



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007

No. 42

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 12, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CAROL SHEA-PORTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL WARMING AND ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, House Speaker NANCY PELOSI is to be commended for her creation of the special Select Committee on Global Warming and Energy Independence. I am honored to be chosen by her to join a strong field of my Democratic colleagues chaired by Congressman ED MARKEY, a long-time advocate for realistic policies on energy and climate change. He will be joined by Members

with special areas of expertise and dedicated commitment to the environment.

HILDA SOLIS, a renowned environmentalist not just in Congress, but dating back to her days as a California legislator. EMANUEL CLEAVER, with important municipal experience as Mayor of Kansas City, and one who has been working with the community of faith, particularly evangelical Christians who are worried about our stewardship of God's handiwork.

My Northwest colleague, JAY INSLEE, is strong, an environmentalist with keen interest and expertise and energy. STEPHANIE HERSETH, who has been a leader particularly in reducing the carbon footprint in the all-important agricultural sector. Even our two Members newly elected to Congress; JOHN HALL may be famous as a musician, but for years he has been involved with advocacy and leadership in the energy arena. And JERRY MCNERNEY is a successful alternative energy businessman and engineer who probably has more technical knowledge than anybody else in Congress.

I was perplexed somewhat by the Republican appointments, not so much about who is there, but who isn't. There are a few people in the Republican Caucus who have been outspoken about their concerns of climate change, global warming, their understanding of the science, people who are not in denial, but they were passed over for membership. There are some Republican Members who have been outspoken critics, for example, of the Kyoto treaty. Well, you know, this whole effort has moved beyond Kyoto. The world has moved on.

While for 12 years Republican leadership in Congress refused to move forward, there are 320 cities who have gone ahead with their own post-Kyoto initiatives. There are hundreds of counties and universities. Last month, 10 major companies here in Washington,

D.C. announced that they would meet or exceed the standards. They can't afford to wait for the Federal Government. The people who are still hung over Kyoto have never produced a viable alternative and are being left behind by people who do understand and who do care.

It is not that we don't know what to do; cut carbon emissions and increase energy efficiency. Girl Scouts, neighborhood associations and campus conservation teams can tell this administration and Congress what to do. Why, the Bush Administration could just approve the higher energy efficiency standards for appliances. There are 34 of them that have been stalled, they could stop dithering and start acting.

And it is not that we can't afford to do this; we cannot afford to act. Those energy efficiency standards will actually save consumers money while they encourage new product development.

We are on a very dangerous trend line. Ask people in Alaska, where roads are buckling from melting permafrost and coastal villages are eroding. Ask ski operators about the impact of global warming. Look at impact of extreme weather events on our disaster budgets. We will face far higher costs in the future if we don't act now, take action like private companies, cities across America, and governments around the world.

There are opportunities for field hearings and parliament exchanges for this new committee. I would hope that we could entice them to visit the Pacific Northwest. With Congressman JAY INSLEE and my colleague GREG WALDEN from Oregon, we can demonstrate that the Northwest in the last quarter century has saved 3,000 average megawatts equivalent to building eight giant coal power plants, but at only half the cost. We can bring them to Portland, Oregon, where as a member of the City Council in 1990 we adopted energy efficiency standards to achieve

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2403

at least \$1 million savings within 10 years. We reached that goal in 5 years ahead of schedule, and we continue to increase the efficiency and get the benefit, \$2.5 million last year, 20 percent saving in energy cost.

There is land-use planning, broad transportation choices, people living closer to where they work. All these are among the reasons that Portland's greenhouse gas emissions since 1990 on a per capita basis have fallen by 12.5 percent, unlike probably any other American city.

So my congratulations to the Speaker. My thanks for having a chance to play a role as we use this select committee for the Federal Government to help catch up with the rest of the world.

U.S. SERVICES INDUSTRY ESSENTIAL TO GLOBAL ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, when we look at the issue of globalization and the rapid economic rise of countries like India and China, critical questions about the continued competitiveness of the U.S. economy are understandably raised. Are there industries where we still have a comparative advantage? Can we compete with countries that have more than a billion people? Will the power of our innovation maintain our global economic leadership? These are complicated questions that demand a thorough analysis of our economy, our strengths and our weaknesses and the policies we are pursuing. I have explored some of these very issues in recent weeks from some remarks I have been making here in the House.

Actually, as we look at the very positive indicators we have in the U.S. economy, we are thriving because of our engagement in the worldwide marketplace. Because of the complexity of these issues, we need a rigorous, open and honest debate. But today I want to talk about an economic issue that is not at all complicated, Madam Speaker; a matter of benefits that is so clear and widespread that it may be the one single globalization issue that is too simple to refute, and that is the issue of our services industry.

Services have become absolutely crucial to our economic growth, employment and international trade. This sector represents nearly 80 percent of both economic output and private employment in this country. Services are essential inputs into the production of virtually all products that we make, sell, buy or consume. The price and quality of services influence cost and productivity in all other sectors of the economy, including manufacturing and agriculture.

Because our economy has come to rely on efficient, innovative and effec-

tive services, the industry has grown to become the largest part of our economy. In fact, services account for 78 percent of private sector GDP, or in excess of \$8.5 trillion.

This tremendous growth can be seen in our workforce as well. Since 1993, the services sector has added roughly 25 million new jobs to our economy, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts that virtually all new employment in the United States over the next half decade will be in the area of services.

While the issue of job creation is absolutely critical to the strength of our economy, the issue of job quality is absolutely critical to standards of living. Again, the services industry is at the cutting edge, creating jobs that pay very well. Services jobs pay an average of \$51,045 annually. In many service industries, ranging from professional services, management services, wholesale trade, transportation and warehousing, financing, insurance, information services and others, the average compensation levels are significantly higher than that. These are the types of jobs that constantly offer the opportunity to learn new skills, develop expertise and continue to climb the economic ladder. These are not the hamburger-flipping jobs that the service industry has been maligned for in the past. These are high-quality, high-paying jobs that offer the chance of advancement and an ever-increasing quality of life, and they are the backbone of our economy.

Just as the service industry has thrived here at home, it is tremendously competitive in the worldwide economy as well. Madam Speaker, U.S. financial services, express delivery, telecommunications, entertainment, audio-visual services and IT are achieving exceptional success around the globe. With 95 percent of the world's consumers outside of the United States, their presence in foreign markets is crucial for their global competitiveness.

Today, the U.S. is the world's largest service exporter. U.S. services exports have reached nearly \$400 billion annually, with a trade surplus of about \$66 billion. Our services companies have built this record, even though faced with high and complex barriers in many key foreign markets. The service sector remains one of the most tightly closed and controlled industries within our trading partners around the world. The removal of these barriers is crucial to our continued competitiveness.

As services become more liberalized, they will have an even more powerful effect on the competitiveness of our entire economy. When it comes to the issue of globalization, services are a clear example of American competitive advantage and global leadership.

Some facets of the globalization debate involve complex issues and challenges that require a great deal of careful consideration and analysis for us to fully understand them. But the U.S.

service industry stands out as a clear, irrefutable example of how the U.S. economy thrives through global engagement, and it is a powerful and compelling indicator of how much our economy has to gain by expanding that engagement with the rest of the world's consumers, producers, workers and investors.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue to pursue an economic agenda that empowers U.S. companies and entrepreneurs to harness the power of the worldwide marketplace to grow our economy right here at home.

PREGNANCY RESOURCE CENTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor to commend my colleagues' attention to a resolution that I recently introduced honoring the work of pregnancy resource centers.

According to the nonprofit Guttmacher Institute, about half of American women will face an unplanned pregnancy, and at current rates more than one-third will have an abortion by the time they are 45 years old. Of the women who have had abortions, 90 percent indicate they would have preferred other options had they simply known about them.

The tragedy and irony in many situations is that most women are flooded with a pro-abortion message, but are rarely offered any other message of choice. Rather, unknowing clients are led to believe that abortion is the only solution to their problem.

Through costly advertising, young women go into abortion clinics and they are assured that help is only a few hundred dollars away. Harmful consequences of abortion are minimized or simply ignored. Alternatives, like parenting or adoption, are not encouraged; in fact, they are very rarely mentioned. Sadly, my colleagues, it is only later that they learn there are indeed alternatives.

Desperately trying to spread this message to young women are the 2,500 pregnancy resource centers across the United States. Through education and support, pregnancy resource centers meet women's emotional and physical needs. They provide one-on-one counseling regarding the facts about adoption, abortion and parenting so that the client may make a wise and informed decision about her pregnancy. Centers are dedicated to helping each woman resolve her situation in a way that equips her with better life skills for her future. Practical help, like parenting classes, support groups, education and job skill classes are offered through many pregnancy resource centers as well. Maternity clothes, baby needs and even temporary housing is also offered. Some pregnancy resource

centers have full medical services on their premises, and unlike abortion clinics, these centers offer support for women suffering from post-abortion syndrome.

For those women who have undergone an abortion, the devastation can be real and ongoing if she does not receive help. Most centers are committed to the healing, body and soul, of women who have suffered from an abortion. They offer medical and counseling services and stand alongside these women in the healing process.

Life-affirming pregnancy centers provide an example of love and compassion to women and their unborn babies. These centers have been upholding the values of all human life, born and unborn, for several decades. Women are increasingly turning to these centers for physical, psychological, emotional and of course spiritual help. They are always treated with the utmost dignity and respect and provided with accurate, up-to-date information in order to make informed decisions about their pregnancy, sexual health and relationships. Because everyone should have access to this information, all services are free of charge.

I am honored to represent one such center in my hometown of Ocala, Florida. The Women's Pregnancy Center has been serving the people faithfully in Marion County for 22 years. This center serves nearly 1,500 women a year of all ages and backgrounds. They serve these women and men faithfully and discreetly.

My colleagues, in today's culture abortion is too often the first thought for women facing unplanned pregnancy, but there are alternatives, and pregnancy resource centers can provide them. These centers are not only the most strategic and effective, but often the most needed of the forces engaged in the defense of the unborn. It is fitting that we recognize these courageous and struggling agencies that seek to bring purpose to the surprises of life. Never are these needs greatest than in the smallest of family, a mother and her growing baby.

I invite my colleagues to join me in providing support for the more than 2,500 crisis pregnancy centers around the United States of America. The good work of these centers merits our recognition, and their compassionate staff deserve our admiration and praise.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution and demonstrate their support for pregnancy resource centers and their tens of thousands of volunteer staff who are encouraging the protection and value of all human life in America.

THE FAILURE OF LEADERSHIP AT WALTER REED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I felt the need today to rise and to briefly express my deeply felt dismay over the failure of leadership concerning the problems at Walter Reed.

We have witnessed a disservice to the men and women in uniform to whom we owe such a deep debt of gratitude. It is simply inexcusable. We can and must do a better job by our injured troops, especially after asking them to do so much for us.

I was glad to see actions to hold the Army and hospital leadership accountable, and the President's choice to create the Dole-Shalala Commission. Both Senator DOLE and Secretary Shalala have the experience to craft solutions to improve the situation. I know they will be independent and offer a sound assessment of the problem with good solutions.

Ultimately, our troops deserve the best. This is a bipartisan issue, and I look forward to working diligently on it.

We must not rest until our troops are assured of the medical treatment that they so rightfully deserve.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, source of wisdom and love, we bless You and praise You for all the natural and human resources showered upon this Nation.

Raise up in our midst people who will respond to those most in need or suffering, that true religion may flourish in our land and deeds of charity with the rule of justice may create a new humanity across the face of the Earth.

To You be all praise and glory now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota 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.

TRIUMPH OF SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia overturned one of the most unfair laws on the books. The Court upheld second amendment rights and struck down D.C.'s misguided law prohibiting handgun ownership.

For too long D.C. residents have been denied the fundamental right to protect themselves and their families. This ruling is truly a victory for law-abiding, gun-owning citizens in the tradition of the late Rick Daniel, who championed the success of concealed weapons permits in South Carolina.

I find it ironic that our Nation's capital, a symbol of American freedoms and rights worldwide, has had one of the most restrictive gun control laws in the country. Despite these oppressive measures, D.C. has maintained one of the highest murder rates in the Nation. Sadly, last July, 13 people were killed in 12 days.

I applaud the court for defending the Constitution and returning to D.C. residents their right to bear arms.

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

WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to add my voice to those deeply disappointed by conditions found at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. The physical infrastructure and administrative problems revealed are absolutely inexcusable. As a Nation and as a military, we have a responsibility to provide both top-quality acute care and top-quality outpatient treatment.

The fine doctors and nurses in Iraq; at Landstuhl, Germany; and at Walter Reed provide excellent medical care that has saved countless lives. But it is clear that a lack of leadership and administrative initiative at the top created these shameful conditions.

The American military has historically entrusted the ultimate responsibility and accountability to those in command. I was pleased that the Army leadership followed that proud tradition, and I am hopeful that Walter

Reed's new commander, Major General Eric R. Schoomaker, will rebuild trust in the Army's medical service. I am also hopeful that a number of corrective actions announced last week by Army Chief of Staff Peter Schoomaker will help ensure each soldier receives the care which he or she deserves and that no one, no one, falls through the cracks.

AL GORE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, our former Vice President, Al Gore, hasn't gotten so much attention since he invented the Internet.

But behind the Oscars, behind the left's unending praise, behind the fawning media coverage lies the truth. And, unfortunately, that truth is pretty inconvenient.

It seems that one of the biggest violators of Gore's own environmental doctrines is Al Gore himself. While he jets around on the global warming celebrity circuit telling everyone else how to live a greener life, his own home in Tennessee is consuming nearly 20 times the energy of the average American home.

Gore defends this conspicuous consumption by purchasing carbon emission offsets. But he buys those offsets from a company he helped create and he currently chairs.

Mr. Speaker, global warming may or may not be an inconvenient truth. But apparently for Al Gore, practicing what you preach is the most inconvenient thing of all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

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

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

AMENDING THE HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING ACT OF 1991

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1068) to amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1068

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

SECTION 1. HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Title I of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the title heading, by striking “**AND THE NATIONAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION NETWORK**” and inserting “**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**”;

(2) in section 101(a)—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(A) provide for long-term basic and applied research on high-performance computing;

“(B) provide for research and development on, and demonstration of, technologies to advance the capacity and capabilities of high-performance computing and networking systems;

“(C) provide for sustained access by the research community in the United States to high-performance computing systems that are among the most advanced in the world in terms of performance in solving scientific and engineering problems, including provision for technical support for users of such systems;

“(D) provide for efforts to increase software availability, productivity, capability, security, portability, and reliability;

“(E) provide for high-performance networks, including experimental testbed networks, to enable research and development on, and demonstration of, advanced applications enabled by such networks;

“(F) provide for computational science and engineering research on mathematical modeling and algorithms for applications in all fields of science and engineering;

“(G) provide for the technical support of, and research and development on, high-performance computing systems and software required to address Grand Challenges;

“(H) provide for educating and training additional undergraduate and graduate students in software engineering, computer science, computer and network security, applied mathematics, library and information science, and computational science; and

“(I) provide for improving the security of computing and networking systems, including Federal systems, including research required to establish security standards and practices for these systems.”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (C) as subparagraphs (D) and (F), respectively;

(iii) by inserting before subparagraph (D), as so redesignated by clause (ii) of this subparagraph, the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) establish the goals and priorities for Federal high-performance computing research, development, networking, and other activities;

“(B) establish Program Component Areas that implement the goals established under subparagraph (A), and identify the Grand Challenges that the Program should address;

“(C) provide for interagency coordination of Federal high-performance computing research, development, networking, and other activities undertaken pursuant to the Program.”; and

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (D), as so redesignated by clause (ii) of this subparagraph, the following new subparagraph:

“(E) develop and maintain a research, development, and deployment roadmap for the provision of high-performance computing systems under paragraph (1)(C); and”;

(D) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph—

(i) by striking “paragraph (3)(A)” and inserting “paragraph (2)(D)”;

(ii) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) provide a detailed description of the Program Component Areas, including a description of any changes in the definition of or activities under the Program Component Areas from the preceding report, and the reasons for such changes, and a description of Grand Challenges supported under the Program.”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “specific activities” and all that follows through “the Network” and inserting “each Program Component Area”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “and for each Program Component Area” after “participating in the Program”;

(v) in subparagraph (D), by striking “applies;” and inserting “applies; and”;

(vi) by striking subparagraph (E) and redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (E); and

(vii) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated by clause (vi) of this subparagraph, by inserting “and the extent to which the Program incorporates the recommendations of the advisory committee established under subsection (b)” after “for the Program”;

(3) by striking subsection (b) of section 101 and inserting the following:

“(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—(1) The President shall establish an advisory committee on high-performance computing consisting of non-Federal members, including representatives of the research, education, and library communities, network providers, and industry, who are specially qualified to provide the Director with advice and information on high-performance computing. The recommendations of the advisory committee shall be considered in reviewing and revising the Program. The advisory committee shall provide the Director with an independent assessment of—

“(A) progress made in implementing the Program;

“(B) the need to revise the Program;

“(C) the balance between the components of the Program, including funding levels for the Program Component Areas;

“(D) whether the research and development undertaken pursuant to the Program is helping to maintain United States leadership in high-performance computing and networking technology; and

“(E) other issues identified by the Director.

“(2) In addition to the duties outlined in paragraph (1), the advisory committee shall conduct periodic evaluations of the funding, management, coordination, implementation, and activities of the Program, and shall report not less frequently than once every two fiscal years to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on its findings and recommendations. The first report shall be due within one year after the date of enactment of this paragraph.

“(3) Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the advisory committee established by this subsection.”; and

(4) in section 101(c)(1)(A), by striking “Program or” and inserting “Program Component Areas or”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 4 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5503) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “and multidisciplinary teams of researchers” after “high-performance computing resources”;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “scientific workstations.”;

(B) by striking “(including vector supercomputers and large scale parallel systems)”;

(C) by striking “and applications” and inserting “applications”; and

(D) by inserting “, and the management of large data sets” after “systems software”;

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking “packet switched”;

(4) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5);

(5) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting “; and”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) ‘Program Component Areas’ means the major subject areas under which are grouped related individual projects and activities carried out under the Program.”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 1068, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1068, a bill to amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991. This is a bipartisan bill which Congresswoman BIGGERT and I introduced.

I want particularly to acknowledge the role Mrs. BIGGERT has played in working to develop this legislation over the past several years. This bill is based on a bill introduced by Congresswoman BIGGERT and Congressman LINCOLN DAVIS during the past two Congresses. And in both those Congresses, the bill passed the House.

I also want to thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL for their support for the legislation, for helping to advance it through the committee and to bring it to the floor.

H.R. 1068 will improve the planning and coordination process for the major Federal interagency research program in information technology. Information technology is a major driver of economic growth. It creates high-wage jobs, provides for rapid communication throughout the world, and provides the tools for acquiring knowledge.

For example, information technology helps to make the workplace more productive, to improve the quality of health care, and to make government more responsive and accessible to the needs of our citizens.

High-performance computing and networking is not only an essential component of U.S. scientific competitiveness, it also has important industrial, medical, and defense applications.

Vigorous long-term research is essential for realizing the potential of information technology. The technical ad-

vances that led to today’s computers and the Internet evolved from past federally sponsored research, in partnership with industry and universities. High-performance computing is necessary as we work to develop new ways to transfer vast amounts of information around the world.

The depth and strength of U.S. capability in information technology stems in part from the sustained research and development program carried out by Federal research agencies under a program codified by the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991. That act is widely credited with reinvigorating U.S. high-performance computing capabilities after a period of relative decline during the late 1980s.

The 1991 act created a multi-agency R&D program to accelerate development of information technology and to attack challenging computational science and engineering problems. The 1991 act also put in place a formal process for planning and budgeting for the activities carried out under the interagency R&D program, which is formally known as the Networking and Information Technology R&D Program.

The need for this legislation today arises from what I would characterize as a weakening over time of the planning and prioritization process for the program.

In order to maintain our competitiveness, we must ensure that the resources available to advance high-performance computing technology are allocated to the highest priority areas and that the activities supported are carefully coordinated among the performing agencies.

Toward that end, H.R. 1068 requires formal biennial reviews of the interagency program by its external advisory committee in order to provide advice from the research community and from the information technology industries on how to sharpen program priorities and improve program implementation. Also, the required annual progress report for the program must now include a formal response to the recommendations of the advisory committee.

H.R. 1068 calls on the agencies carrying out the program to focus more effort on high-end computing. The key requirement is for the Office of Science and Technology Policy to create and maintain a road map for developing and deploying high-end systems necessary to ensure that the U.S. research community has sustained access to the most capable computing systems.

Finally, this bill clarifies the grand challenge problems supported under the interagency program, such as clean energy production, climate change, and patient safety and health quality, which are intended to involve multidisciplinary teams of researchers and demand the most capable high-performance computing and networking resources.

Consistent with this requirement, the bill also specifies the provisions for

access to high-end computing systems includes technical support to users of these systems.

Mr. Speaker, the interagency information technology research program launched by the 1991 act has been largely a success. H.R. 1068 will serve to strengthen this vital research program and deserves the approval of this House. I ask my colleagues for their support in passing H.R. 1068.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1068. It will strengthen the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991.

Tomorrow, the Committee on Science and Technology will hold a hearing on U.S. innovation and competitiveness. High-performance computers have a role to play in our economic competitiveness, as they vastly enhance our ability to perform very complex computations quickly and they do it efficiently. H.R. 1068 will help ensure that American researchers have access to the very best tools available as they tackle cutting-edge problems in key fields such as nanotechnology, homeland security, and biotechnology. In addition, this bill helps reinforce the Federal commitment to “supercomputing,” a commitment that becomes increasingly more important as European and Asian countries continue to increase their investment in developing and purchasing the next generation of supercomputers.

Nobody knows this measure better than my distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT). She has worked tirelessly in two previous Congresses to have this important legislation enacted. In fact, she has been successful in the House on both occasions, only to see it stall on the Senate side.

In an effort to keep that from happening again, we have made a few modifications to help ensure it gets Senate support. With these slight alterations, I hope we will find that the third time is a charm.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1068.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas, the ranking member of the Science Committee, for yielding me the time.

And I am so pleased to be the cosponsor of this bill that was introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD). He has been a great member on the Science Committee for several years. This bill may seem familiar to many of my colleagues in the House and for

good reason. In both the 108th and 109th Congresses, we did introduce legislation that would do exactly the same thing as the bill we are considering today with some additions. H.R. 4218 in the 108th Congress and H.R. 28 in the 109th Congress were approved not only overwhelmingly by the Science Committee but by the full House of Representatives.

□ 1415

Unfortunately, because of jurisdictional complications, our friends in the other body across the rotunda had never considered this legislation. It had been endorsed by the President's science adviser, Dr. Marburger, several years ago. It is a real shame that it hasn't moved forward, but we are really happy we are. I think, going to have both sides of the aisle work on it this time.

At the time when we first introduced the High Performance Computing Revitalization Act in April of 2004, a new Japanese supercomputer, the Earth Simulator, was the fastest supercomputer in the world, a title it held for well over 2 years, from June 2002 through November of 2004.

Some experts claimed that Japan was able to produce a computer far ahead of American machines because the U.S. had taken an overly cautious or conventional approach to computing R&D. In hindsight, we see that caution meant lost opportunities.

Granted a lot has changed since November of 2004. The U.S. is now home to not only the world's fastest supercomputer, but seven of the 10 fastest, thanks to the hard work and competitive spirit of people at IBM, Cray and Silicon Graphics, as well as the Department of Energy and NSF.

But we must retain the leadership and development and use of supercomputers. As confirmed by reports of the Council on Competitiveness and the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee, supercomputers are essential to maintaining U.S. leadership in many scientific fields and have many applications, from pharmaceuticals and climate to national and homeland security.

That is why the bill that we are considering today is so important. It is designed to ensure U.S. preeminence and competitiveness in computational science. This bill commits the Federal Government to providing the research community with sustained access to the highest end supercomputers, supporting all aspects of high performance computing, including software development and data management for scientific and engineering applications, and developing and maintaining a road map for computational science in the fields that require it.

I am honored to have worked with the chairman of the Research and Science Education Subcommittee, Mr. BAIRD, on this straightforward, commonsense legislation, and I have good reason to be hopeful that it will pass.

As my colleague from Washington has already indicated, we made changes in this bill, simple changes, that would help our colleagues in the other body avoid those jurisdictional problems that they seem to have sometimes that have stymied their consideration of this bill in the past.

In closing, I just want to say that this bill will provide researchers in the United States with the computing resources they need to remain world class. Our Nation's scientific enterprise and our economy will be stronger for it.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1068.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I will just very briefly again commend Mrs. BIGGERT for her leadership on this. She has been steadfast and dogged on this. We hope with the changes we made to this bill, it will meet the approval of the other body. This is not a partisan issue. This is about keeping American science and industry at the very forefront of the world. This bill will help us do that.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1068, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACT

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 85) to provide for the establishment of centers to encourage demonstration and commercial application of advanced energy methods and technologies, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 85

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 "Energy Technology Transfer Act".

SEC. 2. ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.

Section 917 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16197) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 917. ADVANCED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CENTERS.

"(a) GRANTS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Energy Technology Transfer Act, the Secretary shall make grants to nonprofit institutions, State and local governments, cooperative extension services, or institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof), to establish a geographically dispersed network of Advanced Energy Technology Transfer Centers, to be located in areas the Secretary deter-

mines have the greatest need of the services of such Centers. In making awards under this section, the Secretary shall—

"(1) give priority to applicants already operating or partnered with an outreach program capable of transferring knowledge and information about advanced energy efficiency methods and technologies;

"(2) ensure that, to the extent practicable, the program enables the transfer of knowledge and information—

"(A) about a variety of technologies and

"(B) in a variety of geographic areas;

"(3) give preference to applicants that would significantly expand on or fill a gap in existing programs in a geographical region; and

"(4) consider the special needs and opportunities for increased energy efficiency for manufactured and site-built housing, including construction, renovation, and retrofit.

"(b) ACTIVITIES.—Each Center shall operate a program to encourage demonstration and commercial application of advanced energy methods and technologies through education and outreach to building and industrial professionals, and to other individuals and organizations with an interest in efficient energy use. Funds awarded under this section may be used for the following activities:

"(1) Developing and distributing informational materials on technologies that could use energy more efficiently.

"(2) Carrying out demonstrations of advanced energy methods and technologies.

"(3) Developing and conducting seminars, workshops, long-distance learning sessions, and other activities to aid in the dissemination of knowledge and information on technologies that could use energy more efficiently.

"(4) Providing or coordinating onsite energy evaluations, including instruction on the commissioning of building heating and cooling systems, for a wide range of energy end-users.

"(5) Examining the energy efficiency needs of energy end-users to develop recommended research projects for the Department.

"(6) Hiring experts in energy efficient technologies to carry out activities described in paragraphs (1) through (5).

"(c) APPLICATION.—A person seeking a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary an application in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The Secretary may award a grant under this section to an entity already in existence if the entity is otherwise eligible under this section. The application shall include, at a minimum—

"(1) a description of the applicant's outreach program, and the geographic region it would serve, and of why the program would be capable of transferring knowledge and information about advanced energy technologies that increase efficiency of energy use;

"(2) a description of the activities the applicant would carry out, of the technologies that would be transferred, and of any other organizations that will help facilitate a regional approach to carrying out those activities;

"(3) a description of how the proposed activities would be appropriate to the specific energy needs of the geographic region to be served;

"(4) an estimate of the number and types of energy end-users expected to be reached through such activities; and

"(5) a description of how the applicant will assess the success of the program.

"(d) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall award grants under this section on the basis of the following criteria, at a minimum:

"(1) The ability of the applicant to carry out the proposed activities.

"(2) The extent to which the applicant will coordinate the activities of the Center with other entities as appropriate, such as State and local governments, utilities, institutions of higher education, and National Laboratories.

"(3) The appropriateness of the applicant's outreach program for carrying out the program described in this section.

“(4) *The likelihood that proposed activities could be expanded or used as a model for other areas.*

“(e) *COST-SHARING.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall require cost-sharing in accordance with the requirements of section 988 for commercial application activities.*

“(f) *DURATION.—*

“(1) *INITIAL GRANT PERIOD.—A grant awarded under this section shall be for a period of 5 years.*

“(2) *INITIAL EVALUATION.—Each grantee under this section shall be evaluated during its third year of operation under procedures established by the Secretary to determine if the grantee is accomplishing the purposes of this section described in subsection (a). The Secretary shall terminate any grant that does not receive a positive evaluation. If an evaluation is positive, the Secretary may extend the grant for 3 additional years beyond the original term of the grant.*

“(3) *ADDITIONAL EXTENSION.—If a grantee receives an extension under paragraph (2), the grantee shall be evaluated again during the second year of the extension. The Secretary shall terminate any grant that does not receive a positive evaluation. If an evaluation is positive, the Secretary may extend the grant for a final additional period of 3 additional years beyond the original extension.*

“(4) *LIMITATION.—No grantee may receive more than 11 years of support under this section without reapplying for support and competing against all other applicants seeking a grant at that time.*

“(g) *PROHIBITION.—None of the funds awarded under this section may be used for the construction of facilities.*

“(h) *DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:*

“(1) *ADVANCED ENERGY METHODS AND TECHNOLOGIES.—The term ‘advanced energy methods and technologies’ means all methods and technologies that promote energy efficiency and conservation, including distributed generation technologies, and life-cycle analysis of energy use.*

“(2) *CENTER.—The term ‘Center’ means an Advanced Energy Technology Transfer Center established pursuant to this section.*

“(3) *DISTRIBUTED GENERATION.—The term ‘distributed generation’ means an electric power generation technology, including photovoltaic, small wind, and micro-combined heat and power, that serves electric consumers at or near the site of production.*

“(4) *COOPERATIVE EXTENSION.—The term ‘Cooperative Extension’ means the extension services established at the land-grant colleges and universities under the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914.*

“(5) *LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.—The term ‘land-grant colleges and universities’ means—*

“(A) *1862 Institutions (as defined in section 2 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601));*

“(B) *1890 Institutions (as defined in section 2 of that Act); and*

“(C) *1994 Institutions (as defined in section 2 of that Act).*

“(i) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated in section 911, there are authorized to be appropriated for the program under this section such sums as may be appropriated.”*

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 85, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, when we examine market barriers for advanced research energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies, we find that a simple lack of public knowledge often keeps those technologies on the laboratory shelf and out of the marketplace. Outreach and education of building and industry professionals and other key decisionmakers will undoubtedly accelerate the deployment of beneficial energy technologies and practices into the larger marketplace.

Through the guidance of Congressman BRAD MILLER, we sought to address these challenges in the energy bill of 2005 by establishing in section 917 a network of Advanced Energy Technology Transfer Centers. These centers would be a partnership between local entities and DOE to showcase advanced energy technologies and simply teach the right people how to utilize them.

Mrs. BIGGERT worked with Mr. MILLER to refine this section of the EPA Act in her bill, H.R. 85, and I believe it is a valuable improvement that will get these centers up and running sooner.

This bill came through the Science Committee and passed the House last year as part of H.R. 6203. It was a good idea then, and Chairman GORDON saw that it should be treated the same in this Congress. Like the other two bills before us today, the Science and Technology Committee passed this bill out of committee with no objection. I again commend my colleague from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for working with the majority on this important bill, and I urge its approval by the House.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 85, the Energy Technology Transfer Act, that was introduced by Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT, a most valuable and respected member of the Science Committee and former chairwoman of the Energy Subcommittee. I thank her and Mr. MILLER from North Carolina for their work on this bill.

There is concern that there is not enough assistance or education available in the area of transferring technologies in energy efficiency and distributed clean energy that has been developed by the Department of Energy and the national laboratories to energy end users.

In this time of heightened awareness of how much energy we are using and how much energy costs, how dependent we are on foreign countries for energy

feedstocks and how to continue the emissions reductions achieved thus far under various programs, it makes sense to do all we can to make sure that energy end users are as informed as possible about what is available to them to help them become more energy efficient.

H.R. 85 would amend section 917 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which requires the Secretary of Energy to distribute grants to establish a network of advanced energy technology transfer centers for the transfer of advanced energy technologies and methods to a wide range of energy end users, including individuals, businesses and building and industrial professionals.

The bill does not create a new program. It simply improves upon the current section 917 by specifying types of activities that may be funded, minimum criteria and priorities for qualifying applications, duration of funding, and grantee evaluation requirements.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. HALL, for yielding me the time to discuss H.R. 85, the Energy Technology Transfer Act. I would also like to commend my friend and colleague Mr. BAIRD of Washington for managing this bill, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) for his hard work on this bill.

The provisions in this bill were included in section 11 of H.R. 6203, the Alternative Energy Research and Development Act, which passed the House by voice vote in September of last year. The Federal Government spends billions every year on energy-related research and development at our universities and national laboratories. The result is often new technologies that reduce our consumption of energy or encourage the use of alternative fuels, and thus reduces our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

But the biggest challenge to realizing these energy savings is getting these technologies out of the laboratory and into the marketplace where they can benefit all energy end users. Whether we are talking about a business owner, a homeowner, or a county or local government official, these energy end users may be hesitant to embrace advanced or alternative energy technologies with which they may not be familiar, have little experience or which may require new infrastructure.

The risk of investing in new energy technologies is just too great compared to conventional energy technologies, and getting information on the latest, greatest energy technologies can just be too costly or time-consuming.

That is why section 917 of EFACT of 2005 directed the Department of Energy to create a geographically dispersed network of energy efficient technology

transfer centers. The purpose of these centers is to transfer and provide education on energy efficiency and distribute clean energy technologies developed by DOE and at the national laboratories to energy end users.

The bill we are considering today, H.R. 85, the Energy Technology Transfer Act, would simply improve section 917 of EPACT. Instead of creating from scratch this network of centers, H.R. 85 would authorize the DOE to provide grants to and partner with existing community outreach networks. These existing networks could include cooperative extension system offices, State energy offices, local governments, institutions of higher education and non-profit organizations with expertise in energy technologies or outreach.

The Cooperative Extension Service and similar community outreach networks have a long and successful history of transferring knowledge about new technologies and techniques to farmers and other constituencies. However, few have the resources to focus on energy efficiency outside of the agriculture center. H.R. 85 would change that and would build on the successful model of the ag extension service without creating any new entity or bureaucracy.

H.R. 85 still demands the same requirements of these centers. They must be geographically dispersed; they must coordinate regional resource engineering and business expertise; and they must help apply energy technologies and methods suitable to local climate. But instead of limiting these centers to the transfer of energy technologies, H.R. 85 would expand their mission to include all advanced energy technologies.

In addition to requiring grant recipients to demonstrate results or risk losing their grant, H.R. 85 would require grantees to provide feedback to DOE on the research needs related to the production, storage or use of energy identified by energy end users. It would also encourage grant recipients to work with utilities to carry out informational activities for energy end users.

H.R. 85 prohibits grant recipients from using grants funding to construct facilities to house the tech transfer center. It doesn't authorize any funding that isn't already authorized in EPACT. In other words, this bill contains no new funding. Instead, it simply gives new guidance and direction to the Secretary about how to bolster the Department's technology transfer capacity.

I just want to give you one example from Chicago about how this program might work and its potential to save energy through the deployment of advanced energy technologies.

Before expanding their frozen pizza production plant in Woodridge, Illinois, Home Run Inn Pizza consulted with the University of Illinois Chicago's Energy Resource Center. After conducting an assessment of the plant and its oper-

ations, the UIC Energy Resource Center identified nine ways Home Run Inn Pizza could reduce their energy consumption and energy costs. Using advanced energy technologies developed as a result of DOE's funded research, Home Run Inn Pizza could reduce natural gas consumption by 13 percent and energy consumption by 5 to 6 percent, saving a total of over \$15,000 annually.

Because of resource limitations, the UIC Energy Resource Center will help 12 companies in this way in fiscal year 2007, saving each on the average 15 percent of its energy budget and providing a return on investment within 2 years.

With passage of H.R. 85, the UIC Energy Resource Center and other cooperative extension and community outreach organizations could add the capacity and expertise to help many, many more companies, building managers, home builders and homeowners use technology to save energy and money.

I want to conclude by thanking the bill's chief cosponsor, my friend and colleague from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) for his strong interest in tech transfer and this legislation in particular. As we have worked with the majority to improve this legislation, his input has been invaluable. I also want to thank Chairman GORDON for recognizing the value of this legislation and moving it expeditiously through the committee. I want to thank Ranking Member HALL for his assistance as well.

Finally, I want to thank the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and a long list of its members for their strong support of this bill. This bill represents just a small investment in the tech transfer capabilities we need to help our universities and labs move advanced energy technologies from the labs into the markets so Americans can enjoy the tangible benefits of our Federal investment in R&D.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1430

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I just would echo Mrs. BIGGERT's astute comments. We talk a lot in this body and in the administration about the importance of launching new energy research initiatives. The fact is we have a number of efficient technologies before us today, and the real challenge is getting those out to the public to be implemented as soon as possible.

The quickest way to address our energy challenge is not to immediately invent some miracle cure. The quickest way is to implement the existing technologies and mechanisms that we have already before us to begin saving energy today.

I encourage passage of this bill and commend Mrs. BIGGERT for her leadership.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I originally introduced as an amendment to the

Energy Bill, what is now section 917 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Then Chairman BOEHLERT accepted that amendment in the 108th, and then made it part of the base bill the next time that it came through this committee in the 109th. H.R. 85 makes improving changes to section 917, to make it an even more effective program.

There has never been a partisan divide over this program. This committee passed the language in this bill as part of a broader energy bill that Mrs. BIGGERT introduced in the last Congress. I thank the Chairman for working to get this bill to the House floor and thank Mrs. BIGGERT for continuing to work with me on the issue of energy technology transfer.

The purpose of the program is to encourage the use in the real world of energy efficiency technologies that have been developed with, often, federally funded research, the Department of Energy, but that has sat unused on the shelf. Using those energy efficiency technologies offers the promise of immediate help with our problems, with our energy needs, our dependency, and we should be using every effort to try to make ourselves more energy independent.

This bill would extend those ways of delivering energy conservation and efficiency programs to include cooperative extension services, which is a definite improvement, and important, that these energy efficiency technologies make their way into rural America.

And I hope that these improvements to Sec 917 of EPACT really do make the program much more comprehensive and will send a message to the Department of Energy and to the appropriators that this program should be funded.

The President's budget request failed to request funding for this program this year. In the 109th Congress the appropriators failed to include funding, despite my best efforts and many efforts to tug at someone's sleeve and get their attention, to try to include it in the appropriations bill. And I hope with a strong bipartisan effort this year, this program can be funded, and we can begin to make sure we get into practical use the energy efficiency technologies that we have developed.

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

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 85, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REAUTHORIZING THE STEEL AND ALUMINUM ENERGY CONSERVATION AND TECHNOLOGY COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1988

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1126) to reauthorize the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1126

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 9 of the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 5108) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act \$12,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2012.”.

(b) STEEL PROJECT PRIORITIES.—Section 4(c)(1) of the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 5103(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking “coatings for sheet steels” and inserting “sheet and bar steels”; and

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

“(K) The development of technologies which reduce greenhouse gas emissions.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988 is further amended—

(1) by striking section 7 (15 U.S.C. 5106); and

(2) in section 8 (15 U.S.C. 5107), by inserting “, beginning with fiscal year 2008,” after “close of each fiscal year”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1126, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1126, legislation reauthorizing the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988, also known as the Metals Initiative.

Today, the steel industry and other metals industry, including aluminum and copper, are important parts of our national economy; and they must remain innovative in order to stay competitive in the increasingly global economy. It is vital to ensure that

these industries are fully prepared to confront the challenges they face. This bill will help develop the innovative tools needed to grow valuable American jobs and businesses, and to protect the environment, by tapping into good old-fashioned American ingenuity.

Originally passed by the 100th Congress, the Metals Initiative authorizes Federal cost-sharing of research whose goals are threefold: first, enhancing energy efficiency; second, increasing the competitiveness of American industries; and, third, improving the environment through reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

More specifically, this legislation promotes collaborative, public-private cost-shared research between American industry, the Department of Energy, and institutions of higher education. The bill would reauthorize the Metals Initiative at \$12 million per year for fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2012 to fund advanced metals research.

The success of the American steel industry has a special personal significance to me. My father-in-law was a steelworker at Bethlehem Steel in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, until he lost his job when his plant closed due to foreign competition. This bill will help prevent further loss of good American jobs like his by using American innovation to increase the competitiveness of our domestic industry.

While American industries have significantly modernized, the pace of technology and the competition from overseas is relentless. Reauthorization of this bill is essential to grow American jobs, keep the customers of metal industries strong, and ensure that we have a domestic supply of the materials we need for our national defense.

The results of this program speak for themselves. Since its inception, the Metals Initiative has delivered numerous technologies to the factory floor, resulting in incredible environmental and energy savings while increasing the competitive position of the steel industry and the domestic manufacturing sector.

In the Chicago area, schools such as my alma mater Northwestern University have participated in this program, as well as companies such as IPSCO. Because of the advances made in steel production, partially through the industry's partnership with DOE, the steel industry as a whole used 28 percent less energy per ton in 2004 than it did in 1990.

In addition, this research has produced several successful and important technological breakthroughs, including the development of advanced high-strength steels and ultra-lightweight steel automobile bodies, meaning lighter, safer and more energy-efficient cars.

Recently, these advanced technologies were applied to a new, lightweight military vehicle, yielding performance improvements including 25 percent weight savings and 50 percent fuel efficiency improvements. Through

this partnership program, the U.S. Army now has a next generation tactical vehicle that is agile and responsive. These advances, applied to the civilian versions of the vehicle, add a substantial further positive impact to our Nation's economy.

It is also important to note that the Federal funds in this program are given to the schools to conduct the research. Companies are not the recipients of funds, and they must provide a share of the cost of the research. But the American company that provides that match has the first opportunity to take advantage of the research findings and improve their manufacturing operations, benefiting American workers.

H.R. 1126 is simply a great example of how public-private partnership can benefit American workers and taxpayers, while saving energy, improving the environment, and accelerating the development and implementation of modern technology.

All Americans can benefit from commonsense programs such as this one, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1126.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1126, a bill to reauthorize the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988. This legislation has been passed unanimously by this body for the past two Congresses, and I hope it will do so again today.

The Department of Energy's steel-related energy-efficiency research and development program was first established in 1986 and was expanded to a broader “metals initiative” in 1988 when the President signed into law the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988.

Reauthorization of appropriations for the program occurred in 1992 with the passage of the Energy Policy Act, but expired in 1997. The steel industry and the Department of Energy continued the partnership under the Metals Initiative and its predecessor, the Steel Initiative, after the authorization expired. This bill would reauthorize the important program through 2012 and expand it slightly by adding research on technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The metals industry is one of the most energy-intensive industries, with energy accounting for a major portion of the cost of production. Improving energy efficiency for this industry will help to reduce the cost of steel and keep American steelmakers competitive in the world market. Improving efficiency will also help with our country's goal to become energy independent and environmentally responsible.

Investment made at the government level in partnership with industry to stimulate achievement of this increased energy efficiency has shown great results. Over the years, 58 steel

companies and 23 research organizations participated in and benefited from this program. According to testimony from the United States Steel Corporation, through this program they saw a “set of projects that saved nearly a barrel of oil per Federal dollar invested. Or, in terms of the environment, a ton of CO₂ for every \$2 of Federal money invested, all the while delivering real technology to the plant floor to help maintain a competitive advantage.”

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1126.

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a great example of what we can be doing and should be doing in this country. We have legislation here that takes advantage of our great American universities and all of the knowledge, wisdom that is there, the research ability of these institutions, and puts that together with American industry to come up with ways that we can both save American jobs, grow American jobs, and help to protect the environment.

As Representative HALL said, a dollar in this program saves a barrel of oil. It is a great opportunity and a great example of what we should be doing more of here in this Congress.

I would like to thank Representatives EHLERS and AKIN for their support also on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1126.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING THE GIRL SCOUTS ON THEIR 95TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 136) commending the Girl Scouts of the United States of America on the occasion of their 95th anniversary, for providing quality age-appropriate experiences that prepare girls to become the leaders of tomorrow and for raising issues important to girls.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 136

Whereas the Girl Scouts of the United States of America (hereinafter referred to as the “Girl Scouts”) is an organization that is committed to helping girls of today become leaders of tomorrow and that delivers quality experiences for girls locally, nationally, and internationally (through USA Girl Scouts Overseas);

Whereas the Girl Scouts are celebrating their 95th anniversary on March 12, 2007;

Whereas the Girl Scout program is girl-driven, reflecting the ever-changing needs

and interests of participating girls, and provides girls with a wide variety of opportunities through its new mission statement, “Girl Scouting builds girls of courage, confidence, and character, who make the world a better place.”;

Whereas the Girl Scouts encourage increased skill-building and responsibility, and also promotes the development of strong leadership and decision-making skills, through program activities that are age-appropriate and based on the “Girl Scout Promise and Law”;

Whereas at all levels of the Girl Scouts, girls participate in activities that build self-confidence, responsibility, integrity, creative decision-making skills, and teamwork, helping them take steps toward becoming the leaders of tomorrow and developing real-world leadership abilities that will last them a lifetime;

Whereas the Girl Scouts advocate for public policy that is girl-centered and beneficial to all girls;

Whereas the Girl Scouts recognize that approximately 9,000,000 children over the age of 6 are obese; that obesity is highest among girls coming from families with low-income levels, and that fewer than 1 in 3 adolescents participate in an acceptable amount of physical exercise, with girls getting less exercise than boys overall; and

Whereas the Girl Scouts are focusing on promoting healthy living for girls during 2007 and recognize through a recent study “The New Normal: What Girls are Saying About Healthy Living” that girls define “health” as a combination of diet and exercise as well as emotional well-being and self-esteem: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for its efforts to launch a national dialogue on the issue of obesity among young girls;

(2) recognizes the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for its leadership and expertise in knowing the needs of girls through the work of the Girl Scout Research Institute; and

(3) commends the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for continuing to actively promote issues important to girls.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, it was a brisk March morning when Juliette Gordon Low placed a historic phone call to her cousin in Savannah, Georgia. Juliette said, “Come right over. I’ve got something for the girls of Savannah, and all of America, and the world, and we’re going to start it tonight.”

That phone call proved to be a historic one. On the evening of March 12,

1912, Juliette Gordon Low gathered 18 girls to register the first troop of Girl Scouts in the United States of America. With one phone call a movement was born.

An organization founded upon the principles of strength, empowerment, responsibility, and community, the Girl Scouts have continued to change the lives of many girls for generations. While other organizations have struggled to deal with factors such as race and socioeconomic status, the Girl Scouts have always been looked at as an organization of inclusion, having desegregated councils as early as 1917.

□ 1445

The Girl Scouts also offer programs for girls in unusual situations that make it difficult for them to participate in the standard program. The Girl Scouts Beyond Bars programs helps daughters of incarcerated mothers to connect with their mothers and to have the mothers participate in Girl Scout activities.

Another program, Girl Scouting in Detention Centers, allows girls who are themselves in detention centers to participate in scouting. Other initiatives try to help girls in rural areas or in public housing. There are also programs for American girls living overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not comment on one of my favorite Girl Scout traditions, which is the annual cookie sale. For many years, I was overjoyed when I would see the little girls selling cookies door to door. I personally like the shortbread cookies.

It is because of the long-standing history and commitment of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America that I commend them and ask my colleagues for their support in the passage of this commendation without delay.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today commemorates the 95th anniversary of the founding of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. Founder Juliette Daisy Gordon Low organized the first Girl Scout meeting with 18 girls in Savannah, Georgia. While living in the United Kingdom, Low dreamed of giving the United States something for all girls and envisioned exposing girls to helping their communities and enjoying the outdoors.

The organization went through many different name changes, but it was finally renamed as we know it today in 1947. It was later chartered by the United States Congress on March 16, 1950.

For 95 years, the Girl Scout organization has provided real-world leadership training for over 50 million girls and young women across the Nation. Today, overall membership includes 2.7 million girl members and 928,000 adult members, working primarily as volunteers. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say

that my two oldest granddaughters are members of the Girl Scouts of America.

The important guidance given to girls goes far beyond the eagerly anticipated annual sale of Thin Mints, Tagalongs and Dos si Dos, now made without any trans fat. Through their various programs, the organization instills the ideals of character, conduct, leadership, as well as service to others. They have recently launched a program for girls focused on healthy living that includes education regarding diet and exercise.

This important education has been instituted because of the national concern about obesity among children and the knowledge that a program such as this has been proven to lead to emotional and physical well-being.

The Girl Scouts organization has long been committed to helping girls of today become leaders of tomorrow through activities that build self-confidence, responsibility, integrity, creative decision-making skills, and teamwork. It can be difficult growing up, especially in today's society.

The Girl Scouts is one organization that has consistently guided members to believe that girls can do anything by offering girls aged 5 through 17 a variety of opportunities through their scouting programs.

The Girl Scouts are woven into the fabric of American life and have affected girls' lives, as well as their families, in virtually every community in the country. Girl Scout programs continue to expand, taking into account the diverse population of America today.

They have initiated outreach programs that strive to include all cultures as part of their mission to foster the qualities on which the United States depends. The Girl Scouts not only reach out to girls in the United States but through U.S.A. Girl Scouts Overseas, it is committed to helping girls worldwide become leaders of tomorrow. Their new vision statement sums up all that is good about this organization by saying, "Girl Scouting builds girls of courage, confidence, and character, who make the world a better place."

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 136.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his eloquent remarks, and it is my pleasure to yield such time as she might consume to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Congressman WESTMORELAND from Georgia, also.

March marks the 95th anniversary of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. Founded in 1912 by Juliette Gordon Low, with only 18 members, Girl Scouts is now the finest organiza-

tion for girls in the world, with close to 4 million active members and more than 50 million former members, and I am proud to say I am one of them.

Girl Scouts provides high-quality, age-appropriate experiences for girls locally, nationally and internationally that build girls of courage, confidence, and character, who make the world a better place.

For 95 years, Girl Scouts has served girls through a remarkable leadership development program delivered by dedicated volunteers in every community across the country. All programs are girl-driven and provide girls with a wide variety of leadership building activities that promote teamwork and the development of strong decision-making skills.

There are many programs to choose from, including more than 70 achievement badges encouraging girls to pursue education and careers in math, science and engineering, an anti-bullying and violence prevention program, and a program that connects girls with their mothers who are incarcerated.

Girl Scouts also offer a huge range of outreach activities to girls who have never had the opportunity to be a Girl Scout, including Latina and Native American girls, along with girls in rural communities and in public housing developments.

Girl Scouts recognizes the importance of giving a voice to girls by sharing original research reviews that have helped change the dialogue among the media, policymakers and community leaders on issues important to girls. They have released numerous reports that have helped shape policy discussions in this country.

In celebrating 95 years of excellence and the significant contributions, Girl Scouts will raise the bar in being the voice for all girls.

Help me commend the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for its leadership and expertise in meeting the needs of girls throughout their 95 years of remarkable programs, knowledge and information about girls who recognize the nearly 1 million current adult volunteers and volunteers through the decades.

Mr. Speaker, spending time as a Girl Scout when I was a young child I have to say was a wonderful, wonderful experience. Back then, we only worked on homemaking skills. We did things that girls did in the early 1960s, but today I am proud to say that when you see the Girl Scouts working together, serving, certainly volunteerism in nursing homes and helping our elderly, mentoring for those students that need it, they have come a long way and they are on the right track, certainly expanding their horizon for what they are going to do. When they meet with other Girl Scouts internationally, it is a wonderful opportunity so different countries can get to know each other.

They are the future of our Nation, and I am proud of them, and I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a certain amount of personal pride and a great deal of civic pride that I join my colleagues in support of this resolution today.

On the civic side of things, I have the privilege of representing Savannah, Georgia, in the U.S. House of Representatives. It is my hometown. Juliette Gordon Low founded the Girl Scouts in Savannah. She was a native of Savannah. She founded the organization in 1912. The first organization's headquarters was in the back of her home in Savannah, Georgia, and from that humble beginning some 95 years ago we have gone from 18 members to almost 4 million members worldwide. I go by that building every time I am in town on the way to work, walking on the streets. It gives me a great deal of civic pride, along with the rest of my fellow Savannahians, who recognize that Girl Scouts the world over look to Savannah as the home and the homeplace of Girl Scouting.

On a personal level, I venture to say that very few of us guys in the U.S. House of Representatives are closer to Girl Scouting than I am. I have three sisters. Every one of them was a Girl Scout, including my twin sister, and I can tell you as a guy you don't get much closer to Girl Scouting than that.

I know that there are lots of organizations that promote courage, confidence and character in young girls but none do as good a job as the Girl Scouts.

On behalf of my hometown, on behalf of the 700,000 people that I have privilege of representing in Congress, and on behalf of the millions of brothers of Girl Scouts the worldwide, I am proud to congratulate the Girl Scouts on their 95th anniversary, and I extend my best wishes for the next 95 years.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is just good to know that in addition to the great scenic beauty and southern charm that Savannah is so well-noted for, that other good things have come from there, and certainly the Girl Scouts of America. I would urge all Members to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the Girl Scouts of the USA in celebrating their 95th anniversary. Since its founding in 1912, the Girl Scouts has become the world's preeminent organization for girls. Back then they had just 18 members, but today, there are 3.7 million Girl Scouts—2.7 million girl members and 928,000 adult members working primarily as volunteers.

Girl Scouting builds confidence, character, and leadership skills which allow girls to grow into young women who make positive contributions to the world around them. Each unique experience, be it reading to younger students or participating in a math competition, empowers girls and helps them reach their full potential.

On the national level, the Girl Scouts of the USA has been an advocate for girls' involvement in math, science and engineering; for violence prevention and for the health and safety of all girls. Through their many government and corporate partnerships, the Girl Scouts bring innovative programming to girls throughout the country and expand their reach to underserved communities where girls need it most.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the Girl Scouts of Freedom Valley, which serves my district, has over 21,000 members and 7,000 adult volunteers. I am proud to have such a wonderful team of volunteers dedicated to the leadership and character development of girls in Southeastern Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us take pride knowing that each and every Girl Scout of today will be one of tomorrow's leaders.

I know the Girl Scouts of the USA will celebrate many more anniversaries and continue to be a positive influence on our Nation's girls and on our society for generations to come.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 136.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ESTABLISHING DUTCH-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP DAY

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 89) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a day should be established as Dutch-American Friendship Day to celebrate the historic ties of the United States and the Netherlands.

The Clerk read as follows

H. RES. 89

Whereas, 225 years ago, on the 19th of April, 1782 in the City of the Hague, the Ambassadorial credentials of John Adams were officially recognized by Prince William V of Orange and the States-General, thus establishing formal diplomatic ties between the new government of the United States and the Republic of the Netherlands.

Whereas the historical ties between the Dutch and American people go back nearly 200 years earlier to the period when the Pilgrims resided for almost 11 years in the Netherlands before sailing to the new world;

Whereas the diplomatic ties between the governments of the United States and the Netherlands are the longest continuous ties between the United States and any country of the world;

Whereas the Dutch contribution to the American melting pot has played such a significant role in the life of America as exemplified by Presidents Martin Van Buren, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt;

Whereas the bonds of friendship linking the Dutch and American people continue to grow in strength and affection; and

Whereas the heritage of this friendship between peoples serves as a laudable example for the kinds of relations that should link all the peoples of the earth and should be properly extolled: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that a day should be established as Dutch-American Friendship Day to celebrate the historic ties of the United States and the Netherlands.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, every year we and the Dutch-American community in the Netherlands celebrate the bilateral relations between the Netherlands and the United States. On April 19, 1782, John Adams, the second President of the United States, was received by the State's General in The Hague and recognized as Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America.

Also, this was the day that Mr. Adams purchased a house at Fluwelen Burgwal 18 in The Hague, which became the first American embassy in the world. This day is known by many people as the Dutch-American Friendship Day that reminds us how the Dutch played a role in America's history and traditions.

Prior to 1782, America had always had a long-standing relationship with the Dutch going back as far as 1609 when Henry Hudson, an explorer hired by a Dutch-based United East India Company, traveled up a river that now bears his name and made a land claim for his employer in the area known as New York.

□ 1500

His exploration helped the Dutch to continue to be the foremost traders and merchant mariners in the world and expanded their influence in setting up a trading post on the southern end of Manhattan Island. In 1625, the Dutch

used beads to purchase Manhattan from the Indians for 60 guilders, about \$24, and renamed it New Amsterdam.

It became the center for trade and commerce that attracted the best and brightest people from different walks of life, culture, and creeds. New Amsterdam received an official charter and officially became a city in 1653, making it to the first city in North America where citizens freely elected their city council. This was one of the first acts to help establish a platform for democracy in the United States.

In 1776, the Dutch played a major role in financing the Revolutionary War, and it was repaid by the U.S. Government with stock certificates, an action that eventually led to the establishment of the New York Stock Exchange in 1791. Many prominent Americans from Dutch ancestry have made significant contributions to our country, like Presidents Martin van Buren, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. All were great Americans who dedicated their lives to help shape America to be the land of the free and home of the brave.

The Dutch contributions to America are part of our customs and traditions that have enriched our lives for over 200 years. So it is very easy to support H. Res. 89. I do so and urge all of my colleagues to give their support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, America began its relationship with the Dutch in 1609 when Captain Henry Hudson, searching for a faster route to Asia, sailed up what is now known as the Hudson River. Although he did not find his way to Asia, he and other Dutch traders quickly saw the potential and opportunity of this country and established the second European settlement in America named Fort Nassau near Albany, New York.

Their growth continued, and eventually a large portion of the early eastern United States was settled by the Dutch. The Dutch and the United States have proven to be extraordinary allies over the past 200 years, where in many instances they came to each other's aid at critical times in history.

Shortly after the Revolutionary War, the Netherlands presented a risky and courageous act by being the first country to salute the American flag. A few years later, on April 19, 1782, John Adams secured the recognition of the United States as an independent government at The Hague. He was the first U.S. envoy to the Netherlands and brokered the first loan for Congress from three banks in the Netherlands, which amounted to the entire U.S. foreign debt at that time.

Consequently, the Netherlands followed France to become the second country in the world to establish formal diplomatic relations with the United States. Also during this time, John Adams purchased a home that became the first American embassy on

foreign soil anywhere in the world. These ties still remain strong and, in fact, constitute one of the longest, unbroken diplomatic relationships between the United States and any foreign country right up until the present time.

The Netherlands have demonstrated its commitment to the United States, even in modern times, by being one of the first countries to ally itself with the U.S. after the attack on Pearl Harbor. It was one of the first to assist in the war on terror; and in the wake of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita, the Netherlands graciously provided Members of Congress access to their unique and innovative perspective on water management and flood protection.

I would also like to point out that Dutch Americans have contributed greatly to our fine country and have played a significant role in the life of America. This is exemplified by our three Presidents of Dutch descent, Presidents Martin van Buren, Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt. Dutch Americans have served at all levels of our government and have served us well in this distinguished body, including the two sponsors of this bill, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and my colleague on the committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Dutch Americans and our rich history have many firsts with the Netherlands, and it continues to strengthen our tie with this true diplomatic friend working side by side with the United States to bring peace, freedom, and commerce in the world at large.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 89.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for H. Res. 89. New York City was first founded by the Dutch, and they made a tremendous contribution to the city I am honored to represent and to our country. Two of the Dutch Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, both came from New York.

If you go to the City Museum of New York, there is really a beautiful exhibit that pays tribute to the many contributions in our early days by the Dutch.

I rise in strong support of this resolution and to the preceding resolution, which honors the 95th anniversary of the Girl Scouts. I really rise today to honor the 95 years of educating, nurturing, and empowering our Nation's girls through the Girl Scout programs. Its 3.6 million members learn skills and develop character that help them succeed in the real world.

The Girl Scouts' Web site highlights the organization's focus on the leader-

ship, strong values, social conscience and conviction about their own potential and self-worth of its members. These are vital attributes that help girls grow into the women who will lead our country and inspire the next generation of scouts.

I know personally about the power of being a Girl Scout, because I was one. The basic character and skills I learned then have served me my entire life, and they even serve me now in Congress.

For that I owe the Girl Scouts and the great Juliette Gordon, who founded the organization in 1912, a great debt of gratitude. I am proud that my hometown, New York City, is home to the Girl Scouts' national headquarters. I applaud the scouts for 95 years of empowerment and excellence, and I wish them many more years of helping nurture America's girls.

I rise in support of these two resolutions and applaud the leadership of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for bringing them before this body today, and I urge unanimous support for them.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 89, which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that a day should be established as Dutch American Friendship Day.

On April 19, 2007, the United States and the Netherlands will mark 225 years of unbroken diplomatic relations. It is the United States' longest existing diplomatic relationship.

My parents emigrated to the United States from the Netherlands when I was 3 years old. I am deeply proud of my Dutch heritage and feel that I have a special connection to both countries. As Russell Shorto notes in "The Island at the Center of the World," Americans are indebted to the culture of tolerance that was present in 17th-century Dutch Manhattan, where men and women of diverse races and religions lived in relative peace for the first time in the New World.

Dutch ideals such as individuality, freedom, hard work, and human rights have flourished in the United States; and our two countries can and have worked together to confront common challenges to our very similar societies. Last year, my colleague on the other side of the aisle, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, and I created a bipartisan Congressional Caucus on the Netherlands, a group that I hope will deepen our understanding of the ways in which we can continue to keep working together as allies for the mutual benefit of our countries.

The United States and the Dutch have proven to be outstanding allies, allies for over 200 years. The Netherlands was the first country to salute the American flag after the Revolutionary War. It was one of the first to

assist the United States and recognize the threat from radical militant Islamists and has graciously provided Members of Congress and others with critical access to their unique and innovative perspective on water management and flood protection in the wake of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita.

Put simply, the value of the relationship between our two countries and the opportunities that exist to learn from each other should be deeply appreciated and recognized.

I encourage all Members to support H. Res. 89 to honor Dutch and American friendship and celebrate the historic ties between our countries.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a co-sponsor in strong support of H. Res. 89, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a day should be established as Dutch-American Friendship Day, to celebrate the historic ties of the United States and the Netherlands.

My district in West Michigan has some of the deepest roots of Dutch-American history and heritage in the country. Dutch explorers, traders and settlers were a significant part of the earliest European exploration of the New World, especially in New York and New Jersey. However, the first major wave of Dutch immigration began in the 1840s with the Dissentings (later on known as Calvinists), a new group of religious people in the Netherlands. Like so many of the original settlers here in America, they wanted more religious liberty than they experienced in their home country. They were also seeking prosperity in a time of economic downturn and agricultural hardship in Europe. So the Dutch pilgrims dared the journey across the Atlantic to New York and then moved across northern New York and finally settled near the shores of Lake Michigan. Waves of Dutch settlers soon found Grand Rapids and Holland, Michigan, to be the places of job growth and the religious liberty they were seeking.

I am proud to report that the traditions of a "Dutch work ethic" and religious devotion still permeate Grand Rapids and the West Michigan region today. Generations of Dutch immigrants have enriched our area with the unique customs and traditions of their ancestral homeland. They are a people that have given the world great artists, celebrated philosophers, noted theologians, and leaders of international business.

The Dutch-American Friendship Day called for in this resolution would be an honorable response to annual celebrations in the Netherlands. Every year, the Dutch-American community in the Netherlands commemorates the bilateral relations between the Netherlands and the United States. Celebrated on April 19, the Dutch-American Friendship Day remembers the day that John Adams, the second president of the United States, was received by the States General in The Hague and recognized as an ambassador of the United States of America. It was also the day that the house he had purchased at Fluwelen Burgwal 18 in The Hague became the first American Embassy in the world. Today, the diplomatic ties between our two governments are the longest continuous ties between the U.S. and any other country in the world.

This long history of diplomacy, cooperation and friendship should be lauded as an example for all nations. I congratulate my colleague from West Michigan, PETER HOEKSTRA—himself a Dutch-American—for introducing this resolution. I am proud of my family's and my wife's family's Dutch roots, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today in support of House Resolution 89, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a day should be established as Dutch-American Friendship Day.

The Dutch/American relationship is the longest unbroken diplomatic relationship in the history of the United States of America. The relationship actually began years before the Pilgrims landed in America as they first resided for almost 11 years in the Netherlands before sailing for the New World.

On November 16, 1776, only 4 months after declaring our independence from Great Britain, an American ship sailed into the West Indies Dutch harbor of St. Eustatius and was greeted by a cannon salute in recognition of the American flag. It was the first official recognition by any sovereign nation of the United States.

On April 19, 1789, Ambassador John Adams officially presented his credentials to Prince William of Orange, thus establishing the diplomatic ties between the United States and the Republic of the Netherlands that we enjoy today.

The U.S./Dutch relationship has stood the test of time and has strengthened in the crucible of conflict as the Dutch have stood beside us in times of peace and war. The Dutch supported us in our war for independence. Sixty years ago Dutch and American servicemen stood side by side during World War II and today the Dutch stand by us still in the Global War on Terror.

The debt we owe to our Dutch friends is seen not only in our people, and in the persons of such famous Dutch Americans as Presidents Martin VanBuren, and Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt, but also in our experience as a Nation. Our traditions of religious freedom and tolerance as well as our system of government, all have spiritual and legal roots in our relationship with the Dutch Republic.

That is why I stand today to thank the Dutch people for their support over these centuries and to encourage the founding of a Dutch-American Friendship Day.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H. Res. 89, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I support and strongly urge the passage of H. Res. 89, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 89.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 198) recognizing the significance of Black History Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 198

Whereas the first African Americans were brought forcibly to the shores of America as early as the 17th century;

Whereas African Americans were enslaved in the United States and subsequently faced the injustices of lynch mobs, segregation, and denial of basic, fundamental rights;

Whereas despite this enslavement, early Black Americans made significant contributions to the economic, educational, political, artistic, literary, religious, scientific, and technological advancement of the United States;

Whereas in the face of these injustices, United States citizens of all races distinguished themselves in their commitment to ideals of which the United States was founded and fought for the rights and freedom of African Americans;

Whereas the United States was conceived, as stated in the Declaration of Independence, as a new country dedicated to the proposition that "all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness";

Whereas since its founding, the United States has been an imperfect work in making progress towards those noble goals;

Whereas the history of the United States is the story of a people regularly affirming high ideals, striving to reach them but often failing, and then struggling to come to terms with the disappointment of that failure before committing themselves to trying again; and

Whereas the month of February is officially celebrated as Black History Month, which dates back to 1926, when Dr. Carter G. Woodson set aside a special period of time in February to recognize the heritage and achievement of Black Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the significance of Black History Month as an important time to recognize the contributions of Black Americans in the Nation's history, and encourages the continued celebration of this month to provide an opportunity for all people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the Nation; and

(2) affirms that—

(A) the contributions of Black Americans are a significant part of the history, progress, and heritage of the United States; and

(B) the ethnic and racial diversity of the United States enriches and strengthens the Nation.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, every February Americans celebrate African American Black History Month. This tribute dates back to 1926, and it is credited to a Harvard scholar, Dr. Carter G. Woodson. Dr. Woodson, the son of former slaves, dedicated his life to ensuring that black history was accurately documented and disseminated.

In an effort to bring national attention to the contributions of African Americans, Dr. Woodson organized the first annual Negro History Week in 1926. He selected the second week of February, during which Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass had celebrated their birthdays.

Later, Woodson's contributions helped emerge during the civil rights campaign of the 1950s and 1960s, where the black studies movement began to spawn African American history, theory courses, programs and departments on the Nation's college and university campuses. During the early 1970s, Negro History Week was renamed Black History Week; and in 1976, it officially became Black History Month, designating all of February for the recognition of African American history.

In 1926, during the time for the first organized tribute to black history, the sociopolitical landscape in this country for African Americans was demonstrably different than it is today. At that time, "separate but equal," a doctrine that afforded African Americans second-class citizenship, was the law of the land, although it was an immoral one.

Through many historic efforts of many Americans of all races, legalized discrimination became a thing of the past. This body passed landmark legislation, most notably the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This was just 43 and 42 years ago when President Lyndon Johnson signed these legislative measures into law, laws that prevented Jim Crow laws from subjugating and denying African Americans the right to vote in certain southern States, the imposition of poll taxes, the segregation of schools, housing, bus and train transportation, restrooms and other public accommodations.

□ 1515

Moreover, Black History Month is also promoting public awareness of the struggles and achievements of African Americans. We must continue to build

on the existence of the past and look forward to the future.

African Americans, over the years, have made great strides, but, yet, we still have a long way to go. For instance, in 2005, there were 37 million poor people in America. The poverty rate is about 24.9 percent for blacks, compared to 8.3 percent for whites.

The homeownership rate among white households is about 74.2 percent, compared to 47.1 percent for African Americans. This huge gap between white and black homeowners will continue to be a primary factor that will undermine the growth of African Americans and their family structure to obtain wealth, capital assets and better neighborhoods.

While 5 percent of the world's population lives in the United States, we have 25 percent of the world's prison population in United States jails and prisons. Nationally, the Bureau of Justice statistics reports that the United States incarcerates 2 million people. Whites are about 36 percent, compared to 46 percent for blacks in prison.

As some of us know, the majority of people in prison are attributed to drug convictions. The law is not equally applied when it comes to drug offenses involving crack and powder cocaine. Five grams of crack cocaine brings a mandatory sentence of 5 years, compared to 5 grams of powder cocaine, which has no sentencing requirements, and the possessor of powder may get probation. Of course, a disproportionate number of the individuals who use crack cocaine are African Americans.

These are just a few barriers that many African Americans confront every day. And so when we honor Black History Month, we are recognizing the struggles and achievements of African Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Representative AL GREEN, who is the sponsor of this legislation, had intended to be here today to speak on it. Unfortunately, he had to be away in Texas taking care of some activities in his district, and I would ask that he be allowed to submit his statement for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I support H. Res. 198, and urge all of my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

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

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

I am honored to speak today in support of H. Res. 198, recognizing the significance of Black History Month.

Each February we express our appreciation of the struggles, determination and perseverance of the African American community of the past and present. February is a time to recognize the contributions of black Americans that have enriched our culture and our heritage.

There have been great activists, politicians, artists, writers, poets, scientists, economists, athletes, enter-

tainers and musicians that have all bettered our way of life. These achievements, the achievements of so many, have encouraged today's youth to strive for a more equal and free country.

It is impossible to celebrate Black History Month without mentioning such noted leaders as Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, Martin Luther King, Jr. and Rosa Parks. These achievers, and others, have helped make this country what it is today.

Today's popular culture is replete with African American icons, through sports, music and the entertainment industry, icons such as Richard Pryor, Halle Berry, Tiger Woods, Arthur Ashe, Michael Jordan, Muhammad Ali, and Hank Aaron.

The music industry alone has influenced our culture for decades, Louis Armstrong, Dorothy Dandridge, Billie Holiday, Sammy Davis, Jr., and Georgia's own Ray Charles, each of whom overcame adversity before and during the civil rights movement just to play their music.

When Harvard scholar Dr. Carter G. Woodson had the idea to create a week-long celebration of black history back in 1926, his goal was, and I quote, "to make the world see the Negro as a participant rather than as a lay figure in history." Over time, it has become the month-long celebration and commemoration that it is today. It is with great pleasure that I speak today in support of H. Res. 198.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me in supporting this resolution.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) for his statement. And I also want to thank him for the opportunity to work with him today during this process. It has indeed been a pleasure.

I also want to commend Representative GREEN from Texas for his introduction of this legislation.

In closing, let me also indicate that it is important that we look at the contributions that all racial ethnic groups have made to the development of this great country that we call the United States of America.

There is no group who didn't come here looking for something different than what they had. And fortunately, for many of them, they have been able to find that America is, indeed, a country where every person can have the opportunity to grow and develop to be a part of.

I have been pleased, I guess, to represent many high profile individuals, African Americans like Oprah Winfrey, who is in my congressional district, like Michael Jordan, who played basketball out at the stadium in my district.

But I often tell young people that I grew up in an environment where we were taught to read by unlocking words. And to us, history sort of

meant, at that time, his story. And so I encourage them to think of what I call mystery, which becomes my story. And so each one of us have an opportunity to contribute to the further development of this great Nation.

I commend the gentleman for introducing H. Res. 198. I urge its passage.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Congressman AL GREEN'S Resolution to honor Black History Month.

Founded in 1926 by Carter G. Woodson, Black History Month serves as a time to recognize and celebrate the contributions of African-Americans in shaping our Nation. It brings to life a rich and vibrant history that was all too often untold.

The fact is that until there was a Black History Month, prominent African-Americans were virtually left out of our Nation's school books. Often, the only mention of African-Americans would reference the institution of slavery. This is simply unacceptable. Black history is not an anonymous footnote, and expands well beyond the institution of slavery. We have great leaders who fought to overcome the oppression of slavery and that of Jim Crow. We have great scientific minds and inventors. We have extraordinary novelists, poets, and musicians. These are not nameless, faceless individuals, but people who have helped shape our Nation.

Because of Black History Month we have expanded our schoolchildren's curriculum. Our children now learn about Frederick Douglas, Thurgood Marshall, Malcolm X and Toni Morrison. These are names and stories that our children otherwise may not have known. With Black History Month we are preserving our abundant history for future generations.

I commend Congressman GREEN for bringing this important Resolution to the floor and I strongly urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 198, a resolution I authored recognizing the significance of Black History Month. This piece of legislation is supported by conservatives, moderates and liberals. It is a piece of legislation that I received not one negative comment on. Every person that I requested agreed to support the legislation. So I thank those who supported it.

I am delighted that 80 Members of Congress joined me in cosponsoring this bipartisan resolution which serves as a testament to our united desire to inform all Americans about the contributions made by persons of diverse backgrounds to the development of our great country.

Black History Month is a time of the year when all Americans of every race and ethnicity are given the opportunity to study the untold history of African-Americans and their contributions to American and world civilization. Additionally, Black history is American history and it is essential that we recognize the great contributions of all Americans by commemorating this month long celebration.

My resolution:

Recognizes the significance of Black History Month as an important time to recognize the contributions of Black Americans in the nation's history;

Encourages the continued celebration of this month to provide an opportunity for all people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the nation;

Affirms that the contributions of Black Americans are a significant part of the history, progress, and heritage of the United States; and the ethnic and racial diversity of the United States enriches and strengthens the nation.

Black History Month is also a special time to honor pioneers such as Martin Luther King Jr., Rosa Parks, Harriet Tubman, Malcolm X, W.E.B. DuBois, and many others who fought for the complete freedom and full emancipation of African-Americans. That is why we use Black History Month and every month to honor their wonderful contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues support H. Res. 198, a resolution recognizing the significance of Black History Month.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to show my support for the principles of Black History Month. I was privileged to be a part of the recent Congressional trip to Selma, Alabama. While in that historic city, we joined together and walked in the footsteps of the brave individuals who fought to ensure that the rights and opportunities of our Nation would be available to all of its people.

The Civil Rights Movement was not the first call for freedom and equality in our Nation's history, and it will not be the last. But its success provided a blueprint for future generations to follow, an example of hope to all those who seek to secure the basic freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution.

The history of African Americans extends far beyond the Civil Rights Movement. The works of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Rosa Parks and Thurgood Marshall will resonate in American society for generations to come. There are so many African Americans who have made notable contributions to our Nation. For example, Benjamin Banneker blazed new trails in astronomy, accurately predicting solar and lunar eclipses and Dr. Charles Richard Drew developed techniques in blood storage and helped to develop the blood banks which have saved countless military and civilian lives over the years. And there are many others, in fields too numerous to name. What is important is that we take time to honor, to remember, and to revere all of these individuals.

Black History month gives all Americans an opportunity to recognize and continue to learn about African-American history, which is the history of our Nation. I am proud to do my part to help promote the contributions that African Americans have made to our country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 198.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1835

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPPS) at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H.R. 85, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 136, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 89, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 85, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 85, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]
YEAS—395

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)

Boyd (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)

Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson

Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder

Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—1

Flake

NOT VOTING—37

Baldwin	Gallegly	Pascrell
Bonner	Gillibrand	Peterson (PA)
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Pryce (OH)
Brady (TX)	Higgins	Radanovich
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Royce
Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Sánchez, Linda
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	T.
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Serrano
Castor	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Meek (FL)	Tancredo
Crowley	Miller (FL)	Weller
Davis, Jo Ann	Moran (VA)	Young (FL)
Emanuel	Neal (MA)	

□ 1859

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM ANDERSON

(Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence on behalf of Captain William Anderson, a former Congressman from Tennessee who recently passed away.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and The House will observe a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDING THE GIRL SCOUTS ON THEIR 95TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 136.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 136, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

YEAS—395

Abercrombie	Bachus	Berry
Ackerman	Baird	Biggart
Aderholt	Baker	Bilbray
Akin	Barrett (SC)	Bilirakis
Alexander	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Allen	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (NY)
Altmire	Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Andrews	Bean	Blackburn
Arcuri	Becerra	Blumenauer
Baca	Berkley	Blunt
Bachmann	Berman	Boehner

Bono	Gilchrest	Matheson
Boozman	Gillmor	McCarthy (CA)
Boren	Gingrey	McCarthy (NY)
Boswell	Gohmert	McCaul (TX)
Boucher	Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)
Boustany	Goode	McCotter
Boyd (FL)	Goodlatte	McCrery
Boyda (KS)	Gordon	McDermott
Braley (IA)	Granger	McGovern
Brown-Waite,	Graves	McHenry
Ginny	Green, Al	McHugh
Buchanan	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Burgess	Gutierrez	McKeon
Burton (IN)	Hall (NY)	McMorris
Butterfield	Hall (TX)	Rodgers
Calvert	Hare	McNerney
Camp (MI)	Harman	McNulty
Campbell (CA)	Hastert	Meehan
Cannon	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Melancon
Capito	Hayes	Mica
Capps	Heller	Michaud
Cardoza	Hensarling	Millender-
Carnahan	Herger	McDonald
Carney	Hersth	Miller (MI)
Carson	Hill	Miller (NC)
Carter	Hinchey	Miller, Gary
Castle	Hinojosa	Miller, George
Chabot	Hirono	Mitchell
Chandler	Hobson	Mollohan
Clarke	Hodes	Moore (KS)
Clay	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)
Cleaver	Holden	Moran (KS)
Clyburn	Holt	Murphy (CT)
Coble	Honda	Murphy, Patrick
Cohen	Hooley	Murphy, Tim
Cole (OK)	Hoyer	Murtha
Conaway	Hulshof	Musgrave
Conyers	Hunter	Myrick
Costa	Inslee	Nadler
Costello	Israel	Napolitano
Courtney	Issa	Neugebauer
Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Crenshaw	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Cubin	(TX)	Obey
Cuellar	Jindal	Olver
Culberson	Johnson (GA)	Ortiz
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Davis (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Pastor
Davis (CA)	Jones (NC)	Paul
Davis (IL)	Jones (OH)	Payne
Davis (KY)	Jordan	Pearce
Davis, David	Kagen	Pence
Davis, Lincoln	Kanjorski	Perlmutter
Davis, Tom	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Deal (GA)	Keller	Petri
DeFazio	Kennedy	Pickering
DeGette	Kildee	Pitts
Delahunt	Kind	Platts
DeLauro	King (IA)	Poe
Dent	King (NY)	Pomeroy
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Porter
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Price (GA)
Dicks	Klein (FL)	Price (NC)
Dingell	Kline (MN)	Putnam
Doggett	Knollenberg	Rahall
Donnelly	Kucinich	Ramstad
Doolittle	Kuhl (NY)	Rangel
Doyle	LaHood	Regula
Drake	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Dreier	Lampson	Rohrabacher
Duncan	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen
Edwards	Lantos	Roskam
Ehlers	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Ellison	Larson (CT)	Rothman
Ellsworth	Latham	Roybal-Allard
Emerson	LaTourette	Ruppersberger
Engel	Lee	Rush
English (PA)	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Etheridge	Lewis (GA)	Salazar
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Sali
Fallin	Linder	Sanchez, Loretta
Farr	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Fattah	LoBiondo	Saxton
Feeney	Loeb sack	Schakowsky
Ferguson	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff
Filner	Lowey	Schmidt
Flake	Lucas	Schwartz
Forbes	Lungren, Daniel	Scott (GA)
Fortenberry	E.	Scott (VA)
Fossella	Lynch	
Foxx	Mack	
Frank (MA)	Mahoney (FL)	
Franks (AZ)	Maloney (NY)	
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	
Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	
Gerlach	Markey	
Giffords	Marshall	

Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Wamp
Sessions	Sutton	Wasserman
Sestak	Tanner	Schultz
Shadegg	Tauscher	Waters
Shays	Taylor	Watson
Shea-Porter	Terry	Watt
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Waxman
Shinkus	Thompson (MS)	Weiner
Shuler	Thornberry	Welch (VT)
Shuster	Tiahrt	Weldon (FL)
Simpson	Tiberi	Westmoreland
Sires	Tierney	Wexler
Slaughter	Towns	Whitfield
Smith (NE)	Turner	Wicker
Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)	Wilson (NM)
Smith (TX)	Udall (NM)	Wilson (OH)
Snyder	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Solis	Van Hollen	Wolf
Souder	Velázquez	Woolsey
Space	Visclosky	Wu
Spratt	Walberg	Wynn
Stark	Walden (OR)	Yarmuth
Stearns	Walsh (NY)	Young (AK)
Stupak	Walz (MN)	

NOT VOTING—38

Baldwin	Gallegly	Pascrell
Bonner	Gillibrand	Peterson (PA)
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Pryce (OH)
Brady (TX)	Higgins	Radanovich
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Royce
Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Sánchez, Linda
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	T.
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Serrano
Castor	Matsui	Skelton
Cooper	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Miller (FL)	Tancredo
Davis, Jo Ann	Moran (VA)	Weller
Emanuel	Neal (MA)	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1910

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING DUTCH-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 89.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 89, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

YEAS—391

Abercrombie	Baird	Bilbray
Ackerman	Baker	Bilirakis
Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Bishop (GA)
Akin	Barrow	Bishop (NY)
Alexander	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (UT)
Allen	Barton (TX)	Blackburn
Altmire	Bean	Blumenauer
Andrews	Becerra	Blunt
Arcuri	Berkley	Boehner
Baca	Berman	Bono
Bachmann	Berry	Boozman
Bachus	Biggart	Boren

Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert

Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoolley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter

McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Johnson (GA)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus

Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor

Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Viscosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

Security Committee and the House Financial Services Committee pending my appointment to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Warm regards,

MARSHA BLACKBURN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 985, WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 985, the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, on Friday, March 9, while on a tour of Walter Reed Medical Center, I inadvertently missed the vote on H. Res. 229. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

REMOVING MINORITY MEMBER FROM AND ELECTING CERTAIN MINORITY MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 236) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows

H. RES. 236

Resolved, That Mr. Burton of Indiana is hereby removed from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 2. The following named Members are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—Mr. Heller of Nevada, to rank immediately after Mr. Walberg.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Mrs. Blackburn.

(3) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—Mr. MARCHANT.

(4) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—Mrs. Capito, to rank immediately after Mr. Boozman.

(5) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—Mr. McCarthy of California.

(6) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. REICHERT, TO RANK IMMEDIATELY AFTER MR. INGLIS OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. PUTNAM (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

NOT VOTING—42

Baldwin
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buyer
Capuano
Castor
Cooper
Crowley
Davis, Jo Ann
Emanuel
Fattah
Gallegly

Gillibrand
Grijalva
Higgins
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Kilpatrick
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
Meek (FL)
Miller (FL)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Murtha (MA)

Pascarell
Peterson (PA)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Royce
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Serrano
Sessions
Smith (WA)
Tancredo
Weller
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1917

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Speaker, due to official leave of absence, I was unable to vote on three bills considered today under suspension of the rules. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of H.R. 85, the Energy Technology Transfer Act; "yea" on final passage of H. Res. 136, Commending the Girl Scouts of the United States on the Occasion of their 95th Anniversary, and "yea" on H.R. 89, Establishing the Sense of the House of Representatives that a day should be established as Dutch-American Friendship Day.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEES ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committees on Homeland Security and Financial Services:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

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

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: I am writing to resign my appointment to the House Homeland

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HALLIBURTON

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, yesterday in the afternoon on a bright Sunday, one of my constituents, my corporate constituents, decided to offer a press statement to indicate that they were relocating to Dubai in the United Arab Emirates.

We know that many American companies do have their offices in Dubai, and we know it is a thriving metropolis of business. But Halliburton is one of the largest corporate government contractors in the United States; and, unfortunately, their offices located in the 18th Congressional District have had an impact on the employees who work there.

It is unfortunate that the arrogance of this company would suggest that they could make announcements in the brightness of sunlight on Sunday and not engage their local community leaders, their employees, and others who might be vested in the relocation of corporate headquarters.

So I ask the leadership of this company to come forward and answer a number of questions which I will be sending to them. And I express my own personal outrage that a company would move its corporate headquarters without the full discussion of those who are stakeholders and work every day paying their taxes as employees of this company.

I look forward to the light of day being shined on Halliburton.

VILLAINS HALL OF SHAME

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, there is a new candidate for the "Villains Hall of Shame." What began as a Sunday morning journey to church for Rose Morat of Queens, New York, ended up in ambush, robbery, and 4 days in the hospital.

Ms. Morat is 101 years old. She was leaving her apartment complex when a shameless woman-beater pretended to help her out the door, but smashed her three times in the face, breaking a cheekbone. He stole her purse; then he threw her to the ground and hit her again. And after making his getaway, this dastardly menace struck again 30 minutes later. This time he beat up an 85-year-old lady and stole her purse.

New York Police Commissioner Raymond Kelly has made it a priority to capture this outlaw. Angry New Yorkers are already flooding the airwaves with suggestions for punishment for this criminal that would make the hanging of Saddam Hussein look mild.

Madam Speaker, even in our current culture of tolerance, there are some things you just don't do, some things we just don't tolerate. No one beats up elderly grandmothers, or they will face the wrath of the public and the long arm of the law.

And that's just the way it is.

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 gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FORMER U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

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. Madam Speaker, today is the 55th day of an injustice. This injustice began on January 17 of 2007 when two U.S. Border Patrol agents entered Federal prison.

Agents Ramos and Compean were convicted last spring for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our border into Texas.

These two agents were doing their job to protect the American people. They never should have been sent to prison. There are legitimate legal questions about how this prosecution was initiated and about how the prosecutors proceeded in this case.

To prosecute the agents, the U.S. Attorney's Office granted immunity to a known drug smuggler. Homeland Security officials promised Members of Congress certain information about this case, but they could not provide the information. Reports have also indicated that the prosecutors may have withheld crucial evidence from the defense. The Drug Enforcement Agency reports revealed that the Mexican drug smuggler brought a second load of marijuana, 752 pounds, into the United States. But this information was kept from the jury and the public.

Madam Speaker, over the past 6 months, dozens of Members of Congress have asked President Bush to listen to the American people and pardon these agents.

I want the two agents and their families to know that we have not forgotten them and we will not forget them. Members of Congress will come to the floor to defend these agents, and we

will continue to do so until they are pardoned.

On February 7, 2007, Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN wrote Judiciary Chairman PATRICK LEAHY to request a committee investigation of this case. She wrote, and I quote the Senator:

"I strongly believe that the sentences in this case are too extreme given the criminal nature of the smuggler and his possession of large quantities of drugs and given the fact that he physically resisted at least one attempt by Agents Ramos and Compean to bring him into custody.

"In addition, to my knowledge, neither of the agents had prior convictions or any other aggravating circumstances to warrant particularly harsh treatment under the law. Yet these men were given sentences that some individuals who are convicted of murder would not receive."

Madam Speaker, this is not a Republican or a Democratic issue, but it is an issue of fairness and justice. Chairman LEAHY has already approved Senate hearings in this case. On February 23, 2007, I sent a letter to House Judiciary Chairman JOHN CONYERS asking for hearings on this case on the House side. I hope Congress will soon hold these hearings because it is time for justice to prevail over an injustice.

Madam Speaker, before closing, I want to say to the White House and to the President, please listen to the American people. Please assure the American people that two agents who have done their best to help protect America will not be forgotten in prison, because they have no business being in prison. They should receive justice, not injustice.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

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

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

(Mr. POE 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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.)

□ 1930

CONDITIONS AT WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I want to rise today before this House to talk about something that weighs on the conscience of every Member in this House, a news story that broke very recently that has upset us all, the conditions at Walter Reed Hospital. Many Members of Congress have gone out there and looked at these conditions, and we are shocked by them.

Every Member that I have spoken to is as concerned as I am. I am particularly concerned because I am from a district that I would argue has probably put more fighters in this war than any district in America, having Fort Hood, Texas, a two division post, the only two division post in the Army in my district. The 4th Infantry Division and the 1st Cavalry Division, along with the 3rd Corps, have deployed now to Iraq on three separate occasions each. The 3rd Corps and the 1st Cavalry are over there right now as we speak and the 4th Infantry Division is gearing back up to go back.

Our soldiers have given a lot of their blood, sweat and tears to this war. They believe in their mission and they go to their mission as heroes, as far as I am concerned. And to learn that someone, whoever they may be, from whatever post in America or around the world, would have substandard conditions at what is supposed to be one of the two or three premier medical facilities for our Army in the country, shocks me and concerns me.

I would think it concerns every Member of this Congress, whether they are for this war or whether they are

against it. But for me in particular, having 50,000 soldiers that depend on me and other Members of this Congress to make sure that we have an adequate facility that gives the absolute best medical care that we can give, that we have that, is important. It is very important. It is actually lifesavingly critical.

Now, first, to get the right picture, I have been to Walter Reed. I have been there on multiple occasions. I have visited one patient as he cycled through there a 9-month period of time, maybe even longer than that.

I will tell you that the emergency care, the intensive care that was given in that unit, I can't say enough good about the doctors, the nurses, the orderlies and everyone who was doing the work there. I think that they gave outstanding service, the kind of service we would expect for our soldiers.

The trauma medicine that is developing and has developed in the military today, from a medical standpoint, and I am no doctor, but I have sat in a courtroom and heard an awful lot of medical testimony, the trauma treatment that we have for our soldiers today is, quite frankly, state-of-the-art in what they can do to save lives, and we, by the procedures we have set up for our soldiers, are saving a lot of lives.

But then we learn that people who are there as holdovers, who are at the recovery side of their phase through Walter Reed, are being housed in substandard housing, where there were rodents and infestations of insects, where there was black mold, which I happen to have personal firsthand experience with, having been moved out of my house for a little over a year because of stachybotrys, black mold, and having had my house totally wrecked to get that stuff out of it. I am very familiar with the health hazards that are claimed for that mold.

To know that soldiers who have given their hard work and suffered an injury of some sort on our behalf are being required to stay in substandard housing such as that, or substandard facilities such as that, it is appalling. Quite frankly, if it turns out that is what the black mold was that they found there, that has health implications that affects the breathing of every human being, and it is very critical that we be concerned with that.

So this is an issue where the light of day needs to shine on it, and we need to talk about it. I hope some of my colleagues will join us later here so we can discuss this matter, because I think it is important. I think it is important, and the American people expect, as I expect, that we will give the best quality health care from beginning to end for every soldier and veteran in the United States.

It is Congress' responsibility to ensure that these medical facilities are providing the best possible care. The buck stops here. We have that responsibility.

I think overall we are very proud of the medical care that is provided for our soldiers. But we can only hope to expend much more time and, if necessary, much more resources to make sure that what is going on at Walter Reed is corrected and that we look to see if there is anything we need to do at every hospital in America.

I want to applaud the Army for getting on this deal right away. They have dispatched officials to inspect the quality of care at 11 hospitals, and they are doing that this week and next. Of course, the President immediately acted and appointed Bob Dole and Donna Shalala to head a bipartisan commission to look into the solution to this problem. I think that is commendable, and I think that clearly shows how much the President and the White House care, as we care, about the health care of our soldiers.

Because I have a major hospital in my district, at Fort Hood, I went this weekend out to Carl Darnall Army Medical Center in my district. This wasn't my first trip there. I have been there on numerous occasions. This hospital serves approximately 50,000 active duty soldiers and airmen, approximately 56,000 family members, and over 40,000 retirees and surviving annuitants. This hospital, quite frankly, we have been working very diligently and we are very hopeful that we will expand Darnall so that it can be bigger and better.

I was not concerned from what I had seen on multiple visits in the past that we would find problems at Darnall. But it seemed like to me that in light of the fact that we had this issue at Walter Reed, which by my visits to the intensive care unit at Walter Reed, I certainly did not see these conditions that are being described at Walter Reed, that I should make sure to talk to the folks, to go look at the hospital, to look at where we are housing our medical holdovers, and just see exactly what is going on at Darnall, too.

I am happy to report, Madam Speaker, quite frankly, I was very impressed. In fact, I went into the rooms where some of our holdover medical folks were. Most of them were Guardsmen. They are living in dormitory-like rooms, dormitory barrack rooms, two to a room, occasionally one to a room, the kind of room I checked my boys into when I checked them into Texas Tech University to go to college. They were the kind of room you would put your child in, you would be happy to put your teenager or young adult child in while they were going to school; clean, well-established, well-furnished, kitchenette-type rooms.

I visited some of the soldiers and asked them how things were working, were things working well there at Darnall. They were pleased. I went into more than one room and dropped in to visit with these folks.

I want to say in defense of the people in the Army Medical Corps, these folks do care about our soldiers. I don't

know what fell through the cracks out there at Walter Reed, and I am sure we are going to find out about that, but overall I cannot impress upon this body how much we have to respect these doctors and nurses and the time they are giving, because these folks are being deployed as well as serving our soldiers here. Many of them are being deployed to the two theaters of war today, working in theater hospitals that are part of the lifesaving process that we provide for soldiers today.

It is a tragedy when we talk about the number of soldiers that we have lost and airmen and, of course, Marines and sailors. It is a tragedy when we lose one, and it breaks the heart of every American to lose any soldier. But as we look at what the medical community has been able to accomplish in this war over previous wars, we have kept fatalities down because of doctors and nurses and administrators and the plans they have to get our soldiers to the doctor, to get help quickly.

The key is if they can get them off the battlefield and to a professional in 12 minutes, the vast majority of the time, no matter how serious the wound, we are able to save their lives. That is a track record that we don't have from previous wars. But it has been done by a combination of utilizing our medical facilities that all the branches of the service are involved in, and I have an example from back home that I will talk about sometime today to show how that works.

Also while I was there, I went and visited the Olin E. Teague Veterans Center in Temple, and I will tell you, you think about what you have heard about veterans hospitals in the past. Well, I am telling you, everything you have heard, you need to go visit Olin E. Teague Hospital in Temple, Texas. I promise you, you will be impressed with the quality of health care and the quality of that facility, which houses everything from our old soldiers in nursing care to intermediate holding care to hospital care for our veterans. I am telling you, it is state-of-the-art, first-class medical care that they are providing there.

Their new center, where they have about 400 men and women, it is better than what I live in here in Washington. It is a nice place. It looks like we have got a bunch of really happy veterans in that center. They have a lot of amenities. It is gloriously beautiful. I commend the foresight of those who preceded me to build that hospital up to the quality it is, and I feel very confident any inspections that take place there or at Darnall are going to come back with a very good report card.

But that doesn't get us away from the issue we have been talking about, the Walter Reed issue. These dedicated professionals can do just so much, and I will tell you when the Army was called upon to respond I think they responded very quickly.

I see I have been joined by my friend ROBIN HAYES.

I yield to ROBIN HAYES.

Mr. HAYES. Congressman CARTER, thank you very much for holding this Special Order tonight. I think it is critically important that people be fully informed as to the quality of medical care that is being administered to our troops.

You are a true champion for Fort Hood down in Texas. The epicenter of the universe for me is Fort Bragg in Fayetteville, North Carolina. You and I both spend a tremendous amount of time on this. Nothing is more important to you and I and our staffs and other Members of Congress than the health of every active duty, former, or soon-to-be-retired veteran. Anybody that is connected to the military, there is nothing that we will not do to make sure that their care is the absolute ultimate.

You and I both have seen, as has Congressman POE and others, there have been some revelations at Walter Reed Army Hospital. There have also been two instances at the VA hospital in Salisbury, in my district, where the care was not what you and I would have liked. Medicine is an art as well as a science. You and I and the rest of Congress are committed to making sure that those situations don't ever happen.

But I think far more important, particularly in this debate, is the American public see here and realize fully that when you and I travel to Landstuhl, Germany, or Fort Bragg or the Hefner Medical Center or the Brooke Army Medical Center in Texas, the care that these men and women receive from incredibly dedicated, well-trained and committed individuals have saved so many lives on the battlefield.

□ 1945

These are the pilots who have flown the medical evacuations in helicopters and C-17 and other aircraft, racing the medical clock back to the U.S., Walter Reed, where incredible medical miracles have been performed, not just because of the advancement of science, but the dedication of the men and women who administer the care.

As we talk about this, it is appropriate and necessary that we look under every nook and cranny. And if any Building 18 situation arises, whether it is Walter Reed, Fort Hood, Fort Bragg, whatever the case may be, we want to know about it. We have many Members and staff members who follow this closely. We will move as quickly as we possibly can. We try to stay in front of these situations.

General Kiley has resigned. I called for his resignation. You hate to do those kinds of things, but the appropriate people need to take action. Action has been taken. People are aware at different levels that maybe weren't as aware as they should have been before. But at the end of the process, and thank you for bringing this to everyone's attention in a concise and I think

important manner, the men and women as we speak around the clock and around the world are doing everything they can, not only to treat our wounded on the battlefield, but to provide preventive care for their wives, children and their parents. Everything that can be done, obviously, is not done every day; but it is not because the desire is not there.

When I look at Womack Army Medical Hospital at Fort Bragg, they receive tremendous care. I was recently down there with ADAM SMITH who is now chairman of the TUTC, which stands for Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Contingencies, to us Special Forces, and he and I toured the medical training facilities where combat medics are trained to respond to battlefield situations. Let me tell you, these men and women have done incredible things.

As we move forward, and well we must, you and I and everyone here are going to do everything possible to make sure that care exceeds everyone's expectation. Nothing is more important to this country. They are responsible for the past; they are responsible for the future. Thank God for the men and women in uniform. We will do everything we can to support them. Again, I thank you very much for having this Special Order tonight.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my colleague from North Carolina, ROBIN HAYES, a true friend of the American soldier. He proves it by his actions as well as his words, and I thank you on behalf of our soldiers.

Now I yield to my colleague from Texas, one of my former judge colleagues, Judge POE.

Mr. POE. Thank you, Judge CARTER. Thank you for an opportunity to make some comments on this important issue.

It has taken less than a week for the American public and this Congress to find out what was taking place at Walter Reed Hospital. It is one of the premier hospitals in the world for treating the injured. But yet there were some problems and those problems, rather than being overlooked, are being dealt with, and that is very, very good.

A couple of observations that I would like to make about this whole episode. As you mentioned, Judge CARTER, American troops if they are found after an injury within a few minutes, the likelihood of their survival is in the 90 percent range. That is a tremendous percentage of recovery for these individuals to live if they are wounded. And they live from wounds that just years ago, even back in Vietnam days, they would have died from. But because of medical science, expanding as it has, they will recover from those wounds, although they will have, many of them, lifetime recovery periods. And that is where we must make sure that we take care of our military, that the recovery for many of these individuals is going to be a long, long time. Sometimes the rest of their lives.

An observation I would like to make about this situation at Walter Reed is that the American public expects us to take care of our soldiers. I think this is good. I think it is good that the American public is upset about the fact that some of our troops are not being taken care of the way they should be because our people in this Nation, regardless of how they feel about Iraq or Afghanistan, the issue of taking care of the wounded is not a political issue. It is an American issue, and Americans expect the best care for our troops. And that is important that the American public support our military in the recovery process.

To try to illustrate how the American public supports our wounded warriors, I had the opportunity to go to Landstuhl Military Base in Germany where wounded Americans come from Afghanistan and Iraq, many of them with severe injuries, and they are treated there before they are even brought back to the United States because of the critical care facilities they have at Landstuhl.

And when I found out I was going to be able to go over for this short trip with about 3 days' notice, I notified my two district directors in Texas to see if we could get some kids from local schools to make some cards to take over and give to the wounded. They met me at the airport with two suitcases full of handmade cards from third, fourth, and fifth graders of the Second Congressional District of Texas, and a little over 6,000 cards. I checked one of the suitcases. The smaller one I took on the plane with me, and I started reading them as I was flying over. The person next to me wanted to know what I was doing and I told him. And so he wanted to see them. He started reading the cards. Next thing I knew, the whole plane was reading. The cards were going up and down the aisle, and there were a few tears in the background.

But the point being that the American public supports our military, supports our military even when they are wounded, and cares a great deal about them, to the tune of 6,000 handmade cards from a bunch of kids in Texas. Of course the troops were very grateful for those cards. But it is a sign and observation that the American public will always support our troops when they are wounded and expect us in the Congress to make sure they have the care that they deserve.

The President acted very decisively and quickly, and I congratulate him for that because when things go bad at a hospital like it did at Walter Reed, the person in charge of the hospital needs to be removed. They need to get somebody over there that will take care of business and make sure that we don't have problems with our military.

How we treat our warriors in aftercare really defines us as who we are as a Nation.

One other comment I would like to make is it goes back to something that

is tradition with our United States military, has been for a long time through many wars. The American fighting man always has the role, the obligation, the duty to never leave anyone behind on the battlefield. People in other cultures do not understand why Americans are so relentless in making sure we take care of not only our wounded but those that have fallen on the battlefield. They don't understand why we do that. We do that because we are Americans.

One way that we leave no one behind is to make sure we don't leave them behind in the hospitals, we don't leave them behind in aftercare. We take care of them for as long as necessary, and if it means taking care of them the rest of their lives, so be it, because that is what we do in this country: we leave no one behind.

So I commend you, Judge Carter, for this Special Order and bringing awareness of this whole plight of hospital care and the care of our warriors to the American public.

Mr. CARTER. I am very fortunate, Madam Speaker, to have DUNCAN HUNTER, somebody if you asked people in this Congress who is a friend of the soldier, the first word of their mouth will always be DUNCAN HUNTER. He is the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. He is a hero for American soldiers because he never forgets the needs of the soldier, both on the battlefield and in the hospital and as a veteran. I am honored to have DUNCAN HUNTER join us.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for yielding, and with that kind of introduction, I will just shut up and sit down. I thank him for that very kind introduction.

I just got back from Iraq with Congressmen DAN BOREN and KEN CALVERT and RANDY NEUGEBAUER. We were at Landstuhl Hospital in Germany, which is the first place where our wounded soldiers and marines are taken after they have been wounded on the battlefields of Afghanistan and Iraq. They are stabilized and treated there, and then they are flown back to Walter Reed and Bethesda.

We went over the new technologies that are being utilized right now and the new focus being put on our wounded soldiers. Let me tell you, that operation is first class.

One thing, and the gentleman talked about Walter Reed and I thought it might be appropriate to bring up an issue that all Members of this body can participate in and help in, and it is this: last year I started in San Diego in Balboa Hospital, which is where a lot of our wounded marines are, and in Walter Reed. We started these forums for getting jobs for our guys and ladies who have gone through their therapy, they are being separated from the service, they have been wounded and they are going to go back into the private sector.

So one thing that I thought we would do out in Balboa, and we did one of

them here at Walter Reed, was to bring in people from industry and introduce them to our wounded soldiers and marines and try to help get them jobs. Hopefully, a young marine would stand up and say I am a generator mechanic from such and such a town in Vermont or Maine or California or Iowa, and we would be able to match them up with a company that might need such a talent in their company.

So we started doing that, and the first session I had was in the dayroom in Balboa Hospital in San Diego, and we actually had CEOs from major corporations in the dayroom and the marines all came in and told us what they did and introduced themselves, and we immediately had a number of people hired right there at that point in time.

Well, I got back, and the Armed Services staff told me you may be breaking the law.

I said, What are you talking about?

They said, We have talked to the ethics lawyers on the Hill and there may be a question if a Member of Congress tries to help somebody get a job with private industry. There is the implication that reciprocal treatment will be required at some point: you are getting a favor and you will give a favor back.

I said, What can we do?

They said, You need legislation that will end up with the Ethics Committee and House Administration Committee expressly permitting Members of Congress to help get jobs for our wounded soldiers and marines.

So last year, a month or two before we broke, we passed a resolution in the full House urging the Ethics Committee and the House Administration Committee to give us express permission to get jobs for our wounded folks. Every Member of the House can help us on this. I know that VIC SNYDER who heads up the Personnel Subcommittee on the great Armed Services Committee and JOHN MCHUGH are very much supportive of this.

Hopefully, we will get this recommendation up before the Ethics Committee and the House Administration Committee. At that point I can see this entire House of Representatives doing great work because you can take a young man or woman from a town in America who has had an injury and gone through rehab and is looking to go into the private sector. A lot are staying with the service, but the ones that aren't staying with the service, we could call up the Congressman from that particular district that young person is going back to and find out if there is a company that needs that generator mechanic or that young man or woman who is interested in law enforcement or some other profession.

□ 2200

So I think there is a lot of opportunities here and I look forward to working with you and with the great gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) and all of our colleagues to try to put this together.

Mr. CARTER. That is a great idea, wonderful idea. We introduced a bill last session, we are going to put it back in this session, that is going to encourage employers to hire the spouses of our soldiers. We give a tax break to employers who hire ex-cons. We ought to give a tax break to employers who hire the spouses of soldiers who have gone to war for us because that is the kind of caring we have got to do, caring about what happens to them when they get back but caring about the worries they carry as they go to battle. That is very popular among employers who are interested in doing that.

There are so many things, and what a great idea you have got, a job fair-type, national job fair promoted by the Congress for our wounded soldiers. That is a great idea.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield further, nobody knows the companies and the businesses in their district better than a Member of Congress, and so I think if we can just pass this little provision in the Ethics Committee that will allow us to do it, we will be able to call up a Member of Congress from whatever district the young man or young woman has a residence in, find out what particular companies have disciplines in the area of occupation that this person specializes in. I think we can marry them up and get some jobs pretty quick.

Mr. HAYES. If the gentleman will yield, you just returned from Iraq, literally landed moments ago. You visited Landstuhl. You were downtown in Fallujah and Ramadi. You were in Landstuhl this time, and you have been there before. I just realized that our Speaker tonight, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), is a wonderful medical professional in another life. So it points out again and again that care and desire to do the right thing medically, absolutely knows no boundaries here.

I remember being in Landstuhl on another trip with Speaker NANCY PELOSI, and she was particularly intrigued by the facilities for premature babies there. So our wounded soldiers are critically important, their families, their children.

You spoke of Dr. Snyder, a Democrat from Arkansas, a doctor from Arkansas. Again, my purpose is to reassure people at home, no, we are not perfect, and yes, it was a serious, serious issue at Walter Reed and there are others, but we are willing, able and anxious and ready to deal with those issues.

Could you relate some of things you saw in your most recent visit to Landstuhl, which was this morning?

Mr. HUNTER. Absolutely. The one thing that we have learned is that when people get concussions, there may be a lasting effect on those concussions, and we talked to several concussion specialists who now are focusing on Landstuhl and when the young people come back, especially when they have been attacked by IEDs, by

weapons systems that have a blast effect, to have a new focus on the after effects of having concussions, and so that is something that is being done right now.

Typically, in the old days, it was done, of course, in sports medicine, for example, guys that were boxers or played football and took numerous hits, and the effect of numerous concussions was studied and was followed.

What we are focusing on here is, you have been in an IED attack or you have had a mortar attack that is close and that gives a concussive effect, it is important to monitor that individual for an extended period of time, not just figure, okay, he was knocked out or she was knocked out, but now they are fine. Monitor them for a period of time. So we have a new focus there in Landstuhl and that focus, it was important to Mr. NEUGEBAUER especially, and DAN BOREN and Mr. CALVERT, who were on the trip with me, were all very interested in making sure that the information that is derived from observation of a patient who newly comes in, comes in and is stabilized there, that then is sent to Walter Reed and to Bethesda so there can be follow-up work so that we can treat the entire patient, and maybe that patient has a fragment wound, making sure that you take care of that, but at the same time make sure that we monitor the effects of concussions, which can in some cases have a lasting effect.

So it is just one example of new focuses and new technologies that are being placed on our wounded soldiers, and the folks there do a great job.

To go to Walter Reed for a minute and this problem we have with the outpatient, the inpatient care is good at Walter Reed. In fact, I was with a wounded Marine and a wounded soldier and it was either the same day or day or two before the story in the Washington Post broke. We have great inpatient capability there. What we have got to have is we have got to have what I would call a family friendly system that is consumer friendly and consumer easy, so that that 22-year-old wife of a Marine corporal, who is undergoing therapy there at Walter Reed and doing rehab there, so that it is easy to walk through the bureaucracy.

So we build these bureaucracies. We inadvertently build them, like the one we built up that says now you cannot get a job for a wounded person or you are violating an ethics rule. We get sometimes so twisted and tied up in this multiplicity of rules that we end up losing sight of the real goals of what we are here for.

So I think we need to make this a consumer friendly system for a person who has got a lot of things on their mind and maybe has some kids back home and they are coming several hundred miles to get rehab treatment or therapy can easily and quickly walk through the system without having to go through a phonebook thick of regulations and sign a million dotted lines.

That is something we can do, one-stop shopping that is easy and simple. That is not bad to have throughout the Federal bureaucracy, but especially when you have military families that have a lot of problems and a lot of things on their mind, we need to have a customer friendly system. That is what we need to develop.

Mr. HAYES. If the gentleman would yield for just a moment, if I might.

Mr. CARTER. All right.

Mr. HAYES. We have got a good doctor from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, going to join the discussion, and excuse us for overlooking you. You are the most qualified to be here. Duncan and I, I think have been accused of being hit in the head too many times before, but the point is on traumatic brain injury, this is something that has been very, very important.

Tomorrow, the private sector, which has been very, very active, Martin Foil from my district, Traumatic Brain Injury Foundation will be here in the foyer of the Rayburn House Office Building, again to help further educate Members on the multiplicity of the implications and complications of brain injury, and all of us here have worked very, very hard for additional funding to do just that.

Mr. CARTER. I am going to yield to the good doctor, to my colleague from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), and one of those fine medical professionals that we have been talking about that serve here in the United States Congress.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for convening this hour this evening. I think it was extremely important, extremely timely that we have this discussion on the House floor, and I am especially glad that we have been joined by such prestigious members on the House Armed Services Committee because I think their words certainly add much more than what I would be able to bring to the subject.

I will just have to say I went to Walter Reed this afternoon, asked to go last week, because I thought it was important as one of the medical professionals in Congress that I go out and just look and see is there anything that causes me grief, that causes me concern. I will have to say I was not upset about the things that I expected to be upset about, and I was upset about things that never would have occurred to me to be upset about, and let me elucidate that a little bit if I can.

Of course I read the stories in the newspapers last week, and I expected to be upset about the physical condition of the building, and the building in question, Building 18, which is just across the street from the Commanding General's residence at the Walter Reed Medical Garrison there in Northeast Washington.

Indeed, the building is not the nicest of buildings in Washington, D.C., and I am sure there has been some attention to some of the problems that had already been rendered to the building in

the week between the time the story broke and the time that I got out there, but in general, if you stop and think about what this housing was designed to do, it was obviously to provide a place for soldiers to stay while their medical conditions were evaluated, but while they decided do they stay in the military, do they get out, if they are able to undergo the physical processes for rehabilitation or allowed to stay in the military, how much time is going to be required. This location, Building 18, being outside the medical garrison of Walter Reed Hospital, had some appeal because it was outside the garrison, and as a consequence there was perhaps a little more freedom, a little more freedom of movement. There is a parking garage underneath it, not quite the same level of restriction that you have within the medical garrison itself.

So the actual physical condition of the building, again, I am sure it had received some attention between the time the story broke and I got out there, was less distressing to me than some of the things that I heard that our wounded soldiers have to go through.

I snapped a picture while I was out there. The gentleman talked about the massive amounts of regulation and red tape. Here is a gentleman going through his medical records. I do not think this picture does it justice, but this is about the size of the Dallas phonebook that he has got in front of him. These are his medical records he has got spread out on the table, and he is trying to put them in some semblance of order so he can make his case for the time he gets out of the military to assess his degree of disability if he were to wish to stay in, to be able to make the argument that he would be able to stay in the military.

But an individual such as this, and this individual, in fact, was part of the Medical corps, you can see on his shoulder patch there. So he had some knowledge of the types of record he was reviewing on his own behalf. Just imagine someone without any medical expertise having to go through these numbers of records, and then what if it all gets lost, which unfortunately happens.

Twenty-four hours total time that he spent in assembling these records, and unfortunately, he told me, it is not an infrequent occurrence, it is not just that a soldier's appointment would be canceled, that they expected for a few weeks time. It is not just that the ride to the hospital did not materialize, but this amount of work going into essentially what will define his future could be misplaced, and in this day and age, when we talk about the computerization of medical records, we talk about the VA system being on an electronic medical records system, there is no way right now for these medical records generated by the Department of Defense to talk to the medical records in the VA system.

So it is a lot of work that we ask these folks to go through on their own behalf, and unfortunately, it can occur that after putting all those hours in this record ends up on the wrong place on someone's desk, and when the time comes to retrieve it, it cannot be found.

That was a one of the things, again, I never expected to see today when I went to the hospital but certainly caught my attention when I visited.

I would stress, and just like the chairman, just like my friend from Texas, I too have been to Landstuhl Hospital in Germany, spent a good deal of time on two separate occasions at the field hospital in Balad, Iraq, and spent some time at the Ebosina Hospital in downtown Baghdad last summer. In fact, that is the hospital where the famed Baghdad ER show was taped, and I would have to say through all of that exposure to the medical care available to our soldiers in the field, the so-called down range exposure, their medical care is top notch.

I had an emergency room physician, an orthopedist in Balad, Iraq, tell me he had medicines and treatments at his disposal out in the field that he would never have had available to him in downtown Cincinnati. It is that training, that expertise that he gains dealing with those new treatments and those new therapies that will then make him a better physician, and he acknowledged this. I will be a better doctor when I go back to take care of the civilians in Cincinnati, Ohio, than I was before I left because of my experience here in Balad.

I have heard other people refer to it, but certainly we have many, many dedicated men and women in the medical staff, the nursing staff at Walter Reed Hospital and our other fine military hospitals, and it does pain me somewhat to think that these individuals are also reading these stories. They go to work every day to do their best work. They go to work every day to take care of the genuine American hero, and then they hear their efforts and their professions demeaned in the press.

I know how disheartening that can be and I would say to those individuals working in the Medical corps in our military hospitals and the Nursing corps in our military hospitals, God bless you. Thank you for what you do because individuals like this who, in another time and another place, might not have had such a happy outcome, he, in fact, is looking forward to a return to civilian life and being quite productive thanks to the expert care that he received at Walter Reed Hospital.

□ 2015

One thing that I do want to bring up because it is terribly important, the Wounded Warrior Transition Brigade, which was just announced last week and has been formed this week. Major General Eric Schoemaker, who is the

new command at Walter Reed Hospital, this establishes essentially a patient advocate in uniform, patient advocacy within a military context.

This is one of the things, when we hear about the failures of leadership that resulted in some of the problems that have surfaced at Walter Reed Hospital, this was the type of leadership that was lacking. So these small brigades, which will now be composed of one leader with 17 men or women under his command in those units who are awaiting a medical decision on their military future, certainly tightening up that ratio between leader and the number of men and women in the cohort will significantly improve things, I think, as far as the advocacy for our heroes.

So the gentleman from Texas was very kind to call me down and let me participate in this. I thank you very much for your leadership on this. It is extremely timely and extremely important.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my colleague from Texas for his comments and his expertise as a doctor. He is invaluable to this House, and we are very, very proud to have him as a Member of this House. I am proud to have him as a friend.

Does the gentleman from North Carolina wish to be recognized?

Mr. HAYES. Congressman CARTER, after listening to Dr. BURGESS, I just had a couple of more things I wanted to relate because they were so important.

Mr. CARTER. Take all the time you need.

Mr. HAYES. I was telling former Chairman HUNTER, Ranking Member HUNTER now, that when he and RANDY NEUGEBAUER return, we have our Congressional Prayer Caucus that meets every Monday or Tuesday night, just at the beginning of votes, and three young men who were just wounded and brought back from Iraq, we were able to pray for them and will contact their families tonight.

Prayer still goes on here in the Halls of Congress, as you well know. We will meet on Wednesday morning. There are a number of organizations, Semper Fi Fund, Fallen Heroes Fund, but there are numerous others where men, women and children are working around the clock again to assist with these wounded veterans. They are doing a fabulous job. As part of this discussion, I wanted to call attention to them.

Last but not least, I met a young man at Landstuhl a couple of years ago, Sergeant Danny Metzdorf, 82nd Airborne, all the way, and walked into that room, and you have had the same experience, he looked just like my son. That was what really caught my attention. He had just been wounded there, and I struck up a conversation with him and he hardly remembered that night. But when he got back to Walter Reed, went to visit him a couple of times, got to know his family, had a prosthetic leg, 25, 30 surgeries, just,

really, all he thought about, I want to get back with my buddies, back with my unit.

Well, that outstanding young soldier, Airborne guy, is now the coordinator and jump master for the Golden Knights. So with that new artificial leg, and these stories are, so, so, many, I want people again to be encouraged, not satisfied, but encouraged that medical treatment is not only available but it is something that is so critically important to us.

I was here one day and some contentious issue was going on in the people's House, and I got an emergency, I thought, call. Dan Metzendorf is calling you. Oh my gosh, something has gone wrong, surgery, he had a complication. I immediately left the floor and called him. He said, gosh, there was so much going on, are you doing okay? That is the way our young people are today. They are for America. God bless them all.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you so much for being here tonight. Let me tell a story about an 82nd airborne soldier. This is an 82nd Airborne soldier from my hometown. My son and daughter-in-law are a high school teacher and coach, and they knew this young man; we knew his family. He, in the invasion of Baghdad, he charged out on a bridge in the open to pull one of the fallen, he was a medic in the paratroopers, 19-year-old medic, and he charged out on his bridge and pulled one of his fellow paratroopers to safety. In the process of going back for others, he received a round through his abdomen.

Now, I told this House earlier that this is a joint effort, and Alan Babin is a perfect example of the joint effort. He was immediately treated on the battlefield by a fellow medic, immediately evacuated and flown to the Navy ship offshore, I have forgotten the name of it now, to a mercy ship off the shore, where they treated him. From there he was flown by the Air Force, air evac medical team to Landstuhl in Germany, where he was stabilized and then he was flown to Walter Reed Hospital and had hundreds of surgeries, and for 7 months laid with an open, exposed abdominal cavity which had to be scrubbed clean every day. That boy would have died on any other battlefield, anywhere else in the world; but he was an American soldier, given American medical care.

Today, he is recovering. While in the process of being treated, Alan suffered a stroke. His wounds are healed now, and he is rehabilitating himself with help from the Army on the damage that he received from the stroke while being treated for his wound.

We expect all of us in Round Rock, Texas, Alan Babin, to be back and functioning and doing well and heal completely because his spirits are great and he is working hard like every soldier and every Airborne trooper would; and he is the pride of Round Rock, Texas. He won the Bronze Star with valor for his treatment of his fellow soldiers, fellow paratrooper.

Those stories, there are a million of them. We see them every day in Landstuhl. I wanted to tell that story, because I want the American people to know that is the kind of medical care that our medical doctors are giving. This week, when I was at Darnall Hospital in Fort Hood, they told me about the fact that we couldn't make it if it wasn't for the doctors who were willing to serve in the Reserve.

In this Reserve, we sent 11 doctors downrange to Iraq in our last deployment. Someone has to fill in for those 11 doctors back at Fort Hood. It is the Army Reserve doctors that come in there and do that and the Army Reserve nurses. I visited with a nurse, I believe, from Jamaica, New York, who was filling in as a Reserve nurse who had been called up, or maybe she was a National Guard nurse.

So not only are the heroes in the war but the heroes in the Reserve and the Guard, they are doing a great job. It is abominable that we had this condition at Walter Reed. We will address it, we will fix it, but let's not take away our doubt that these doctors and nurses and medical professionals are doing everything they can to make sure our soldiers are getting the best care they can.

My friend Mr. KING, STEVE KING, has joined us. I want to recognize him and allow him to say a few things here.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for organizing this Special Order hour and for gathering together a lot of patriotic Americans and shedding some objective light on the health care situation with our men and women; and like many of the Members who have spoken earlier in this hour, I am one who has also made consistent trips over to Iraq, Afghanistan, the hospital, Landstuhl in Germany, and, also, I make it a point to be one place or another to visit our wounded, at either Walter Reed or Bethesda or Landstuhl. So I have been to Walter Reed a number of times, and saw nothing like I saw described here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and make no excuses for that. In fact, like everyone else, I believe we needed to fix it and we did fix it as quickly as possible.

The people that come down here to the floor night after night after night with the same poster that had the words cockroach, mold and mice on it have been repeating the same mantra, but they have not seen anything like we are describing here night after night after night. This was, as I understand it, two rooms out of 300 and some altogether in a place where no one goes. The people that were there were ambulatory patients that liked it there because they were a little off campus, they had a little more freedom. So those were the circumstances. They have been fixed.

But I will say what this needs to be: this needs to be a message to us, a kind of reminder, a wake-up call, because what I saw here demonstrated by Mr.

BURGESS, which is that there are patients there whose care is too bureaucratic, we can use this as a launching pad to bring software into place and to put into place a patient tracking system that will compare the tracking of these patients and the timeliness of their care with that in the private sector and have red flags come up on those files if there is a time they are not being dealt with in a fashion they should be. We can get this set up. It needs to be managed in that fashion.

I will also say that the VA hospitals have taken a fair amount of criticism on this. The ones that I go visit have modern health care and a modern tracking system and a bar code that goes on the wrist of the patient. When they go in there, they read that bar code and within seconds their full medical record is there; any pharmaceuticals that have been prescribed by them are all right there. It reduces and almost eliminates mistakes for prescriptions, for example.

There are a lot of modern pieces that have been put together. Most of our VA hospitals, and the ones I know, do a good job. They shouldn't be dragged into this, and the Walter Reed piece of this, we can do a better job. More of it has to do with patient management and timeliness of care and modernizing the recordkeeping system. Little of it has to do with putting plaster up on the wall and putting carpet into place. Let's use the need to do this to get this place, put Walter Reed back into the 21st century and give these men and women the very best top-notch care that is possible.

We can do that. The people doing the work, we need to applaud them, not criticize them. They give their hearts and their minds and their energy to our brave men and women who have given their life and limb for our freedom and for our liberty.

The only thing that they are short of is they suffer from compassion fatigue, and they get burned out on these jobs. But what I see, selfless Americans are doing the best job they can. We can give them some better tools to work with, which has to do with tracking the patients and being more timely in the service we provide.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for joining us here today. On that issue of electronic records, when I was at Darnall on Saturday, we were talking about them implementing the electronic recordkeeping. I said, well, now, I need to know, are the electronic records that you are working on here, are they interoperable with the VA's electronic records? They said, well, they are so far ahead of us, we will certainly work to have interoperability, but we are way behind the VA.

Most Americans wouldn't expect that to be heard. The VA is getting a reputation on their electronic records of having a state-of-the-art electronic records system. People are coming in from the private sector to look at what the VA has done. The Army is using it

as a model to bring Army electronic records up to par. It is important, it is one of the missions we need to have here in Congress to make sure we provide the support and the funds to make sure we have an electronic record system which will take our soldier and track him from the minute he raises his right hand to serve our Nation, until, at the point we all get there, he is buried in one of our veterans cemeteries, until we have accurate records for him that are electronic, easily found, so we can get him the care, he or she the care, that they need.

Madam Speaker, this is an issue that has concerned every American, Democrat and Republican, since it broke. We are all concerned. We all want the American people to know that whatever differences we may have on the issues concerning the war, this is an issue of the lives of the American soldier; and all Americans care for our American soldiers.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and the honor to be recognized here on the floor of the United States Congress this evening and the chance to pick up where some of my colleagues left off here. But I pretty much had my say about Walter Reed, and I support and endorse the remarks that were made over the last 60 minutes, and I intend to move on to another subject matter here.

I do just simply want to restate that the care that they are provided is good and it is solid. And as I talked to patients at Walter Reed, Bethesda, Landstuhl, continually, they are very, very grateful for the quality of the care. We have some of the best experts in the world treating some of these kinds of injuries; and to look them in the eye and see the level of their commitment, you just know that they are giving it everything that they have.

I am not hearing patient complaints about the care, but about sometimes the timeliness of the recordkeeping and the timeliness of the treatment that is there.

□ 2030

There will be always be things that fall through the bureaucratic cracks, and it is our job to try to seal those cracks up and do the best job that we can. I think we are going to get that done. Certainly, though, I want to make sure that America, Madam Speaker, understands the commitment that is made on the part of the medical care providers for our military men and women, and that is what we must do in order to support their effort and support their sacrifice.

Madam Speaker, I came to the floor tonight to talk about an issue that I

have been here before to raise, and hopefully I will be back again to raise, and that is this broad, overall immigration issue that has captured the debate field in the United States for the last 3 years or more. And what brings me to the floor tonight is a sense that there is a growing effort on the part of the White House, on the part of the Senate and on the part of some here in the House, to build a kind of a critical mass coalition that would bring what they would call a comprehensive immigration reform bill through the Senate and then quickly over here to the House, which I would consider to be a steamrolled or a stampeded bill, something that we don't know what is going on behind the scenes, or there has been hardly anything leaked. And I believe it is their effort to try to get enough Members, a majority, and that would be something or a filibuster proof majority in the Senate and a significant majority here in the House to buy on to a policy that they have never seen, one that is not in print yet, or at least not filed, not dropped, in the fundamental sense, but only get people, people, and I mean Members and Senators, to sign off conceptually, and say I conceptually endorse a comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Well, first, Madam Speaker, the American people need to understand that when the word "comprehensive immigration reform," when that phrase is used, that means we don't like to admit amnesty. But comprehensive is a substitution for the word "amnesty." It has been that way for 3 years. It will be that way until this debate is maybe over for this cycle.

But I recall when the President gave his first immigration reform speech was January 6 of 2004, 3 years and a couple of months ago. There he brought out a lot of the same things that he is standing for now. And the President says that he is opposed to amnesty. But I will say that Ronald Reagan signed a bill that Ronald Reagan called amnesty that is very much the kind of policy that is being advocated by the White House.

I am greatly concerned about this moving so quickly with so little information that the American people would not have an opportunity to weigh in, would not have an opportunity to call and write and e-mail and fax their Senators and their House Members to be able to try to move the center, I guess, of the Republican and Democrat House of Representatives and the Senate.

And so it is important that I call upon Members, don't sign off on something till you read the fine print. The devil is in the details. The devils were in the details last year when the Senate moved their immigration reform bill and the details turned out to be tens of millions of people. Just a small detail, Madam Speaker, of tens of millions of people that would be legalized and granted amnesty in about a couple of decades period of time. That is the

backdrop. That is the foundation of this.

I have a lot to say about this, but I also recognize the gentleman from Texas who has been on this floor for a while has some things he would like to say about it, and I would be very happy to yield to Judge CARTER as much time as he may consume.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for yielding to me. And I appreciate him joining me in the previous hour in our discussion of Walter Reed and the health care for our soldiers and our veterans and how important that issue is.

But I guess, at least in the State of Texas, if what I hear in my town hall meetings is anything to be compared, I think the issue of what is happening on our borders and what we are going to do to resolve the issue of immigration is a topic that has never failed to come up, now, in the past 3 years at literally, every occasion at which I have held a town hall meeting; and I generally hold between 17 and 25 a year with the addition of the new tool of the telephone town hall. I held one of those less than 3 weeks ago for an hour and a half.

And once again, the people of Texas are concerned about the issue of the illegal aliens that have invaded our country. And they are concerned about who is coming, and what are they going to do, and what are we going to do to resolve this problem?

I have a Hispanic Council. The gentleman from Iowa knows that Texas is a State that you would put down as a Hispanic State. In fact, I believe we have now, over 50 percent of the people in Texas are Hispanic. The difference between Texas and some other parts of the world is we have lived with Hispanic neighbors all of our history. I mean, our culture is a kind of a combination of West and Mexican culture. It is the Southwest culture. It has a lot of the influence of Mexico in the Southwest culture. If you don't believe that, come on down to Austin; let me feed you the best Mexican food on Earth.

This is what is going on in Texas. We have lived with our neighbors like this all of our lives. When this issue cropped up I decided I wanted to form a Hispanic Council in my district. And we talk about issues, of course, immigration, the border, these are issues that are primary we discuss. But we made ourselves a promise that we were going to look at the world, all the world of litigation, legislation, and international relations, not just the immigration issue. But we always discuss the immigration issue. And at least my council, which has a membership of folks that are, some of them first generation American citizens, most of them second or third or fourth generation American citizens. All of Hispanic descent, most of whom are from Mexico, although there are some from other places. And we have a let your hair down, no holds barred discussion. And overall, my Hispanic community,

recognizes there is a problem and realizes we have to come up with a solution, and they are supportive of a solution that is within the law.

And I think that is important because, quite frankly, the reason we have a crisis, I would tell my colleague from Iowa, is because we haven't been enforcing the laws we have got and we haven't been enforcing them since 1986 when we cranked out the amnesty program under Ronald Reagan. The key to the Reagan amnesty program being a success was enforce the law. And administrations, Republican and Democrat, have not done it. I mean, those are the facts.

You know, one thing about history, it is history. You can try to write it a different way, but the reality of history is there is only one history and that is the truth of what happened.

And what happened was we didn't enforce the laws. And as a result, we went from a trickle across our southern border and our northern border to a six-lane highway bumper to bumper invasion. And that is what we have been facing now in the last 4 or 5 years.

I would say, I have met with the White House on numerous occasions and been a very big critic of making sure that we got border enforcement. I will say, we are doing better at the border. We are not there yet, but we are doing substantially better. The numbers are down. The catch and release program and the ending of the catch and release program, although not 100 percent, but it is better than it was when it was 100 percent catch and release. We are detaining people. And there are those who want to stop us and there are those who call us inhumane. And, in fact, in my district, one of the real things that we desperately needed was a place to care for families that cross the border. And we had no facility that was family friendly. They built a family friendly, or remodeled a correctional institute to make a family friendly center to hold illegals with children, people who come in this country illegally with children. And it is in my district. It is 22 miles from my home in Taylor, Texas. That thing has come under fire from our neighbors to the south who are sort of San Francisco-like, we would call them, in their views and they have been picketing this facility and claiming it is inhumane. I was there when they started remodeling this facility. I was there two-thirds of the way through the remodel, and so I went back the last month, the last week we were there during the President's Week, and I toured that facility.

I have the expertise of having built two juvenile detention centers as a judge. I was the chairman of the Juvenile Board from its inception in Williamson County until I retired, so until I retired I was the only chairman the Juvenile Board ever had in Williamson County, now a county of about 300,000 people. And so I was in charge of the board that built our first

William S. Lott Detention Center, back when we were a lot smaller county. We are probably the second fastest growing county in the Nation every year of the last 20 years. And so now we have built a much larger, 4 or 500-bed facility, the second one, the Williamson County Juvenile Detention Center.

So when I went into this controversial holding situation that we have got there in Taylor, I was looking for the kind of thing that we put our juvenile offenders into. And, you know, juvenile offenders are not, under the law, criminal offenders. It is a very special category of the world. And so I looked at the classrooms, which, quite frankly, were better than the classrooms that my son and my daughter-in-law teach in at Round Rock High School, and I am pretty proud of the classroom that they teach in at Round Rock High School. They were very well managed. The teachers were bilingual and very, very compassionate.

There was a glitch, bureaucratic glitch that caused some of them not to be taught long enough. But now they are meeting the Texas educational standards. They have recess, they have a playground, the rooms are decorated. They have done the best they can to make it juvenile friendly. And I figure if it is good enough for juveniles, it is certainly good enough for their parents.

But there is a lawsuit filed by the ACLU, and I am certain that our crisis is not over on that facility. But why did we have to build that facility? Because there were coyotes in Mexico who knew that if, for sure, if you were caught and you had a child in your possession, they had no place to house you, no matter where you came from. And 97 percent of the people in that Taylor facility are OTM, other than Mexicans. They knew if you had a kid they couldn't detain you. And so we had to have some way to detain. Those things are improvements. But that is the kind of, this is a very complicated situation. And you are right, it is not something that calls for a quick easy fix that suits certain people's political agenda. It needs to be analyzed and it needs to be done, I still say, as we secure the border and get the confidence of the American people that we care about what is going on, and we are getting there. We need to come up with a way to identify people so we know who has the right to work and who doesn't have the right to work in this country. Then our work program, with those who are here with no pathway to citizenship, in my opinion, and then a work program for those that want to come in legally to work in a legal system, work for a period of time and go back type of system, and finally rework our immigration and naturalization laws to where they work, they are workable. And at that point in time, if you have violated the law, and you want to go for citizenship, you reapply from the nation you come from and you get in line like everybody else with

some kind of penalty for having broken our laws. That makes sense. That is not something we should throw in in a quick laundry basket full of clothes, everything mixed up, and it will all work it out. We will work it out later, because, my friend from Iowa, ask the people that are in the trenches that are dealing with this immigration problem at ICE and other places. They are overwhelmed now. If you throw the 7 to 20 million that are hiding out in this country back on their shoulders to deal with, what are they going to do if we don't think this out logically?

□ 2045

They are going to be more overwhelmed. And when a government system is overwhelmed, it just stops working. And that is what we are experiencing in the United States today. You can't blame these people. When they have got a pile of a thousand applications on their desk and you walk through the door with 10,000 more, they are going to say, I can't do the thousand, I sure as heck can't do the 10,000.

So I think it is really wonderful that the people in this Congress are willing to keep bringing this issue to the floor and reminding the American people that we care, because there are those of us who care very, very compassionately about this issue. We can do it and we can do it right. And when it is done right, justice will prevail. I have been in the justice business all of my life, and I have been in the justice business as a judge for almost 21 years. I believe that what we owe all people who reside in this country is justice. Justice occasionally requires responsibility for your actions, and these are the kind of things we need to think about as we address this problem.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

As I listen to you talk about this, Judge, and you live down in that territory where it has been part of your life and the flow of our life, from my background in the work that I have done, there have been some times in my life when there was something that was so complicated, so convoluted and so unpredictable in its elements and so many hypotheticals that came out of each of those elements that no matter how hard I tried to chart a course through that and lay out contingency plans on, I call them if-then formulas which you can put on a spreadsheet, if then, we will do that; if that happens, then we will do this. And it threads through the whole equation.

This immigration issue is so complicated, so unpredictable and has so many hypotheticals that I contend that it is impossible for a body of 100 Senators or 435 House Members or a President to chart a course through that and be able to put law in place that deals with all of the contingencies and ends up with the kind of product that if we can even agree on what that is, we could not get there. It is beyond human ability to put that into a law

and make that work; too many hypotheticals.

So what I will submit is that we need to take this, as you suggested, one step at a time. I am for let's go ahead and get things under control at the border. Stop the bleeding. As Dr. GINGREY has often said from Georgia, we have got to stop the bleeding before we can decide how we are going to stabilize the patient and give him rehab. That is step one. And we started on that, as you said. I have been down to look at that. In fact, a couple weeks ago I went down there and helped build some wall with Secretary Chertoff down south of Yuma on the border. It occurred to me that probably the only person in America that actually has gone down on the southern border and put border fence up with Chris Simcox or the Minute Men, and then turned around and welded steel wall on the border was Secretary Chertoff. I don't think those two guys are going to get together and do this together. I had the privilege of doing it on different occasions with each of them. But we can control this at the border; in fact, we must. And if we can't do that, then all the rest of the policy we talk about goes for naught.

And another fundamental principle that I stand on is that of all the discussions that come out of the House and the Senate and the ideas about guest worker, or temporary worker, how we will give them a card, how that all might work; how you do background checks on people and then legalize them here, I don't hear anyone address what you do with those that don't come forward. Because those that come forward with a clean background record, they would then get their pass to either guest worker card or a path to citizenship, depending, they might feel pretty comfortable if all they did is come into the country illegally and that this government should write up a law, which I would oppose, that would be amnesty, too. But those that have a criminal record beyond that, those that have run afoul of the law for whatever reason, they are not coming out of the shadows because they don't want the hook of the law in them, they don't want to go off to prison and they don't want to be deported.

So we will not be uncovering the bad elements of society by trying to do background checks on people. And those elements of society, those slackers that don't want to come forward for whatever reason, those that have reasons not to come forward, they still remain in the shadows an illegal core in this civilization, and the only way you get them out is to actually send people back home again.

So I submit that we should use all of our local law enforcement. We should end all sanctuary policies. The local police force, county sheriffs, the highway patrol, the Texas Rangers, all those folks that are involved in law enforcement at all levels, and have them cooperating at all levels.

I grew up in a law enforcement family. And it was not something that we could have conceived of, but there would be a city police officer that would be prohibited from cooperating with a Federal officer on a law in this Nation because it happened to be Federal law as opposed to a city ordinance. So by that rationale, city police would only enforce city ordinances and State highway patrol and State officers, DCI or whatever, could only enforce State laws and then Federal officers could only enforce Federal laws. And I don't know what the county sheriffs are going to do except maybe they are just going to serve warrants and papers.

So we need to cooperate on all levels and we need to reestablish the rule of law.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman would yield, I absolutely agree with that. And as law enforcement, we have learned how to cooperate over those jurisdictional boundaries. There is no reason in the world why we can't cooperate over jurisdictional boundaries with the Federal law enforcement officers, also. It can be done. We have done it in Texas, we have done it across the country. We can do it with the immigration issue.

And I do agree with you, also, that no one is talking about what do you do with the people who don't? That has to be addressed, also. If we are going to hold out a carrot of a work permit for people to come out and turn themselves in and report and file whatever pre-procedures this Congress establishes, we have to have a stick for those who don't; that if we don't, it won't work.

I am not for pounding anybody, don't misunderstand me. My whole point is the carrot and the stick policy is law enforcement, the way we do some things in law enforcement. And it is important that we have that. If you don't, there are going to be serious ramifications for not joining and trying to solve this problem.

And those people that are in this country illegally out there tonight, if they are listening, I hope they know that whatever this Congress does, and I am with you, as it works out this thing logically and putting a focus on each element as we move along, not a big trash basket, when we do, we put together a program, we expect you to participate. And if you don't participate, I think there should be serious consequences.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas. And I know that there are some people in this Congress and across the country that will say, well, what about two sticks and no carrots. We may hear about that from the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. GOODE, who I would be happy to yield as much time as he may consume.

Mr. GOODE. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be here with Mr. KING; I appreciate the time he has allotted to me.

I want to thank him for his hard work in combating illegal immigration

and the many problems that such brings to our country. I know today he had a forum over at the Woodrow Wilson Institute and had to slug it out with others who did not concur with his views.

Judge Carter was here. I also want to thank him for his hard work on this issue, and for recognizing the need to secure our borders.

First, I wish to commend the Mayor and Council of Hazelton, Pennsylvania for their courageous stand in defending the sanctity of Hazelton, the well-being of its citizens, and the integrity of the rule of law. The courage of this community should spur this Congress to be resolute in standing for the security of our Nation.

By setting forth the city's determination to impose penalties of those who rent to illegal aliens and requiring employers to verify the legal work status of potential workers, the leadership of Hazelton is speaking for a majority of Americans who know and believe that strict measures must be employed if we are to secure jobs for workers who are here legally, if we are to preserve the traditional culture of our Nation, and if we are to be protected from criminal illegal aliens.

Further, Hazelton's action to stipulate English as their official language is a step that this Congress should also take in order to prevent our Nation from becoming divided into splinter groups that hunker down in the assertion of their individuality rather than becoming a part of a great melting pot that Americans have cherished for over two centuries.

Hazelton is now defending itself against the legal challenges of the ACLU and others. Hazelton should know that it is supported by millions of Americans who know that its cause is just.

I would also like to mention, Madam Speaker, the movie "Borders," which was showing in the Cannon Office Building last week. It is produced by Chris and Lisa Burgard. Lisa hails from Pittsylvania County, which is in the Fifth District of Virginia. We were honored to have in attendance Mr. and Mrs. Robert Duvall and Mr. Ron Maxwell, who starred and directed "Gods and Generals." We also had some Members of Congress to witness this film. Hopefully this film will be showing in theaters across the country in the near future. It illustrates the need for a secure fence along our southern borders.

The criminal activity along our border with Mexico is rampant. The coyotes and the drug dealers bring people across on a regular basis, bringing drugs with them, paying them to smuggle in the illegal drugs so that the main ones are not caught with the drugs on them. This is just an example of the illegal activity that a secure southern would prevent.

Last week, Secretary of the Interior, Dirk Kempthorne from Idaho, spoke about a fence that he saw on national land along our border with Mexico. He

told how it is believed that the drug cartel would jump that fence at night.

When we talk about a fence that will secure our border, we cannot be lulled into thinking that you can have a woven wire or one fence that would keep our borders secure. We must have something akin to the triple fence that exists between San Diego and Mexico. You have a fence, then a roadway for the Border Patrol to ride up and down, then you have a large barrier in the center, you have another roadway, and then a third fence.

The Secretary told about how the drug cartel would get these great drivers who would jump that fence with inclines and keep on going. I dare say, even if you had someone like Dale Jarrett or Bobby Labonte, they could never jump the San Diego fence. It would be mighty tough to tunnel under it, too. And Mr. KING, I know you have illustrated that fence here on the floor. That is the kind of fence that will keep them out. And that is the reason a number of persons oppose this fence and do not want to see it funded because it will do the job.

You mentioned amnesty, Mr. KING. You are right on the money. We cannot afford to have amnesty in any way. We have a great country in the United States of America; various beliefs, different religions, tremendous tolerance. We cannot afford to be swamped and sunk by the invasion of illegals into this country.

Just the talk of amnesty means more illegal entry. Those that come in illegally say well, let's go and stay just a few years. If we can go and stay a few years, we are going to get to stay forever. In the 1980s, they gave those that came and stayed a while amnesty. In the 1990s they, meaning our government, gave those that came and stayed for a while amnesty. And those that come across now, every time the body on the other side of this Capitol talks about amnesty, more want to come. When they hear the President say we are going to create a new guest worker program with a glidepath to citizenship, more want to come because they know. And the sidewalk talk is correct, if we can get there and stay just a little while, we are going to get a blue card, a red card, a green card or something, and we are going to have our glidepath to citizenship. And we will have ridden around a system. And everybody that is playing by the rules and waiting in line, well, they are just foolish. We broke the law, we got away with it, and they are giving us amnesty.

□ 2100

Illegal immigration has swamped our hospitals. It has jacked up health care costs for Americans not only in the southwestern United States but all across this land. We want to do something about health care costs. Shut off illegal immigration, and you will get a benefit.

I have been to community health centers which have gotten significantly

increased funding over the last 5 to 8 years. Community health centers serve those primarily who have little or no assets and who have little or no insurance. They don't question whether someone may not have the wherewithal or whether someone is in this country illegally or not. They see someone needs health care assistance, and they get it. A big impact on community health systems is illegal immigration. A big impact on free clinics is illegal immigration.

Social services, now, they say there are some rules against providing them for illegal aliens. But, again, the check system at the local level is not there. And there would be some if they did like Hazelton, Pennsylvania. They are saying you are being too harsh. Well, a lot of illegals have left Hazelton, Pennsylvania; and if we had more Hazelton, Pennsylvanias around this country, we would have a lot less problem.

Corrections, illegal aliens, a huge negative impact on local jails and local prisons. A huge impact on the State prison systems all across the country. Last year the head of the Federal Bureau of Prisons testified that out of 189,000 Federal prisoners, 50,000 were illegal aliens. And I think you figured it at about 28 percent.

I surely hope the illegal alien population in the United States is not that high. It is high and it is growing. We got to 300 million much quicker than anticipated. A huge strain on our energy, a huge strain on many aspects of our society.

Let's stop illegal immigration and improve America. Our policy towards illegals needs to be clear: keep them out, direct them back, and save America.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for a clear message.

The American people appreciate straight-talking, clear messages. There have been far too many of these messages that are muddled and confusing, and those muddled and confusing messages cause more problems with more people coming across the border. And I am not hearing people stand up and say it would be wonderful if everybody could wake up in their own country one day in a legal fashion and not have to look over their shoulder and rebuild their own nation, rebuild their own society, rebuild their own economy.

I had this conversation with the ambassador to the United States from Mexico. And I say, If you encourage your people, the vitality of your nation, to come here to the United States, who is going to be there to reform Mexico? Who is going to be there to rebuild Mexico? And he had to concede that is no way to run a country.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman mentioned his recent trip out to the Mexican border in the

State of Arizona. I had the pleasure of accompanying you on that trip and found that very insightful.

As we begin to move into this debate this session of the Congress, I think it is important that we keep some principles in mind. And, hopefully, these principles, I think, if they are followed, will help us arrive at the right public policy decision. And I think there are just three key ones.

And the first one is and it has been mentioned by the previous speakers this hour, but the first one is we have to focus on security first. As we discovered down at the border with Secretary Chertoff, it is important that we secure the border and we do that first. I think the former Speaker of the House has made the statement, does an antiballistic missile defense system make a lot of sense when a terrorist can rent a truck and drive it across the border? That is an important thing. It is about security.

When we were down there on our visit, a few things stuck out in my mind, and the American people understand this. The first is how real this problem is. As the gentleman from Iowa knows, we were in a helicopter flying out along the border, and the pilot came over the intercom and said, Look out the window right there and you will see some aliens attempting to cross right now. And we literally saw approximately 20, 25 people coming across. We were flying right along the Mexican/United States border, and we saw 25 people trying to cross the border illegally, and they attempted to hide under a tree. There wasn't much cover out in the desert, as the gentleman remembers, but there they were. And they had the clothes on their backs and jugs of water in their hands and they took off running back to the border. But it just reinforced in my mind what the American people need understand about how real this problem is.

The second thing that I think I came away with from that visit is the fence is working. As the gentleman from Virginia pointed out, where they are constructing it right now is having an impact. And obviously the strategy of our Secretary of our government is to put the fence up first in those areas where it is going to have the best and greatest impact, and that is in the urban areas. And it is working, and it is a double fence, as the gentleman talked about. And it is making a difference.

The other thing that is making a difference out there is our National Guard, our good men and women in the National Guard who are helping build that same fence where I know you welded and we all had a chance to do a little welding there. They are providing more eyes to see the illegals as they attempt to cross, and they are helping with that fence. But security has to be priority number one, as we think about the policy that makes sense for our country.

The second principle that has to guide this debate, and, again, it has

been highlighted already, is the idea that our country is great because we have a lot of great principles that were there at the founding and are still present today. One of those fundamental principles that makes America the greatest Nation ever is the concept that the rule of law matters. And when people willingly, knowingly violate the rule of law, there have to be serious consequences. And that is why amnesty as a policy makes no sense for people who willingly and knowingly violated the law.

And, finally, the third thing I would point out, and I think sometimes as we focus on making sure we are securing our borders and following the rule of law, one of the things that seems to get left out in the debate is we should welcome people, we should welcome immigrants who want to come here legally. I mean, immigrants have always been a great treasure to this country, have always added to the greatness of this country. And for those folks who want to come here and learn our culture, learn our language, learn English, we should welcome them.

And who can fault people who want to come to the freest, greatest Nation in history? So if they want to do it the right way, the legal way, we should work on a policy that also helps the bureaucracy work better to help those people who want to be a part of the American culture and want to be a part of this great country.

Madam Speaker, this is the greatest Nation in history. And for people who want to come here for the right reasons, we should welcome them here. If these three principles drive our policy, I think we are going to get at the right policy and I hope we do, but it has to be driven by these three principles, and security has to be of paramount importance.

And I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa's leadership on this issue and others here in the United States Congress.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

I did appreciate the privilege to travel with you. And there is some extra value in that, and that is you see what it is that people notice and you understand what their priorities are and you begin to understand how people rearrange their priorities and the basic values that come together. And you have heard some of these basic values flow out from Mr. JORDAN here this evening, Madam Speaker. And I look forward to a lot more of these kinds of events in helping to shape policy for the American people.

I look at this overall immigration policy that we have, and I think there are some great big blanks out there and questions that are asked and not answered, seldom asked and never answered. The first question that one should ask is, Is there such a thing as too much illegal immigration? Or let me put it this way: Is there such a thing as too much immigration? And if

the answer to that is "yes," then you need to divide that between legal and illegal. And for me illegal immigration, any of it, is too much. All immigration should be legal. We shouldn't tolerate illegal immigration, and we surely should not reward it with an amnesty plan, which I believe is being worked on right now in the offices over in the Senate and perhaps on the House side, preparing to reach that kind of an agreement between the House and the Senate and the White House to quickly bring a bill that we don't have time to scrutinize and time to debate thoroughly.

If you look at what happened last year, there was mistake after mistake after mistake made in the Senate's version of the bill. And first they had a bill on the floor that would have legalized between 100 and 200 million people. And then there was, I believe, a Bingaman amendment that reduced it and put a cap on one or two of those categories that took that number down under 100 million. Different numbers came back and forth. The Senators voting on that didn't know how many numbers they were talking about. You could ask them point blank, and they would not answer. But the best numbers, the most reliable numbers came from Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, and the numbers that I saw there near the end of that debate were 66 million people that would be brought into the United States under the policies that exist and the ones that the Senate would have added in their reform bill that they passed last year. A lot of that same sentiment; 66 million people, Madam Speaker.

And so I went back and looked, and I wondered how many people were naturalized into the United States legally in all of our history. And it turns out that we began keeping records in 1820. Not at the beginning, but in the 1820s. The numbers were small prior to that. They were small in 1820. And we tracked this thing up until the census of the year 2000. So between 1820 and the year 2000, the complete totals that we have, the number is 66.1 million people have been naturalized into the United States in all of our history. And this Senate version of the bill last year would have matched the pot all in one fell swoop. And they did this all with a straight face, Madam Speaker.

I recall the amnesty in 1986 that Reagan signed, and it was supposed to be 1 million people. I was appalled that 1 million people would get a pass on the rule of law. Well, I was triply appalled when I realized how bad it was because that 1 million turned into more than 3 million by most accounts because, first of all, they underestimated how many people would apply. Secondly, they underestimated how persuasive the fraud would be with people that raced across the border and jumped in line so they could get their amnesty.

I have met some of the people that received amnesty in 1986, and they are

almost universally in favor of amnesty in 2007. And the reason is because they were a beneficiary of amnesty. When they had amnesty, it was good for them; so, of course, they advocate that for anyone else. Certainly their children were taught: amnesty was the best thing that ever happened to you, sons and daughters of mine, and we need to make sure that everyone else can take advantage of this same thing.

But amnesty comes with a price, and the price is you sacrifice the rule of law if you grant amnesty.

So the 3 million that received amnesty in 1986 became great advocates for more amnesty. And then each generation after that, more people have come into the country, that 3 million, and today the most conservative number of illegal immigrants in the United States is about 12 million. Many of us believe that number exceeds 20 million. Some believe it exceeds 30 million. I am in that above-20 million category, and it is anybody's guess up in that territory. But if there is an amnesty bill that comes out of the Senate and through the House and to the White House, then you are going to see tens of millions of people that take advantage of this, and we will be sacrificing, Madam Speaker, the rule of law.

And I have talked about why would we do this, what would be the purpose for this kind of a policy. Well, first of all, the Federal Government has failed to enforce adequately our immigration laws. And as we got more and more illegal immigrants into the United States, it became a magnet for more and more to follow. They began to recruit in their communities. We had companies that put up billboards in Mexico encouraging people there to illegally come to the United States and apply for a job. Some of them recruited them down there and brought them across the border to go to work in their factories and in their plants. And this is commonly known in the communities that utilize this kind of labor. So what kind of a Nation would do that and why would we? First of all, the Federal Government didn't enforce the law.

Secondly, employers took advantage of that because they could hire illegal labor cheaper than they could local labor. And capital is always rational. Capital is going to do the smart thing. Capital is going to follow the path of least resistance like electricity. So there wasn't a resistance on the law enforcement side; so capital then hired illegal labor, brought them into the United States or hired them when they came here. Regardless, that was the magnet.

□ 2115

They understood that they could pay illegal labor less and there were far fewer contingent liabilities that went along with the illegal labor.

So if you have to pay \$15 an hour as a going rate for an American citizen or someone who is lawfully present in the

United States to do a job, but you can hire someone who is here illegally because they are in the shadows and have to scurry around and hide away from the law, if you can hire them for, let's say, \$8 an hour, and then if you have to provide health insurance, retirement benefits and take on the contingent liabilities of legal employees, the \$15 an hour, plus the health insurance package, plus the retirement package, plus the worker's comp piece, which is going to be higher because they are more likely to file the claims, plus the litigation risk of filing a suit against an employer, and then the unemployment claims that would come if you lay people off, none of that exists in any significant quantity when you are hiring someone who is illegal.

So you hire them cheaper, maybe at \$8 an hour, compared to a \$15 an hour legal person, but then that is all you are really ending up with, was 8 bucks an hour. But if you hire somebody at \$15 an hour and they are legal, then you have to add on to that so much for health insurance, so much for retirement benefits, so much for worker's comp, so much for unemployment, so much for contingent liabilities. What if this employee turns around and sues me for something? You add that all up, it is far cheaper to hire the illegal laborer than the legal. Then that magnetized and brought more and more into this country.

Americans have allowed it to happen under their nose. The administration hasn't sounded the alarm. They could seal the border more quickly than they are, and they are accelerating their efforts here, and I want to compliment them for that effort. But I am also watching closely to see if this effort is a real, sincere committed effort, or if it is an effort that is designed to help clear the political groundwork so that Members of Congress will be lulled to sleep, so-to-speak, and adopt a comprehensive plan, which again the word "comprehensive" is the substitute word for amnesty plan.

So do we do this because we need the labor, is one of those questions. The statement is made over and over again, well, we have to have the labor. After all, we have willing employers and willing employees. That should be the standard.

Madam Speaker, if you can give me cheap enough labor, I want to hire them all. If you can get me reliable workers, I want the first 100 at a buck an hour I can get. I probably want the first hundred at \$2 or \$3 an hour, or in fact \$5 an hour. We will find a way to make some money. I want them legal. They have to be for me.

My point is though the cheaper labor gets, the more demand there is. Kind of like if gas goes down to 50 cents, people are going to drive more, or if porterhouse steaks go down to 50 cents a pound, a lot more people are going to eat the fancy steak instead of eating the hamburger. Cheap labor, the same thing; the lower the price, the more consumption there is.

So it isn't an equation of willing employer-willing employee, because the employer is always going to be willing if he can make money off of a willing employee who will work cheaper than the going rate. It is an advantage for the employer to do that.

I hear from Member after Member, think tank head after think tank head, they get on the media airwaves every day, Madam Speaker, and they say a willing employer, a willing employee. We have people that need this labor. There is a demand for it. Therefore, we have to find a way to provide it. Otherwise, what happens in America if we don't flood the cheap labor market?

Well, one thing that has happened from flooding it is we have seen the unskilled purchasing power drop by 12 percent over the last 10 years, that is because there is a flood of cheap labor on the market. And it should go the other way. We want a broad middle-class. We want an ever more prosperous middle-class. Instead, the pressure that is coming here is those that are making money off of the cheap labor are becoming an aristocracy. They are part of nouveau rich in the United States of America. And our upper-middle class, or upper class, for that matter, is growing, and so is our lower class growing, because we are importing it, and that is putting a squeeze on middle America.

One of the principles of a free society is you need to have a broad and prosperous middle-class. We have been growing and broadening that middle-class for generations and becoming a stronger Nation because of it. But this last generation it is going the other way, Madam Speaker. This last generation, we are growing the aristocracy and we are growing the lower class, importing a lower class, all at the expense of the middle class, which is being squeezed in between the two.

But in the middle is the real America. In the middle is the real America that understands truth, justice, the American way, the merits of hard work, the American dream. They have a tremendous work ethic, a sense of family and community. They are being squeezed, Madam Speaker, by the interests on the upper levels of our society and by the thunderous herds that are coming across particularly our southern border, on the lower end of our society, at the expense of our middle-class.

I would point out that if you envision this society like a barbell, and the middle-class would be the bar, and the weights on each end would be the bells, on one side you have the weight on the right side of that barbell, that is the business interests in America. A lot of them are Republican interests, but certainly not all of them. There are a lot of liberal elitists that sit in that category too. And they are clamoring for more cheap labor because they make money doing it, and they are not threatened, nor do they believe their children will ever be threatened by the

competition in the labor market that takes place down in the lower end of the spectrum.

The people on the right side of that, the business side of that barbell, that interest, they will send their children to Ivy League schools, upper crust universities, they will get an education. They won't ever have to compete, probably, with the lower income people that don't have that kind of education, that kind of culture, that gives them a path to professionalism.

So they will end up living in their ivory towers and end up living in their gated communities and getting rich off the cheaper labor, and their children will be wired into that same kind of thing. And that is how you grow an aristocracy. That is how you grow a ruling class. That is how you grow an arrogance, that they have a birthright to a servant class, which they are creating.

That servant class that they are creating is the other end of this barbell, and that is this massive number of people who give especially the left a lot of political power. Even those who are in this country illegally give political power to many Members here in this Congress because we count people rather than citizens when he with redistrict in America.

As we count people, that means we count illegal immigrant in these districts. So illegal immigrants give political power to the Members of Congress who are here because they don't have to get their vote. They only have to compete.

There will be a couple of seats here in the House of Representatives, where it will take about 110,000 votes for me to get reelected to my seat, there are a couple of seats that take around 30,000, 35,000 votes for the same thing, and the reason is because the illegal population is counted in the census, and the larger that number is, the fewer citizens are left to actually cast a ballot. And that is the circumstance.

So think of this barbell. On the one side is the ruling class, on the other side of the barbell, the political power of the lower class, the new servant class that is being created, and in the middle, the bar itself is the middle-class that holds it altogether that is being squeezed by the two. That is what we are up against, Madam Speaker.

So, do we need this labor? I would point out that if it is 12 million in the United States illegally, according to I believe it was a Pew Foundation study, that the illegal labor amounted out of that 12 million, 6.9 million workers are actually working. They don't all work, of course. Some are homemakers, some are too young. But 6.9 million working illegals in America.

Of that 6.9 million, that represents 4.7 percent of the overall workforce, and 2.2 percent of the actual production, because they are unskilled, they don't produce like a more highly trained worker does. So they are only doing 2.2 percent of the work.

Well, if you opened up your factory doors in the morning and you found out that 2.2 percent of your production, your work force, wasn't going to show up that day, in order to make up for the difference, I would send a memo out to my staff that said, you know, your 15-minute coffee break this morning and your 15-minute coffee break this afternoon, I am going to shorten that to 10 minutes.

If you do that, if you cut your two coffee breaks, morning and afternoon, by 5 minutes each, you will have picked up 2.1 percent of the production, almost the same thing that the illegal labor represents. Ten minutes a day out of an 8 hour shift of America, that is how much we would be missing. Yet I hear Chicken Little, oh, we can't get along without this labor. We must have it. If we don't have it, the economy will collapse.

It will not collapse, Madam Speaker. We can adapt to it easily. We have taken years to get here, at least 20 years to evolve into this circumstance that we are today, and we can evolve away from that, away from the dependency, away from this addiction, away from this methadone of illegal labor that we have in America, and it will not be that hard to do.

Also there are 6.9 million working illegals in America, but then the argument is, well, but we have unemployment at essentially record low rates of 4.6 percent. Well, that is nice. That is effectively a very low unemployment rate. It is not the lowest. It is not record low unemployment. In World War II, we had a 1.3 percent unemployment rate then.

But it is about 4.6, and they will say you can't get enough workers out of the unemployment rolls to fill the gap we need for this labor. Well, maybe you can't, and probably in fact I will say certainly you can't.

I will say also going into the welfare rolls, we couldn't hire all of them. Many of them would not be employable. If we could hire half of them and if we could hire half of those on unemployment, we still wouldn't put a very significant dent in that 6.9 million labor force.

But I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that going to look at the Department of Labor statistics, it shows an entirely different story. If you were going to place a factory in a location, you wouldn't simply look at the unemployment rate in that location and determine how many people there were to hire. You would hire a consulting company, and that company would go in and survey the area and determine the available labor force that was in the area. This is a standard known practice in all business and industry. The consulting firm would identify the available labor.

I went into the Department of Labor Statistics to determine the available labor supply in America, and I began to add up the different categories of age groups. 16 to 19 year olds, we have 9.3

million non-working 16 to 19 year olds in America. Now, not even part-time. Some of these are part-time jobs. And so I start there, because that is where young people learn their work ethic.

As I add up these age categories from 16 on up to 19, and then from 20 to 24 and the list goes on up the line, and I got to 65 and I had to make a decision, and I looked around and concluded that Wal-Mart hires up to 74 years old, so I added them all up to that. One of the reasons I am going to confess, Madam Speaker, is because it was a convenient number I could memorize. It is not substantially changed if you lower the number down to 65.

But it works like this: 6.9 million working illegal laborers in America could be replaced by hiring one out of ten of the 69 million workers in America who are simply not in the workforce.

What Nation would ignore 69 million people not in the workforce and go and bring people in from another country? That would be like having a lifeboat with that percentage of people on it, and deciding you needed some more people to pull on the oars, and having all of those people up there in steerage riding along, and no, it wouldn't occur to us to go up and say come on down here and grab ahold of that oar. Why don't we pull off on an island and see if we can't recruit some more people, load them in the lifeboat, and maybe 7 out of 12 of them will row. That is what it amounts to, Madam Speaker.

So we have not been very objective in this. There is also a tremendous amount of crime, and the victims of that crime, it has been a tremendous price paid here in the United States. We talk about it very little, but every day there are American citizens that die violently at the hands of criminal aliens who are in this country and who, if we had enforced the laws, with not be here.

I had a gentleman say to me today, there isn't a shred of evidence that illegal immigrants commit crimes at any greater rate than average Americans do. But the truth is, Madam Speaker, there is a tremendous amount of evidence that they do.

In fact, the numbers work out to be that in the United States, the violent death rate is 4.28 per 100,000 annually. In Mexico, it is 13.2 per 100,000. That is a solid three-plus times greater violent death rate in Mexico. And Mexico is the most peaceful nation south of our border that I can identify. Honduras has nine times the violent death rate. El Salvador's is not published, but we know it is very high. If you go to Colombia, their violent death rate compared to the United States is 15.4 times higher.

So if you bring people from that society, of course they are going to commit more crimes. They are committed in their home country. They bring that culture with them. Also, \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs pour across that southern border every year, brought in by these elements.

I am not here to say that they are all bad people. No, the vast majority of them are very good people looking for a better life for their families. But they have a higher percentage of violence among them, even as good people, than the average American that is here, and we are paying a price of about 12 Americans a day who lose their life as victims of murder to criminal aliens, about 13 a day who die at the hands of negligent homicide, mostly the victims of drunk drivers, not the drunks themselves.

□ 2130

That is the magnitude of this, Madam Speaker. And I recognize by the clock I am in a position where I need to say thank you for the privilege of addressing you on the floor of the House of Representatives

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BALDWIN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 13 on account of illness.

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. CASTOR (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BISHOP of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and March 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 13, 14, and 15.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, March 13.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, March 13.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 2007, at 10:30 a.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:

804. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tennessee Federal Regulatory Program (RIN: 1029-AC50) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

805. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf and Oil Spill Financial Responsibility for Offshore Facilities-Civil Penalties (RIN: 1010-AD39) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

806. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf-Incorporate API RP 65 for Cementing Shallow Water Flow Zones (RIN: 1010-AD19) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

807. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for *Monardella linoidea* ssp. *viminea* (Willow Monardella) (RIN: 1018-AT92) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

808. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30494; Amdt. No. 3167] (RIN: 2120-AA65 (1-25/5-31/Amdt. 3167) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

809. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30500 Amdt. No. 3172] (RIN: 2120-AA65 (1-25/6-28/Amdt. 3172) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

810. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, DC-9-20, DC-9-30, DC-9-40, and DC-9-50 Series Airplanes; Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), and DC-9-87 (MD-87) Airplanes; Model MD-88 Airplanes; Model MD-90-30 Airplanes; and Model 717-200 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22254; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-001-AD; Amendment 39-14598; AD 2006-10-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

811. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200, -300, and -300F Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22529; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-0990-AD; Amendment 39-14592; AD 2006-10-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

812. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB-Fairchild SF340A (SAAB/SF340A) and SAAB 340B Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24075; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-235-AD; Amendment 39-14589; AD 2006-10-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

813. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319-100, A320-200, A321-100, and A321-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22919; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-087-AD; Amendment 39-14582; AD 2006-09-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

814. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulation Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Statute of Limitations on Assessment Concerning Certain Individuals Filing Income Tax Returns with the U.S. Virgin Islands (RIN: Notice 2007-19) received February 26, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

815. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Announcement and Report Concerning Advanced Pricing Agreements (RIN: Announcement 2007-31) received February 26, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

816. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revised Housing Cost Amounts Eligible for Exclusion or Deduction (RIN: Notice 2007-25) received February 26, 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. Supplemental report on 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 effect that such policies, forms, and agreements are consistent with certain disclosure protections, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-42 Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1309. A bill to promote openness in Government by strengthening section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 110-45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1045. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 210 Walnut Street in Des Moines, Iowa, as the "Neal Smith Federal Building" (Rept. 110-46). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1362. A bill to reform acquisition practices of the Federal Government; with an amendment (Rept. 110-47 Pt. 1). 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. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1468. A bill to ensure that, for each small business participating in the 8(a) business development program that was affected by Hurricane Katrina of 2005, the period in which it can participate is extended by 18 months; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 1469. A bill to establish the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation under the authorities of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FILLNER:

H.R. 1470. A bill to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Programs Enhancement Act of 2001 to require the provision of chiropractic care and services to veterans at all Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILLNER:

H.R. 1471. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit eligible veterans to receive direct access to chiropractic care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARROW (for himself, Mr.

BACA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1472. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the deductible and change the method of determining the mileage reimbursement rate under the beneficiary travel program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARROW (for himself, Mr.

BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1473. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require child care providers to provide to parents information regarding whether such providers carry current liability insurance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY (for himself, Ms.

HERSETH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas):

H.R. 1474. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the sponsor of a prescription drug plan or an organization offering an MA-PD plan to promptly pay claims submitted under part D and to prohibit the inclusion of certain identifying information of pharmacies on explanatory prescription drug information and cards distributed by prescription drug plan sponsors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mrs.

MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Mr.

MCHUGH, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and equalize the exclusion from gross income for parking and transportation fringe benefits and to provide for a common cost-of-living adjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 1476. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to expand the nursing home patients' bill of rights to include the right to receive care from a credible caregiver by requiring background checks on direct access employees and the right to a safe environment during an emergency or natural disaster by requiring nursing long-term care facilities to establish disaster emergency and evacuation plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1477. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend military commissary and exchange store privileges to veterans with a compensable service-connected disability and to their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. PASTOR):

H.R. 1478. A bill to amend the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental and Native American Public Policy Act of 1992 to provide funds for training in tribal leadership, management, and policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 1479. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of qualified acupuncturist services under part B of the Medicare Program, and to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for coverage of such services under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently de-

termined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 1480. A bill to impose a 2-year moratorium on implementation of a proposed rule relating to the Federal-State financial partnerships under Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 1481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude amounts received as a military basic housing allowance from consideration as income for purposes of the low-income housing credit and qualified residential rental projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 1482. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit and a deduction for small political contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. SPACE, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. WAMP, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1483. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the authorization for certain national heritage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 1484. A bill to provide consistent enforcement authority to the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service to respond to violations of regulations regarding the management, use, and protection of public lands under the jurisdiction of these agencies, 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 Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution recognizing the dedication and honorable service of members of the Armed Forces who are serving or have served as military nurses; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PUTNAM:

H. Res. 236. A resolution removing a Minority Member from and electing certain Minority Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. SPACE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. HARE):

H. Res. 237. A resolution supporting and encouraging greater support for Veterans Day each year; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Res. 238. A resolution commending the first democratic elections in Aceh, a province in Sumatra, Indonesia, and expressing support for the further democratic development and implementation of the Helsinki Memorandum of Understanding; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. MARKEY introduced A bill (H.R. 1485) for the relief of Esther Karinge; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 23: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 73: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 92: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 98: Mr. HAYES, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. RENZI, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 100: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 169: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 211: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 255: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 260: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 322: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 327: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 419: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 464: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 473: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 549: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 551: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 563: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 620: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 631: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 634: Mr. WOLF and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 690: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 743: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 760: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 787: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 790: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 797: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HOLT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 814: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 854: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 887: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 916: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

- H.R. 942: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 943: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 960: Mr. LOEBSSACK.
H.R. 971: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1061: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 1087: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1093: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 1119: Mr. McCAUL of Texas.
H.R. 1149: Mr. TERRY, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1186: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1187: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1188: Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 1192: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 1200: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1224: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1229: Mr. BERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1235: Mr. TOWNS and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1244: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1261: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 1284: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1294: Mr. RENZI.
H.R. 1300: Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1303: Mr. McNERNEY.
H.R. 1317: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 1330: Mr. SHULER and Mr. POE.
H.R. 1347: Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 1350: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. PETRI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1353: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1359: Mr. POE.
H.R. 1362: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1363: Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1409: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 1430: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 1458: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1462: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. WEINER.
H. Con. Res. 33: Ms. MATSUI.
H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Con. Res. 83: Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. CALVERT.
H. Con. Res. 89: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 16: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 55: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. STARK.
H. Res. 68: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 101: Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 106: Mr. SPACE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. BILBRAY.
- H. Res. 107: Mr. BARROW, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WALBERG.
H. Res. 136: Mr. BARROW, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. ORTIZ.
H. Res. 143: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Res. 158: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. SOUDER.
H. Res. 169: Mr. BARROW.
H. Res. 171: Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. POE.
H. Res. 196: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 197: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 198: Mr. HARE.
H. Res. 208: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 209: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H. Res. 221: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. SERRANO.
H. Res. 226: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 227: Ms. LEE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 228: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 231: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H. Res. 233: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. McDERMOTT.