communications skills will also enhance the interaction of the scientific community with business leaders, the media, and the general public. This initiative will foster greater cross-disciplinary education and improve public access to scientific expertise.

Innovation and competitiveness are at the forefront of public policy discussions. A key element to ensuring continued American excellence in science and technology innovation is providing our scientists with the skills necessary to offer their valuable expertise and insight to the public policy dialogue. By doing so, we will accelerate the speed with which the government, the media, and the general public are able to access information on new discoveries in science, technology, health and medicine, and other technical topics. Better access to expertise from our scientific community will ensure that we, the policymakers, can make the most informed and beneficial decisions possible when shaping new policy directions for our country.

This legislation will provide resources to the National Science Foundation to expand its ability to offer communications training to scientists. Some training programs funded by the NSF and other agencies have already made the commitment to implement such training. For example, some awardees of NSF's Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program provide communications training for their students. I applaud the forward thinking of those program administrators. Unfortunately these are exceptions, whereas training our scientists to be effective communicators should be a standard practice.

This legislation is designed to encourage the integration of communications training into more scientific programs. This type of training will ensure that our scientists are better equipped to incorporate their expertise into the public dialogue on science and technology-related issues. Members of Congress should take particular interest in this initiative, since we regularly invite scientists to provide us with first-hand knowledge on such topics as climate change, nanotechnology, and new research into health and disease. To ensure that those important conversations continue to be fruitful, curricula for the science communications program proposed in this bill might include case studies of actual Congressional testimony by scientific experts to demonstrate the importance of clear and concise expertise in public policy.

While the training provided within this legislation focuses on the interaction between scientists and the public policy community, the benefits will spread more broadly. The ability to clearly explain technical topics to nonscientific audiences will translate to other industries, all of which will benefit the United States research enterprise and, consequently, our economy. Training our early-career scientists to discuss technical topics with nonscientific audiences will have the effect of augmenting the engagement of the scientific community with other professional fields. This might, for example, lead to more frequent interaction with business leaders and venture capitalists to inform the private sector and investors about cutting-edge technologies and improve the transfer of research discoveries to the marketplace.

The Scientific Communications Act of 2007 will add an important new dimension to the education of American scientists. The ability of the United States to remain an economic leader depends, in large part, on our continued successes in science and technology research and development. We must, therefore, ensure that our scientists are equipped with the skills to provide their expertise to policymakers, business and community leaders, and the general public. This initiative will enhance the dialogue on science- and technology-related topics and facilitate the development of fully informed public policy. I ask the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in supporting this legislation.

NATIONAL SPORTSMANSHIP DAY

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate March 6, 2007, as the 17th annual National Sportsmanship Day.

National Sportsmanship Day serves as an opportunity for athletes and sports fans of all ages to recognize and discuss the need for ethics, fair play and sportsmanship in athletics. Parents, teachers, students, and school administrators are encouraged to engage in thoughtful and constructive dialogue to promote self-control, nonviolence, and honesty on and off the field. With increased pressure to succeed placed upon today's athletes and students, the importance of integrity and fair play have never been more evident.

In today's society, students face heightened demand in all areas of life, including athletics. As a result, the drive for success can foster unhealthy competition. Sadly, the principles and participation of sport are lost when students are forced to adopt a "win at all costs" mentality. National Sportsmanship Day strives to promote sportsmanship through the defeat of gamesmanship, the practice of ethically dubious methods to gain an objective. Through activities and discussions, more than 13,500 schools throughout the United States and around the world will participate in these events to spread integrity in athletics.

Each year, National Sportsmanship Day recognizes a number of athletes who offer a tribute to their respective sport and enhance their skills with their desire to play fairly. This year, the Institute for International Sport has selected their Sports Ethics Fellows based on recommendations from a number of players, coaches, and school administrators at the high school level. With their simultaneous pursuit of both academic and athletic excellence, they model and promote the virtues of the student-athlete in the truest sense.

I hope that my colleagues can join with me on this day in celebrating and promoting the continued success of National Sportsmanship Day. With their moral, ethical and fitness components, today's activities can promote a healthy and more active community amongst our nation's youth, and support a team-oriented future for our nation of sports enthusiasts.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. EGBERT'S CATHOLIC SCHOOL, MOREHEAD CITY, NORTH CAROLINA

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th anniversary school year of St. Egbert's Catholic School in Morehead City, North Carolina.

The school has designated the theme of this important milestone: "Celebrating 50 Years of Loving and Learning."

St. Egbert's started its first year of operation in September 1956 with 46 children in grades kindergarten through four, and was officially dedicated in 1957.

As a mission of St. Egbert's Catholic Church, the original teachers at St. Egbert's were a group of Spanish sisters known as the Daughters of Jesus.

The original school, which was built for just $55,000, consisted of three classrooms and two other rooms that could be combined to serve as an auditorium.

Since then, a second classroom wing has been added, as well as a computer lab. The school now serves grades kindergarten through eight.

Many adults who once attended St. Egbert's have sent children to their alma mater, and now serve as dedicated parent volunteers at the school.

Lesley Ferguson has served as St. Egbert's principal for 30 years, and was the first Catholic school principal in the Raleigh Diocese who was not a Catholic nun.

Although St. Egbert's has grown and seen numerous changes over the past five decades, the school's philosophy and commitment to providing a quality education in a safe Christian environment remains unchanged.

I congratulate the entire community of St. Egbert's Catholic School for reaching this tremendous milestone, and I wish the school many blessings and successes in the years ahead.

COMMITTEE FUNDING RESOLUTION

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2007

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, as ranking Republican of the House Agriculture Committee, I want to commend the chairman of our committee, COLLIN PETERSON, for the cooperative path we have followed in developing the funding method for our committee. We are carrying on the bipartisan tradition of the Agriculture Committee in staffing and expenditures.

Under normal circumstances, I would be voting to support H. Res. 202 that supports the operations of all the committees of the House. Unfortunately, the Speaker has used

the unusual and inappropriate mechanism of the self-enacting rule to add the creation of a new and completely unnecessary Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming. We are being asked to support the expenditure of nearly $4 million on a committee that would have no legislative jurisdiction and would cover no issue that is not already well addressed by existing committees. It strikes me that $4 million is too much for the taxpayer to pay for press releases.

The attempt to create this expensive and useless committee has added an unacceptable element to what would otherwise be a bill I could support. Therefore, I reluctantly oppose H. Res. 202.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GREAT CATS & RARE CANIDS ACT OF 2007

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce the Great Cats & Rare Canids Act along with my original cosponsers and fellow cochairs of the International Conservation Caucus, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. TANNER and our newest cochair, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

Madam Speaker, the first time you witness a great cat or a wild dog, you are likely to feel a rush of adrenaline, a sense of awe, and a heightened awareness of your vulnerability. Leading experts in carnivore biology assure us that these majestic animals feel equal anticipation and anxiety when encountering people. When I spoke with Dr. Alan Rabinowitz of the Wildlife Conservation Society, who has dedicated his life to saving big cats like jaguars, tigers and snow leopards, he told me, ''Of all of the earth's magnificent creatures, the ones easiest to identify with, the ones most symbolic of the wildness remaining on our planet are the large carnivores, the top predators of the world.'' He is right.

Lions, cheetahs, leopards, African wild dogs, Ethiopian wolves, jaguars, manned wolves, bush dogs, clouded leopards, snow leopards, dholes, Iberian lynx and European gray wolves face threats from habitat conversion, loss of food sources, illegal trade, and disease. Scientists report that populations of all of these species are sharply declining compared to their historic ranges. African wild dogs and Ethiopian wolves especially are approaching crisis. Populations of snow leopards in Asia have declined due to illegal hunting for their use in traditional Asian medicine.

That is why it is imperative that the United States, through the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, support efforts to conserve these predators at the top of the food chain. Modeled after the highly successful Multinational Species Conservation Funds, which conserve rhinos, tigers, Great Apes, Asian elephants, African elephants, and marine turtles, this bill is authorized at $5 million annually for the conservation of more than a dozen species of great cats and rare canines existing outside the United States. Acting as umbrella species for entire ecosystems, the health and stability of these iconic species are excellent indicators of human sustainability as well.

I don't stand alone in my conviction to conserve these species. My fellow cochairs of the House International Conservation Caucus and 77 other Members of Congress cosponsored the Great Cats and Rare Canids Act in the 109th Congress. In fact, last year on Capitol Hill, another champion of these animals, the actress Glenn Close, who serves on the Board of the Wildlife Conservation Society, premiered a film entitled Living With Predators, to raise awareness of the plight faced by these predators and how global conservation organizations are offering innovative solutions to ensure their healthy populations and landscapes remain. Even just a minor commitment from the United States will greatly support their efforts. This bill authorizes that support.

Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my fellow cochairs of the House International Conservation Caucus—Representative TANNER, Representative ROGERS, and Representative ROYCE—to re-introduce the Great Cats and Rare Canids Act of 2007. I call on all members of Congress to show their support for these wonderful wild animals and the ecosystems in which they exist by cosponsoring this bill.

PEACHCARE III

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today I rise to call attention to the funding emergency that threatens Georgia's PeachCare.

This is the third time this week I have stood here and announced that starting this Sunday—in just 2 days—no new children will be permitted to enroll.

If no action is taken by Congress or the Governor, this program will run out of funding completely within the next month.

And hard-working Georgia families will no longer be able to provide health care for their children.

I call on the Governor of Georgia and my colleagues in this Congress to ensure these children get the care they need.

I call on my colleagues and the Governor to save PeachCare.

These children deserve healthy futures.

HONORING MR. DENNIS EVERHART

HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dennis Everhart of Woodrow, Colorado, for his impressive contributions to Colorado agriculture. Dennis touched many lives and shared his love for agriculture as a Vocational Agriculture teacher for 26 years. Recently, Dennis received the high honor of induction into the Colorado Agriculture Hall of Fame.

Dennis was raised on a ranch in New Raymer, Colorado, where his family ran a cow and calf operation. After working several years in the oil fields and with his parents in a custom haying operation, Dennis joined the Marines. Following 52 months of active duty, Dennis returned home and earned his bachelor of science degree from Colorado State University in 1970. Dennis taught Vocational Agriculture at Woodlin School in Washington County from 1970 to 1998, taking 1 year off to teach in Golden and 2 years off to manage a commercial hog operation. After retirement, Dennis ran for county commissioner and is currently serving his ninth year as Washington County Commissioner. Dennis and his wife Evelyn are the parents of three grown sons: Doug, Todd and Dennis.

Dennis taught a complete program in vocational agriculture, including crop science, livestock science, agricultural mechanics, marketing and management, and leadership skills. Both he and his students enjoyed a great deal of success. Twenty-six of his students earned the American Farmer/FFA degree; 81 students received the State Farmer/FFA degree. There were also a number of State winners of proficiency awards as well as several State officers from the Woodlin Future Farmers of America chapter. Several of Mr. Everhart's students are currently teaching agriculture education in Colorado. Dennis was a mentor to other young educators as well, supervising student teachers for 23 years. Additionally, Dennis was a sponsor of a successful Colorado Young Farmers Education Association Chapter.

As an individual, Dennis earned many awards through the years, including: honorary membership in the Woodlin FFA chapter; Honorary State Farmer Degree; Honorary American Farmer Degree; Friend of Washington County; 4-H Outstanding Young Farmer Advisor; Outstanding Young Member of Colorado Vocational Ag Teachers Association; Outstanding Region II Teacher for National Association of Ag Educators; Distinguished Service Award from Production Credit Association and officer of the Colorado Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association (serving as president 1987–1988). Dennis was also named U.S. Steel's Ag Teacher of the year and 1998 Ag Teacher of the year by Western District Ag Education.

Dennis led by example and his enthusiastic community involvement demonstrated his passion for making a positive impact on the world around him. I am extremely proud to have the opportunity to honor Dennis Everhart today for his commitment and devotion to Colorado agriculture.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DONALD S. KWALICK

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Donald S. Kwalick, who will be retiring as the Chief Health Officer of the Southern Nevada Health District.

Dr. Kwalick has devoted more than 25 years to serving the community as a public health official. Dr. Kwalick earned his Bachelor of Arts degree in Biological Sciences from Rutgers University and his Medical Degree from New York University. He also attended Columbia University where he earned his Masters in Public Health.

Dr. Kwalick began his service to the community as a public health servant in the 1970s

when, for 2 years, he was the Medical Director of the Trenton (NJ) Neighborhood Health Center. Following this work, Dr. Kwalick served as the Assistant Commissioner of New Jersey's Department of Health. During the 1980s, he was the Hillsborough County Health Officer in Tampa, Florida. In 1990, Dr. Kwalick began his work for the State of Nevada when he became Nevada's State Health Officer, and eventually became the Chief Health Officer of the Southern Nevada Health District.

In addition to achievements in the public health field, Dr. Kwalick's career is also distinguished for his service as a Preventive Medicine Officer at Fort Bliss, Texas, during the Vietnam War and for his involvement in various professional associations. Dr. Kwalick is a Fellow of the American College of Preventive Medicine, a Fellow of the American College of Physician Executive, and a Fellow of the American Public Health Association. He is also a Clark County Medical Society Delegate to the Nevada State Medical Association, NSMA, and Chairman of the NSMA Public Health Committee and President-Elect of the Clark County Medical Society.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor Dr. Kwalick and his career. His dedication to the community is commendable and I wish him luck in his retirement.

HONORING COACH TERRY BUCKLES

HON. RON LEWIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise to publicly congratulate Terry Buckles for achieving his 500th career win as head coach of the Central Hardin High School Women's Basketball Team.

Throughout his 17 year career, Coach Buckles has epitomized the qualities that make Kentucky hold its basketball heroes in high regard. His steady leadership and the lifelong lessons imparted on his players have made his teams a model of teamwork and good sportsmanship. His success is evident through his players, 26 of whom have continued their student-athlete careers at the collegiate level.

In addition to his remarkable record of wins, Coach Buckles has coached his teams to six Kentucky High School Athletic Association Regional Championships. In 1996, he took the Central Hardin Lady Bruins to the State finals and later coached his team to a Kentucky AAU State Championship victory. His success has continued this season, leading the Lady Bruins to a 23–6 record, ranking fourth in the State. With his 500th win, Coach Buckles has joined only seven other coaches who have reached this milestone. He currently stands as the all time leader in wins in the Fifth Region and ranks in the top 10 for career wins for women's coaches in State history.

Coach Buckles' hard work and success at Central Hardin High School has been recognized throughout the Commonwealth. He has received numerous "Coach of the Year" awards; is an inductee of the Fifth Region Hall of Fame; and was honored last year with induction into the Kentucky Association of Basketball Coaches "Court of Honor," the highest tribute a basketball coach in Kentucky can receive.

I would like to recognize Terry Buckles today before the entire U.S. House of Representatives for his recent coaching milestone. His contributions to education and athletics make him a remarkable citizen worthy of our appreciation and respect.

IN MEMORY OF ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER, JR.

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, this Nation has lost one of the great chroniclers of the American experience. I rise today to honor the memory of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., a Pulitzer Prize-winning historian and a member of the Kennedy administration. He was 89 years old.

Mr. Schlesinger was among the most prominent historians of our time and a widely respected observer of contemporary politics. As an author, he received a National Book Award for "Robert Kennedy and His Times" and a National Book Award and a Pulitzer for "A Thousand Days," his memoir/chronicle of President Kennedy's administration. He also won a Pulitzer, in 1946, for "The Age of Jackson," a chronicle of Andrew Jackson's administration. He was also widely described as the "court philosopher" of the Kennedy Administration.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate the life of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and he will be surely missed. He contributed a great deal toward our understanding of our Nation's past. His legacy of service to his country and his fellow man will surely be remembered for years to come.

WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my outrage at the horrific conditions uncovered at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center by Washington Post reports last month. As a frequent visitor to this facility, I was appalled to read about a part of the center I did not see—overused outpatient housing in disrepair, patients confused about where to go after serious operations, and a tangled bureaucracy that service members and their families had to endure.

These conditions are not only unacceptable, but also indicative of the Bush administration's failure to plan for the Iraq war and its aftermath. We owe our wounded service members, who bravely served our country, so much more than what they have received. Many promises are made to our service men and women before they deploy, and when these promises are not met, we have failed this distinguished group. Not only does this affect current service members, but it affects those that may look at a future career in the service. What message are we sending them?

Madam Speaker, these past few years we have found ourselves in a fiscal bind. Hundreds of billions of dollars have been spent on the war, and we are now faced with difficult budget decisions so that future generations do not have the burden of a deficit. But we should all agree that what cannot be sacrificed is the well-being of our wounded service members. As Members of Congress, it is our duty to do everything in our power to make sure that these vulnerable men and women do not slip through the cracks without proper counseling, adequate care or a safe place to live.

I am committed to ensuring that our men and women in uniform receive unfettered access to competent and coordinated care in safe, clean facilities. It is clear that administrative policies need to be revised, not only at Walter Reed, but across the system at locations both here and abroad. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1268, the Dignity for Wounded Warriors Act of 2007, which was introduced by my colleague from Arizona, Congressman HARRY MITCHELL. This bill will establish oversight and accountability of the Nation's military medical centers and housing facilities and reduce the amount of paperwork and bureaucracy for recovering service members and their families by establishing an electronic clearinghouse. This measure will also establish support services and rights for recovering service members and their families, as well as the Oversight Board for the Wounded.

While we must provide the best possible medical care to service members returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, we also must pay heed to those that served our country previously. We cannot forget that the VA will play a larger role in the coming years as more service members return from ongoing conflicts. We must promise both service members and veterans that we will seek accountability and work towards eliminating these problems completely. They have given too much to our Nation to expect anything less.

What we need now is accountability, honesty and oversight. I fully support my colleagues on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, the Armed Services Committee and the Veterans Affairs Committee that have held hearings on this matter. I am also encouraged by the creation of a bipartisan presidential commission led by former Senator Bob Dole and former Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, that is charged with looking into the care of wounded service members.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and forging solutions to correct our military care structure and give our wounded service members the care that they earned and deserve.

CREDIT CARD ACCOUNTABILITY RESPONSIBILITY AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2007

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, at a time when the savings rate of hard working American families is in red, negative for the first time since the Great Depression, it is incumbent that this Congress provide a new direction for the working men and women who hold credit cards.

Credit card usage by consumers play a critical role in the home finances of millions of Americans, particularly those in the working middle class. The overwhelming majority of Americans who use credit cards do so in a responsible manner, however, they are far too often at the mercy of credit card companies, even when they pay their bills on time.

Credit card companies have engaged in dubious patterns of behavior such as using hidden fees, penalty interest charges, and other unfair practices to siphon money away from the households of working families. The terms and conditions set fourth by credit card companies too often lack clarity and snare unsuspecting working men and women into a negative cycle of debt and adverse credit worthiness. Outrageous fees, improper billing practices and highly complex credit card agreement terms should not be the norm for the credit card industry nor should they be a burden to working Americans. Quite simply put, families should not have to hire a CPA or an attorney to decipher their credit card agreement terms and billing statements.

I want the Record to reflect my original cosponsorship of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2007, offered by my colleague Congressman MARK UDALL. I commend his vision and efforts to help provide relief to untold numbers of working families who have been victimized by a lack of transparency. It is my hope that in addition to the efforts of this Congress, the credit card companies and financial sector advocates work with us to address this issue and provide fairness to the American consumer.

I thank Congressman UDALL for his efforts.

BDI-IMDI CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION SPEECH

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, on February 20, 2007, I gave the following speech in Hamburg, Germany:

The American and European economies are deeply rooted and complimentary. In 2006, the transatlantic commerce—trade, investment and local business by transatlantic subsidiaries—representing three trillion dollars in business and providing some 14 million jobs on both sides of the Atlantic.

We recognize that the U.S. Administration and Europe have developed numerous plans to eliminate barriers between the two continents, however much work remains if we are to achieve a truly barrier free transatlantic market.

Chancellor Merkel has rightly pointed to the need for a new transatlantic initiative as the best means of expanding economic opportunity and enhancing competition in the global economy. We support the call for a new Transatlantic Partnership based on the foundation of our shared values to further deepen our economic ties and to eliminate trade barriers that still exist.

Previous attempts by both U.S. Administrations and the European Commission to develop plans to enhance transatlantic cooperation have resulted in some favorable results, but a higher-level commitment is in order to more effectively dismantle the barriers that limit the economic and trade opportunities in both continents.

A mutual pledge to addressing the barriers that inhibit trade and commitment to strengthening competitiveness and growth in the transatlantic economy is timely. The BDI-IMDI Congressional Roundtable discussion underscores the need for a transatlantic framework agreement in which the governments and legislatures on both sides of the Atlantic commit to addressing these issues.

We applaud Chancellor Merkel for giving priority attention to the Transatlantic Partnership in her position as President of the European Union and support placing the item on the next EU-U.S. Economic Summit Agenda and encourage our respective governments to further cooperation in this area.

TRIBUTE TO MARTIN RICHARDS IN HONOR OF HIS BIRTHDAY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise before this historic chamber of the House of Representatives to call to the attention of this Congress the profound achievements of Martin Richards as we honor him on his birthday this March 11.

Many here and throughout our nation know of Mr. Richards through his extraordinary accomplishments as a theatrical and movie producer, having won our nations' highest awards including an Oscar for best picture, numerous Tony Awards for his Broadway productions, and a Pulitzer Prize.

Martin Richards has also blessed the lives of so many New Yorkers through his vision and leadership on behalf of so many seeking hope and opportunity. In 1997, Mayor Giuliani appointed him to a six-year term as a member of The Trust for Cultural Resources of the City of New York. He was also a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council for Theatre.

Mr. Richards served on the President's Council for the Gay Men's Health Crisis, and is on the Board of Directors of Broadway Cares/Equity Fights AIDS. In 1994, in memory of his wife, he established the Mary Lea Johnson Richards Institute at New York University Medical Center for organ transplantation and research, and in 1995, also in memory of his wife, he co-founded the Children's Advocacy Center of Manhattan, New York City's only non-profit center for abused children. For the past eight years he has produced the annual Red Ball, one of New York's premiere charitable events, which benefits both the Institute and the Advocacy Center.

Martin Richards' life is a living example of the expression that one man can truly make a difference. This boy from the Bronx has brought dreams and joy to audiences throughout the world though his work. By celebrating Martin Richards' birthday, we take pride in the ideals that define the greatness of New York City.

Madam Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me now in honoring Martin Richards for bringing joy and hope to the people of New York City and the entire nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FALLEN AND WOUNDED SOLDIERS FUND

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, I want to recognize the tremendous generosity and compassion of the Fallen and Wounded Soldiers Fund. The organization's contribution to the men and women protecting our country should be commended.

The Fallen and Wounded Soldiers Fund began as a conversation between three friends, Christopher Cornelius, Tino DelSignore, and John Gingrell in December 2005. Christopher, a veteran, had just returned from visiting some wounded soldiers and had seen the hardships endured by the families who had lost loved ones. After sharing his experiences, the three friends decided to do something to ease the effects of war on our brave soldiers and their families.

Together they created the Fallen and Wounded Soldiers Fund, a volunteer non-profit organization that is dedicated to supporting U.S. soldiers and their families. Since its inception, the Fallen and Wounded Soldiers Fund has held dinners, auctions, and various community events to raise funds and awareness to their cause. In 2006, I am proud to say that the Fallen and Wounded Soldiers Fund raised over $100,000 in donations that have benefited numerous families in Michigan.

On February 24, 2007, The Fallen and Wounded Soldiers Fund held their second annual dinner. This event drew over 600 people and raised over $75,000 that will be donated to organizations like Homes For The Troops, Special Operations Warrior Fund, and Michigan Paralyzed Veterans of America. In addition the proceeds will be used to help fallen soldiers' children attend college, fly out family members to visit the wounded, and assist in adapting the homes of disabled soldiers for handicapped accessibility.

Today I salute the Fallen and Wounded Soldiers Fund for their tireless efforts on behalf of our courageous men and women in the armed services. Theirs is a shining example of the altruism that embodies the American spirit.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF DR. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN BYRD, JR.

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2007

Mr. COOPER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the memory of Dr. Benjamin Franklin Byrd, Jr., a servant of the common good and fine citizen of our community.

Dr. Byrd was born on May 18, 1918, as the son of Benjamin Franklin and Ida Brister Byrd. An Eagle Scout and ROTC participant, Dr. Byrd attended the Duncan College Preparatory School in Nashville and received his A.B. degree from Vanderbilt University in 1937. In 1941, he earned his M.D. from Vanderbilt University School of Medicine.

During his medical residency, Pearl Harbor was attacked, and Dr. Byrd enlisted in the U.S. Army without hesitation. He was assigned to the 29th Infantry Division, 104th

Medical Battalion, a unit of the 116th Regimental Combat Team (RCT).

Along with the other men in his unit, Dr. Byrd stormed Omaha Beach on D-Day. He headed up the medical evaluation of wounded soldiers and continued on with the unit into St. Lo a month later, as the men fought across France and Germany. Later, Dr. Byrd served as Commanding Officer of the 314th Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH).

By then a Lieutenant Colonel, Dr. Byrd returned from the victorious war effort having earned many honors: the European Theatre ribbon from the Normandy/Omaha Beach invasion, the Bronze Star with two oak leaf clusters after St. Lo, the Purple Heart, and the Silver Star at the Roer River crossing in Germany.

Carrying with him the memories and lessons from World War II, Dr. Byrd proceeded to focus his energy on the care and cure for patients suffering from breast cancer. He advocated mammography as the best tool for early diagnosis and was a main proponent of the transformation of Nashville's Vanderbilt University Medical School into one of the preeminent cancer research centers in the nation.

Over the next few years Dr. Byrd served as a Professor of Clinical Surgery at Vanderbilt University Hospital, Professor of Clinical Surgery at Meharry Medical College, Chairman of the Board of Overseers of the Vanderbilt-Ingram Cancer Center, and Chief of Surgery at St. Thomas Hospital from 1964 to 1970. In addition, he served as President of the Medical Staff at the Junior League Home for Crippled Children and was President of the Nashville Academy of Medicine.

Dr. Byrd served as President of the Tennessee Division of the American Cancer Society in 1963 and served on its national board of directors from 1965 onward. From 1975 to 1976, he served as President of the American Cancer Society (National) and the organization awarded him its first Ted Marrs award. Internationally, Dr. Byrd served as Chairman of the Cancer Study Group in the USSR in 1976, the People's Republic of China in 1977, and the National Conference on Breast Cancer in 1979.

Dr. Byrd served as a member of the Board of Governors of the American College of Surgeons from 1973 to 1979, Fellow of the Southern Surgical Association, Fellow of the American Surgical Association, Chairman of the Surgery Section of the Southern Medical Association, President of the Vanderbilt University Medical School Alumni Association and President of the Southern Surgical Congress. In 1977, he received the Distinguished Service Award and in 1974 was named a Fellow of the Societe Intemationale de Chirurgie. He also received the Outstanding Physician of the Year Award from the Tennessee Medical Association in 1986 and the Distinguished Physician Award from the Tennessee Hospital Association in 1992.

Although much of Dr. Benjamin Byrd's life revolved around his passion for using medicine to alleviate human suffering, he was also a devoted leader in his church. He served at the First Presbyterian Church as Sunday School Director, as Deacon, and as Elder. He also served as Chairman of the Board of Cheekwood from 1971 to 1973, President of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce from 1984 to 1985, Chairman of the Hermitage Board of Trustees from 1982 to 1990, President of the Exchange Club in 1966, and President of Leadership Nashville in 1983. He was a Trustee of Senior Citizens, the Cumberland Museum, the University School of Nashville, and Historic Nashville, and he served as a director and member of the Trust Board of Commerce Union Bank. He also served as a director of the NLT Corporation.

In 1986, Dr. Byrd was named Outstanding Nashvillian for his role as President of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce. Through his leadership and determination, the city became an American Airlines hub and gained the Saturn automotive plant, among many significant achievements. Later, in 1988, Dr. Byrd received the Human Relations Award from the National Council of Christians and Jews.

Raymond N. DuBois, M.D., Ph.D., Director of the Vanderbilt-Ingram Cancer Center and holder of the B.F. Byrd, Jr., Professor of Oncology chair, said, ''Dr. Byrd is really one of the pillars of the Vanderbilt-Ingram Cancer Center. He worked extremely hard to make sure that we could have one of the best cancer centers in the country. I have never met anyone who was so dedicated to the cause and so willing to help out in every way possible. He will be missed greatly.''

Madam Speaker, today I rise to echo those sentiments and pay tribute to a fine pillar of our community. Dr. Byrd's achievements have paved the way for future generations, his selfless actions have provided comfort to neighbors near and far, and his quiet integrity reflects warmly on all who were fortunate enough to know him. I add my modest words of praise today to the many richly deserved honors he received in life. Moreover, I ask the House to join me in celebrating the life of Dr. Benjamin Byrd, his legacy of service to the greater good, and the inspiration he will continue to provide for family, friends, and all citizens of the world.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2955–S2989

Measures Introduced: Six bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 832–837, S. Res. 102–104, and S. Con. Res. 17–18. **Page S2969**

Measures Reported:

S. 377, to establish a United States Poland parliamentary youth exchange program. (S. Rept. No. 110–33)

S. 494, to endorse further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and to facilitate the timely admission of new members to NATO. (S. Rept. No. 110–34)

S. 676, to provide that the Executive Director of the Inter American Development Bank or the Alternate Executive Director of the Inter American Development Bank may serve on the Board of Directors of the Inter American Foundation. (S. Rept. No. 110–35) **Pages S2968–69**

Measures Passed:

International Women's Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 102, supporting the goals of ''International Women's Day''. **Pages S2987–88**

Commending the Kingdom of Lesotho: Senate agreed to S. Res. 103, commending the Kingdom of Lesotho, on the occasion of International Women's Day, for the enactment of a law to improve the status of married women and ensure the access of married women to property rights. **Pages S2988–89**

Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse: Senate passed H.R. 544, to designate the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the ''Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse'', clearing the measure for the President. **Page S2989**

Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building: Senate passed H.R. 584, to designate the Federal building located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwest in the District of Columbia as the ''Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building'', clearing the measure for the President. **Page S2989**

Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse: Committee on Environment and Public Works was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 342, to designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the ''Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse'', and the bill was then passed, clearing the measure for the President. **Page S2989**

Improving America's Security by Implementing Unfinished Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act: Senate continued consideration of S. 4, to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, withdrawing the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2956–67**

Pending:

Reid Amendment No. 275, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2956**

Landrieu Amendment No. 321 (to Amendment No. 275), to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to include levees in the list of critical infrastructure sectors. **Page S2956**

Schumer/Clinton Amendment No. 336 (to Amendment No. 275), to prohibit the use of the peer review process in determining the allocation of funds among metropolitan areas applying for grants under the Urban Area Security Initiative. **Page S2956**

Coburn Amendment No. 325 (to Amendment No. 275), to ensure the fiscal integrity of grants awarded by the Department of Homeland Security. **Page S2956**

Coburn Amendment No. 294 (to Amendment No. 275), to provide that the provisions of the Act shall cease to have any force or effect on and after December 31, 2012, to ensure congressional review and oversight of the Act. **Page S2956**

Kyl Modified Amendment No. 357 (to Amendment No. 275), to amend the data-mining technology reporting requirement to avoid revealing existing patents, trade secrets, and confidential business processes, and to adopt a narrower definition of

data-mining in order to exclude routine computer searches. **Pages S2956–57**

Biden Amendment No. 383 (to Amendment No. 275), to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop regulations regarding the transportation of high hazard materials. **Page S2957**

Schumer Modified Amendment No. 367 (to Amendment No. 275), to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to establish and implement a program to provide additional safety measures for vehicles that carry high hazardous materials. **Page S2957**

Stevens Amendment No. 299 (to Amendment No. 275), to authorize NTIA to borrow against anticipated receipts of the Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Fund to initiate migration to a national IP-enabled emergency network capable of receiving and responding to all citizen activated emergency communications. **Page S2957**

Schumer/Clinton Amendment No. 337 (to Amendment No. 275), to provide for the use of funds in any grant under the Homeland Security Grant Program for personnel costs. **Page S2956**

Bond/Rockefeller Amendment No. 389 (to Amendment No. 275), to provide the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate should submit a report on the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission with respect to intelligence reform and congressional intelligence oversight reform. **Page S2957**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 46 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 68), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the McConnell (for Cornyn) Modified Amendment No. 312 (to Amendment No. 275) (listed above). **Page S2958**

By 69 yeas to 26 nays (Vote No. 69), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on Reid Amendment No. 275 (listed above). **Page S2958**

Chair sustained a point of order under Rule XXII, that the following amendments were not germane, and the amendments thus fell:

Sununu Amendment No. 291 (to Amendment No. 275), to ensure that the emergency communications and interoperability communications grant program does not exclude Internet Protocol-based interoperable solutions. **Page S2956**

Salazar/Lieberman Modified Amendment No. 290 (to Amendment No. 275), to require a quadrennial homeland security review. **Page S2956**

Dorgan/Conrad Amendment No. 313 (to Amendment No. 275), to require a report to Congress on the hunt for Osama Bin Laden, Ayman al-Zawahiri, and the leadership of al Qaeda. **Page S2956**

Landrieu Amendment No. 296 (to Amendment No. 275), to permit the cancellation of certain loans under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. **Page S2956**

Landrieu Modified Amendment No. 295 (to Amendment No. 275), to provide adequate funding for local governments harmed by Hurricane Katrina of 2005 or Hurricane Rita of 2005. **Page S2956**

Allard Amendment No. 272 (to Amendment No. 275), to prevent the fraudulent use of social security account numbers by allowing the sharing of social security data among agencies of the United States for identity theft prevention and immigration enforcement purposes. **Page S2956**

McConnell (for Sessions) Amendment No. 305 (to Amendment No. 275), to clarify the voluntary inherent authority of States to assist in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States and to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide information related to aliens found to have violated certain immigration laws to the National Crime Information Center. **Page S2956**

McConnell (for Cornyn) Amendment No. 310 (to Amendment No. 275), to strengthen the Federal Government's ability to detain dangerous criminal aliens, including murderers, rapists, and child molesters, until they can be removed from the United States. **Page S2956**

McConnell (for Cornyn) Amendment No. 311 (to Amendment No. 275), to provide for immigration injunction reform. **Page S2956**

McConnell (for Cornyn) Modified Amendment No. 312 (to Amendment No. 275), to prohibit the recruitment of persons to participate in terrorism, to clarify that the revocation of an alien's visa or other documentation is not subject to judicial review, to strengthen the Federal Government's ability to detain dangerous criminal aliens, including murderers, rapists, and child molesters, until they can be removed from the United States, to prohibit the rewarding of suicide bombings and allow adequate punishments for terrorist murders, kidnappings, and sexual assaults. **Page S2956**

McConnell (for Kyl) Modified Amendment No. 317 (to Amendment No. 275), to prohibit the rewarding of suicide bombings and allow adequate punishments for terrorist murders, kidnappings, and sexual assaults. **Page S2956**

McConnell (for Kyl) Amendment No. 318 (to Amendment No. 275), to protect classified information. **Page S2956**

McConnell (for Kyl) Amendment No. 319 (to Amendment No. 275), to provide for relief from (a)(3)(B) immigration bars from the Hmong and other groups who do not pose a threat to the United States, to designate the Taliban as a terrorist organization for immigration purposes. **Page S2956**

McConnell (for Kyl)Amendment No. 320 (to Amendment No. 275), to improve the Classified Information Procedures Act. **Page S2956**

McConnell (for Grassley) Amendment No. 300 (to Amendment No. 275), to clarify the revocation of an alien's visa or other documentation is not subject to judicial review. **Page S2956**

McConnell (for Grassley) Amendment No. 309 (to Amendment No. 275), to improve the prohibitions on money laundering. **Page S2956**

Thune Amendment No. 308 (to Amendment No. 275), to expand and improve the Proliferation Security Initiative while protecting the national security interests of the United States. **Page S2956**

Cardin Amendment No. 326 (to Amendment No. 275), to provide for a study of modification of area of jurisdiction of Office of National Capital Region Coordination. **Page S2956**

Cardin Amendment No. 327 (to Amendment No. 275), to reform mutual aid agreements for the National Capital Region. **Page S2956**

Cardin Modified Amendment No. 328 (to Amendment No. 275), to require Amtrak contracts and leases involving the State of Maryland to be governed by the laws of the District of Columbia. **Page S2956**

Sessions Amendment No. 347 (to Amendment No. 275), to express the sense of the Congress regarding the funding of Senate approved construction of fencing and vehicle barriers along the southwest border of the United States. **Page S2956**

Coburn Amendment No. 301 (to Amendment No. 275), to prohibit grant recipients under grant programs administered by the Department from expending funds until the Secretary has reported to Congress that risk assessments of all programs and activities have been performed and completed, improper payments have been estimated, and corrective action plans have been developed and reported as required under the Improper Payments Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note). **Page S2956**

Lieberman (for Menendez) Amendment No. 354 (to Amendment No. 275), to improve the security of cargo containers destined for the United States. **Page S2956**

Specter Amendment No. 286 (to Amendment No. 275), to restore habeas corpus for those detained by the United States. **Pages S2956, S2962**

Ensign Amendment No. 363 (to Amendment No. 275), to establish a Law Enforcement Assistance Force in the Department of Homeland Security to facilitate the contributions of retired law enforcement officers during major disasters. **Page S2957**

Biden Amendment No. 384 (to Amendment No. 275), to establish a Homeland Security and Neighborhood Safety Trust Fund and refocus Federal priorities toward securing the Homeland. **Page S2957**

Bunning Amendment No. 334 (to Amendment No. 275), to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify the authorities relating to Federal flight deck officers. **Page S2957**

Schumer Amendment No. 366 (to Amendment No. 275), to restrict the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to issue a license authorizing the export to a recipient country of highly enriched uranium for medical isotope production. **Page S2957**

Wyden Amendment No. 348 (to Amendment No. 275), to require that a redacted version of the Executive Summary of the Office of Inspector General Report on Central Intelligence Agency Accountability Regarding Findings and Conclusions of the Joint Inquiry into Intelligence Community Activities Before and After the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 is made available to the public. **Page S2957**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the previously scheduled vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill be vitiated; that the bill be read a third time and a vote occur on final passage on Tuesday, March 13, 2007 immediately upon the disposition of Reid Amendment No. 275 (listed above); that when the Senate convenes on Tuesday, March 13, 2007, and resumes consideration of the bill, all time under cloture be expired and Senate immediately begin voting on the pending germane amendments; provided further that during legislative session on Monday, March 12, 2007, the provisions of Rule 22 not bar a motion to proceed made by the Majority Leader. **Page S2989**

Appointments:

Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 101–509, the reappointment of Guy Rocha of Nevada to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress. **Page S2987**

Messages From the House: **Page S2968**

Messages Referred: **Page S2968**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S2968, S2987**

Executive Communications: **Page S2968**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2969–70**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S2970–77

Amendments Submitted: Pages S2977–87

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—69) Page S2958

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:15 a.m., and adjourned at 1:11 p.m., until 2:30 p.m. on Monday, March 12, 2007. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2989.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION/SBA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008, after receiving testimony in behalf of funds for their respective activities from Reuben Jeffery III, Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; and Steven C. Preston, Administrator, Small Business Administration.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 44 public bills, H.R. 1424–1467; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 88–89; and H. Res. 231–235 were introduced. Pages H2397–H2400

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H2400–01

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 985, to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify which disclosures of information are protected from prohibited personnel practices; to require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements to the effect that such policies, forms, and agreements are consistent with certain disclosure protections, with amendments (H. Rept. 110–42, Pt. 1);

H.R. 1254, to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations (H. Rept. 110–43); and

H.R. 1255, to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, with amendments (H. Rept. 110–44). Page H2397

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Solis to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. Page H2343

Water Quality Financing Act of 2007: The House passed H.R. 720, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, by a yea-and-nay vote of 303 yeas to 108 nays, Roll No. 135. Pages H2345–77

Agreed to the Cantor motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 359 ayes to 56 nays, Roll No. 134. Subsequently, Representative Oberstar reported the bill back to the House with the amendment and the amendment was agreed to. Pages H2374–76

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill and modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 110–36 shall be considered as adopted and shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment. Page H2364

Agreed to:

Stupak amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 110–36) that requires the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the State Department and Canadian government, to study wastewater treatment facilities that discharge into the Great Lakes and provide recommendations to improve monitoring, information sharing, and cooperation between the U.S. and Canada and requires the EPA to consult with the International Joint Commission; Pages H2367–68

Hall (NY) amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 110–36) that requires that states, in the development of their priority list under section 606(g) of the Clean Water Act, consider whether the project or activity proposed for funding would first address the repair and replacement of existing wastewater infrastructure; Pages H2370–71

Platts amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 110–36) that extends the application of the full-and-open competition requirements of Title II of the Clean Water Act to bid specifications for projects funded in whole or in part with monies provided through the State Revolving Funds; and **Page S2371**

Hirono amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 110–36) that authorizes technical assistance and grants for the development of integrated water resource plans. **Pages H2371–72**

Rejected:

Baker amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 110–36) that sought to strike the Davis-Bacon section of the bill (by a recorded vote of 140 ayes to 280 noes, Roll No. 133). **Pages H2368–70, S2373–74**

Withdrawn:

Whitfield amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 110–36) that sought to establish a two-year pilot program to test under normal weather conditions what an extended summer pool lake level would mean to enhanced boating safety, recreation, navigation, fishing, and tourism activities, while also enabling us to gauge the economic impact of longer and higher water levels. **Pages H2372–73**

H. Res. 229, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 132, after agreeing to order the previous question. **Pages H2345–51**

Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming: Representative Markey, Chairman; Representatives Blumenauer, Inslee, Larson (CT), Solis, Herseth, Cleaver, Hall (NY), McNerney, Sensenbrenner, Shadegg, Walden (OR), Sullivan, Blackburn, and Miller (MI). **Page H2377**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Marchant wherein he resigned from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure pending his appointment to the Committee on Financial Services. **Page H2377**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, March 12th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H2379**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed by unanimous consent to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, March 14th. **Page H2379**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Inglis wherein he resigned from the Committee on Education and Labor, effective immediately. **Page H2381**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H2377.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2350–51, H2373–74, H2375–76 and H2376–77. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9:00 a.m. and adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Committee Meetings

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies held a hearing on NASA Overview. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Preparing for Disasters, Natural or Otherwise. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Homeland Security: Roger T. Rufe, Jr., Director, Operations Coordination; and R. David Paulison, Director, FEMA and Under Secretary, Federal Emergency Management; William O. Jenkins, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on U.S. Geological Survey. Testimony was heard from Mark Myers, Director, U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

LABOR, HHS, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing on (Panel I) Centers for Disease Control/(Panel II) Emergency Preparedness: Office of the Secretary, Centers for Disease Control, NIH. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Julie L. Gerberding, M.D., Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Anthony Fauci, M.D., Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, NIH; and Gerald W. Parker, M.D., Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of

the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response.

FRAUDULENT PHONE RECESS ACCESS PREVENTION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Held a hearing entitled ''Combating Pretexting: H.R. 936, Prevention of Fraudulent Access to Phone Records Act.'' Testimony was heard from Lydia Parnes, Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection, FTC; Thomas Navin, Chief, Wireline Bureau, FCC; and public witnesses.

SECTION 8 VOUCHER REFORM

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing entitled ''The Section 8 Voucher Reform Act.'' Testimony was heard from Orlando J. Cabrera, Assistant Secretary, Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development; and public witnesses.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of March 12 through March 17, 2007

Senate Chamber

On Monday, at 2:30 p.m., Senate will be in a period of morning business.

On *Tuesday,* Senate will resume consideration of S. 4, Improving America's Security by Implementing Unfinished Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: March 13, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., SD–124.

March 14, Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for the Army, 10:30 a.m., SD–192.

March 14, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine federal funding for the No Child Left Behind Act, 2:30 p.m., SD–124.

March 15, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine solvency and reform proposals for the Federal Housing Administration, 9:30 a.m., SD–138.

March 15, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine international food assistance, 10 a.m., SD–124.

March 15, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 2 p.m., SD–138.

March 15, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for the Department of the Army, Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior, 2:30 p.m., SD–192.

March 16, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for the fiscal year 2008 for the Government Accountability Office, Government Printing Office, Congressional Budget Office, and the Office of Compliance, 10 a.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: March 15, to receive a closed briefing on Iraq, 8:30 a.m., S–407, Capitol.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: March 14, Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Innovation, to hold hearings to examine technology solutions for climate change, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

March 15, Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2008 for the U.S. Coast Guard, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: March 15, Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to hold hearings to examine water resources needs and the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2008 for the Army Corps of Engineers, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: March 14, to hold hearings to examine charting a course for health care moving toward universal coverage, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: March 13, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of James R. Kunder, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator, Douglas Menarchik, of Texas, to be an Assistant Administrator, Paul J. Bonicelli, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator, and Katherine Almquist, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator, all of the United States Agency for International Development, Margrethe Lundsager, of Virginia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, Eli Whitney Debevoise II, of Maryland, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Curtis S. Chin, of New York, to be United States Director of the Asian Development Bank, with the rank of Ambassador, 3 p.m., SD–419.

March 14, Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, to hold hearings to examine strategies to end the violence relating to extrajudicial killings in the Philippines, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

March 15, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Zalmay Khalilzad to be a Representative to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the Representative in the Security Council of the United Nations, and to be a Representative to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Representative to the United Nations, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: March 13, to hold joint hearings with House Committee

on Education and Labor to examine improving No Child Left Behind to close the acheviment gap, relating to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorzation, 9:30 a.m., 2175 RHOB.

March 14, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 624, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide waivers relating to grants for preventive health measures with respect to breast and cervical cancers, Keeping Seniors Safe From Act of 2007, S. 657, to amend the Public Health Service Act to add requirements regarding trauma care, and any pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–430.

March 14, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine enhancing patient access and drug safety relating to Prescription Drug User Fees, 10:15 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: March 13, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine United States international efforts to secure radiological materials, focusing on Department of Energy and Nuclear Regulatory Commission efforts to secure radiological materials through the International Atomic Energy Agency and the other multilateral organizations, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

March 14, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the threat of Islamic radicalism to the homeland, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

March 15, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Gregory B. Cade, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the United States Fire Administration, Department of Homeland Security, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: March 13, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Benjamin Hale Settle, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington, Frederick J. Kapala, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, and Halil Suleyman Ozerden, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi, 10 a.m., SD–226.

March 14, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine reinvigorating the Freedom of Information Act relating to open government, 10 a.m., SD–226.

March 15, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 236, to require reports to Congress on Federal agency use of data mining, S. 261, to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, S. 376, to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, S. 231, to authorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program at fiscal year 2006 levels through 2012, S. 368, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, S. 627, to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to improve the health and well-being of maltreated infants and toddlers through the creation of a National Court Teams Resource Center, to assist local Court Teams, and S. Con. Res. 14, commemorating the 85th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a leading association for the 1,300,000 United States citizens of Greek ancestry and Philhellenes in the United States and possibility of certain subpoenas in connection with investigation into replacement of United States Attorneys, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: March 14, to hold hearings to examine S. 223, to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form, 10 a.m., SR–301.

Select Committee on Intelligence: March 13, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

March 15, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, March 13, Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition and Forestry, hearing to review the federal food stamp program and its impact on children's health, 10 a.m., 1302 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, March 12, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on Secretary of Education, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 12, Subcommittee on Select Intelligence Oversight, executive, on CIA Budget, 5 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

March 13, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Secretary of Agriculture, 2 p.m., 2362A Rayburn.

March 13 and 14, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, on NASA, 10 a.m., 2362A Rayburn and 2 p.m., 2362B Rayburn on March 13 and 10 a.m and 2 p.m., 2362A Rayburn on March 14.

March 13, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn.

March 13, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Secret Service, 10 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

March 13, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, on Arts Panel, 10:30 a.m., on the Social and Economic Status of Native Americans, 1:30 p.m., and on Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of the Special Trustee, 2 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

March 13, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on Department of Education: Elementary and Secondary Education, and Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 13, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, on Capitol Visitor Center, 1:30 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 13, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies, on Navy Budget, 9:30 and a hearing on Veterans' Claims Process, 1 p.m., H–143 Capitol.

March 13, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, on Millenium Challenge Account, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 13, Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, on Status of Public Housing and HOPE VI, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies, on Science Research, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, on National Archives and Records Administration, 10 a.m., 2220 Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, on Bureau of Land Management, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, on Department of Education: Student Financial Aid, Higher Education, Institute of Education Sciences, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs and Related Agencies, on Long-Term Challenges for Military Construction and Budget Overview, 10:30 a.m., and on VA Research, 2 p.m., H–143 Capitol.

March 14, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies, on Secretary of Transportation, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, on Food Safety and Inspection Service, 2 p.m., 2362A Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, on Commission on Civil Rights/Legal Services Commission/State Justice Institute, 10 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

March 15, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, on D.C. Courts and Criminal Justice, 2 p.m., 2220 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Gulf Coast Rebuilding, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, on Indian Health Service, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on Secretary of Labor, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, on U.S. House of Representatives: Budget, 10 a.m., H–144 Capitol.

March 15, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs and Related Agencies, on Base Realignment and Closure, 10 a.m., and on European Command, 2 p.m., H–143 Capitol.

March 15, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies, on Federal Highway Administration/Federal Transit Administration, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, March 13, Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2008 National Defense Authorization Budget Request on Unmanned Aerial Vehicles and Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance capabilities, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 13, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on overview of military resale programs, 9 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

March 13, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on the adequacy of the Fiscal Year 2008 National Defense Authorization Budget Request to meet readiness needs, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, hearing on harnessing technology innovation: challenges and opportunities, 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 15, full Committee, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2008 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the U.S. European Command and Joint Forces Command, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, to continue hearings on views of military advocacy and beneficiary groups, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces, hearing on the Federal ship construction loan guarantee program, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, March 15, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor and Pensions, hearing on ''Examining Innovative Approaches to Covering the Uninsured Through Employer-Provided Health Benefits,'' 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, March 13, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Post Katrina Health Care: Continuing Concerns and Immediate Needs in the New Orleans Region,'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality, hearing entitled ''Climate Change and Energy Security: Perspectives from the Automobile Industry,'' 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission,'' 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled ''Combating Spyware: The Spy Act,'' 11 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality, hearing entitled ''Climate Change: State and Local Perspectives,'' 11 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, March 12, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals on GSE Reform,'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 15, full Committee, hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals on GSE Reform,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 13 hearing on Tibet: Status of the Sino-Tibetan Dialogue, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 13, Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, hearing on Haiti's Development Needs, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 14, full Committee, hearing on the American Red Cross Governance Reform, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, hearing on Global

Polling Data on Opinion of American Policies, Values and People, 2:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and the Global Environment, hearing on U.S. Policy Toward South Pacific Island Nations, Including Australia and New Zealand, 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Europe, hearing on U.S.-Turkish Relations and the Challenges Ahead, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, and the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, joint hearing on Iranian Nuclear Crisis: Latest Developments and Next Steps, 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, March 13, to mark up H.R. 1401, Rail and Public Transportation Security Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

March 14, Subcommittee on Emergency Communication, Preparedness, and Response, hearing entitled ''Public Safety Interoperable Communications Grants: Are the Departments of Homeland Security and Commerce Effectively Coordinating to Meet our Nation's Emergency Communications Needs?'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

March 14, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity and Science and Technology, hearing entitled ''Countering the Nuclear Threat to the Homeland: Evaluating the Procurement of Radiation Detection Technologies,'' 2 p.m., 1539 Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment, hearing entitled ''The Department of Homeland Security State and Local Fusion Center Program: Advancing Information Sharing While Safeguarding Civil Liberties,'' 3:30 p.m., 311 Cannon.

March 15, full Committee, hearing entitled ''Disaster Declarations: Where is FEMA in a Time of Need?'' 1 p.m., 311 Cannon.

March 15, Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counterterrorism, hearing entitled ''Crossing the Border: Immigrants in Detention and Victims of Trafficking,'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, March 15, Subcommittee on Elections, hearing on Election Reform, 2 p.m., room to be announced.

Committee on the Judiciary, March 14, hearing on the District of Columbia Voting Rights Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, March 13, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Oceans, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 50, Multinational Species Conservation Funds Reauthorization Act of 2007; and H.R. 465, Asian Elephant Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 14, full Committee, hearing on the Indian Health Care Improvement Act Amendments of 2007, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 15, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 713, Niagara Falls National Heritage Area Act; H.R. 754, To designate the National Museum of Wildlife Art, located at 2820 Rungius Road, Jackson, Wyoming, as the National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States; and H.R. 929, Land Between the Rivers Southern Illinois National Heritage Area Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, March 13, to consider the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 16, hearing on White House Procedures for Safeguarding Classified Information, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, March 13, to consider H.R. 985, Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2007, 3:30 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

March 14, to consider H.R. 1362, Accountability in Contracting Act, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science and Technology, March 13, hearing on Science and Technology Leadership in a 21st Century Global Economy, 1 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

March 14, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on the Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2008 Research and Development Budget Proposal, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

March 15, full Committee, hearing on NASA's Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, March 14, hearing entitled ''Challenges and Solutions to Health Insurance Coverage for Small Businesses,'' 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn,

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, March 13, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, hearing on U.S./Mexican Trucking: Safety and the Cross Border Demonstration Project,'' 1 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, March 13, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 797, Dr. James Allen Veteran Vision Equity Act; and H.R. 1284, Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2007; followed by a hearing on the Impact of OIF/OEF on the VA Claims Process, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

March 13, Subcommittee on Health, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 612, Returning Servicemember VA Healthcare Insurance Act of 2007; and H.R. 327, Joshua Omvig Veterans Suicide Prevention Act, 1:30 p.m., 334 Cannon.

March 15, full Committee, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 327, Joshua Omvig Veterans Suicide Prevention Act; H.R. 612, Returning Servicemember VA Healthcare Insurance Act of 2007; H.R. 797, Dr. James Allen Veteran Vision Equity Act; and H.R. 1284, Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

March 15, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Traumatic Brain and Poly-trauma Centers, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, March 13, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on Katrina Redevelopment Tax Issues, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

March 14, full Committee, hearing on the Revenue Increasing Measures in the Small Business and Work Opportunity Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

March 14, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Genetic Non-Discrimination, 2 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, hearing on Increasing Economic Security for American Workers, 10 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing on H.R. 1229, Nonmarket Economy Trade Remedy Act of 2007, 1 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, March 13, executive, hearing on Facilities and Infrastructures, 2 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

March 15, executive, hearing on Geospatial Intelligence, 1 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

March 15, executive, briefing on the CIA, 3:30 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: March 13, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, to hold joint hearings with House Committee on Education and Labor to examine improving No Child Left Behind to close the achievement gap, relating to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorzation, 9:30 a.m., 2175 RHOB.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2:30 p.m., Monday, March 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, March 12

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E515
Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E514
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E508, E510
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E514
Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E515
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E515
Davis, Tom, Va., E502, E504, E505
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E510
Dingell, John D., Mich., E509
Doolittle, John T., Calif., E509
Gonzalez, Charles A., Tex., E511
Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E507, E512
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E510
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E513
Jones, Walter B., N.C., E512
Knollenberg, Joe, Mich., E515
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E501, E503, E505, E506
Langevin, James R., R.I., E512, E514
Lewis, Ron, Ky., E514
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E502, E504
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E511
Musgrave, Marilyn N., Colo., E513
Poe, Ted, Tex., E508
Porter, Jon C., Nev., E501, E503, E504, E506, E507, E513
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E507
Sires, Albio, N.J., E509
Tanner, John S., Tenn., E510
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E503, E504
Udall, Mark, Colo., E501, E503, E505, E506, E513
Weldon, Dave, Fla., E507

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.