



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 26, 2007

No. 52

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 26, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KATHY CASTOR 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. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

THE VICE PRESIDENT AND THE IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the Chair.

Well, Vice President CHENEY was in form last weekend in Florida addressing a small group behind closed doors. He attacked the House of Representatives for passing the Iraq Accountability Act. I am not certain whether it is because he objects to the fact that we are going to make this administration review the readiness of our troops, their equipment, before they're rushed to Iraq in an attempt to escalate the

war. They don't want that kind of accountability, because it failed our troops, from day one, on equipment and readiness.

And then maybe it's the other part, the part where we are going to demand accountability of the Iraqi Government. Time and time again President Bush sets benchmarks. "Those benchmarks will be met." They are never met. There has to be a diplomatic and political component. You cannot resolve a civil war with military force in Iraq. But time and time again the Bush administration has let the Iraqi Government skate. This bill says they will meet the President's own chosen, President Bush and al Maliki's, own chosen guidelines and benchmarks or we will begin to bring our troops home. Plain and simple, not a war without end, not a war that will be settled by future Presidents, as George Bush said a year ago, but if this administration and the Iraqi Government fail to do what's necessary for our troops, we are not going to strand them in the middle of a civil war.

But the Vice President objects to those things. He says if they really support the troops, then we should take them at their word and expect them to meet the needs of our military on time, in full, no strings attached.

Let's review the administration's record on those issues. Let's review how the Bush-Cheney administration met the needs of our troops. First of all, it was an unnecessary war. They were pursuing a necessary war against al Qaeda, the Taliban, Osama bin Laden. Remember them? Dead or alive? Dead or alive? They abandoned that war for an unnecessary war launched under false pretenses in Iraq.

Now, something called the Office of Special Plans phoned up the intelligence. DICK CHENEY put together the Office of Special Plans with some of his own hand-picked people, I think one of whom is now on the way to jail, in fact,

Scooter Libby. In fact, he personally, unprecedented for a Vice President, kept visiting the CIA and saying, no, they didn't have the intelligence right yet. I.e., they didn't say what he wanted. Niger yellow cake, Chalabi, all that stuff. He was so wrong. And then he said, "Simply stated, there's no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction." Vice President CHENEY in August of 2002 as he was pushing us toward war.

But then on the eve of the war, even after their myths about weapons of mass destruction, the yellow cake, the aluminum tubes had started to fall apart, he said, "We believe that Saddam has in fact reconstituted nuclear weapons." Vice President CHENEY. A man who has been so wrong and put our troops in harm's way unnecessarily, jeopardized the security of the United States by distracting us from the real fight in Afghanistan, challenges this Congress on the Iraq Accountability Act? No, I think last November the American people started to ask about accountability for him and his supposed boss, George Bush.

And then let's look at their military planning. General Shinseki, a good man. They fired him. It was said we didn't need 350,000 people. Rummy said, "Oh, don't worry. We can do it with 100,000 or so." Shinseki said, that would lead to strife, civil war and chaos. He was right. They fired him. But presidential economic adviser Larry Lindsey said, "It's going to be very expensive. Very expensive." No, CHENEY and his cohorts said, "No, don't worry. Iraq can pay for it themselves." Well, we are now at \$2 billion a week, hundreds of billions of dollars on this war. So wrong.

And then our troops, how did they serve them? Vice President CHENEY again, "We believe we will, in fact, be greeted as liberators. I think it will go relatively quick. Weeks rather than months." So they didn't give our men

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.

H3019

and women body armor, didn't have armored Humvees, they didn't have the equipment they needed. Congress had to uncover those scandals after we heard from the troops in the field. We had to provide it over the objections of this administration, and this guy has the gall to say we aren't serving the troops as they want to keep our troops mired down forever in the middle of a civil war?

This is extraordinary. And, most recently, Vice President CHENEY last year, no, 2 years ago, "I think they're in the last throes, if you will, of the insurgency." I guess he still believes that.

These people have done an extraordinary disservice to our troops, our country, our national security and the fight against true terrorism that attacked us on 9/11. We will not be distracted or bullied anymore. The Iraq Accountability Act is a strong response to their mismanagement and it offers the United States a way to bring this war to a successful conclusion and soon.

Bring the troops home.

CONGRATULATING BARTON COLLEGE'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, there was great cause for celebration in eastern North Carolina over this past weekend, as Wilson, North Carolina's Barton College captured the NCAA Division II men's college basketball championship. What a game.

Barton College, Madam Speaker, is a small but proud college with a rich academic history. With a student body of about 1,000 students, it is located not only in my congressional district but located in my community. I am so proud of them.

Barton College captured the national championship Saturday afternoon, scoring an amazing come-from-behind 77-75 victory over previously undefeated and defending national champion Winona State University. Barton won the title game at the buzzer, with one-tenth of a second remaining. They won their semifinal game by one point on a last-second free throw. And it won its quarterfinal game on a three-pointer at the buzzer in overtime. This will be a game that will long be remembered.

Madam Speaker, it is a great honor for me to recognize the success, efforts and achievements of these outstanding young student athletes. It is my pleasure to recognize their head coach, Ron Lievens, and his staff. Their hard work and dedication to teamwork is something that we are all proud of in Wilson, North Carolina and throughout the First Congressional District.

I ask my colleagues today to rise and join me in paying tribute to Barton College's basketball team of 2007 and to recognize their extraordinary championship.

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 39 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:

"Go down, Moses,
Way down in Egypt land.
Tell ole Pharaoh,
Let my people go."

These lines from the old spiritual, Lord, gave human slavery voice and hope. Its rundown rhythm muffled the sound of the Underground Railroad traveling through darkness to bring people freedom's light.

Lord, we pray that You help now all those held captive in human bondage. May the thousands caught in the clutches of slave labor and worse, in our own country, find a new exodus. Bring their hidden stories to the brightness of news in our day, so they may live with the glimmer of hope. Lead them through the complexity of economic and legal systems to breathe in the common air of freedom.

May our preparations for Passover and Easter shake off our indifference, change obstinate hearts of unscrupulous employers and profiteers in human trafficking that the redeemed may rejoice in You, our God and Savior, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. ROSS 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.

DEMOCRATS CONTINUE TO TAX AND SPEND

(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, Democrats are as predictable as the sun: it continues to rise in the east, and they continue to tax and spend.

The Democratic budget released last week proposes the largest tax increase in American history: \$392.5 billion. Not only does it allow for the expiration of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, but it does nothing to control unsustainable entitlement spending.

Republicans believe fiscal restraint and pro-growth economic policies will lead to budget surpluses and new jobs. Democrats believe out-of-control government spending should be subsidized with the hard-earned money of American taxpayers.

Unfortunately, the Democratic budget continues to squeeze taxpayers' pocketbooks without tightening the belt of Big Government. Such reckless policies will chill our growing economy by reducing job creation.

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

PHOTO IDENTIFICATION SECURITY ACT

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, one of the things that we heard about so often during the campaign last year was illegal immigration. And coming back to Congress, one of the things we are hearing about as we hold our town hall meetings is the impact of illegal immigrants having access to credit cards and to financial services in this country. Banking institutions, the Federal Reserve, the U.S. Treasury, and the IRS are allowing illegal immigrants the ability to sign up for credit cards, mortgages, taxpayer identification numbers, and to transfer money back to their country.

It is a problem, and there is a solution. H.R. 1314 is a piece of legislation I have filed. It is bipartisan legislation with over 50 cosponsors. The Photo ID Security Act will close the loophole that illegal immigrants are using to obtain valid financial service information and access to these services. What it will do is change the identification that is required, requiring them to present a photo ID issued from their home country or the U.S. Everyone in the U.S. can legally obtain these documents.

I encourage all Members to cosponsor H.R. 1314.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that the Speaker's appointment of the remaining 19 members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on January 17, 2007, without objection, is made notwithstanding the requirement of clause 11(a)(1)(C) of rule X.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

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

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

CLIFFORD DAVIS/ODELL HORTON
FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 753) to redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Clifford Davis/Odell Horton Federal Building," as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 753

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

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, commonly known as the Clifford Davis Federal Building, shall be known and designated as the "Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am joined in H.R. 753 by the entire Tennessee delegation, and I am joined in a companion bill with its authorship/sponsorship of each of our Senators, LAMAR ALEXANDER and BOB CORKER.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 753.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 753, sponsored by the entire Tennessee delegation of both the House and the Senate, is to designate the Federal building in Memphis, Tennessee, located at 167 North Main Street as the Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building.

Judge Odell Horton was appointed to the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee by President Jimmy Carter on May 12, 1980. He was brought to the attention of President Carter by then-Senator Jim Sasser and through a proposal by Lieutenant Governor John Wilder who represented the district that Judge Horton grew up in Bolivar, Tennessee.

Judge Horton in 1980 was the first African American Federal judge appointed to the bench in Tennessee since Reconstruction. He has many firsts as an African American, but he has more regard simply as an outstanding jurist, attorney, soldier and human being.

He was born May 13, 1929, in Bolivar, Tennessee, and grew up during the Depression and the Second World War. His father was a laborer and his mother took in laundry. The children, four boys and a girl, picked cotton, stacked lumber, and took other odd jobs to make ends meet.

Judge Horton graduated from Bolivar High School in 1946 and enlisted in the Marine Corps "as a vehicle to find a way out of Bolivar." After an early discharge, he enrolled in Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia, using Federal aid under the GI bill to finance his tuition. The Korean War was under way by the time he graduated in 1951, and he returned for a second tour with the Marines. After a second tour, during which he graduated from the U.S. Navy School of Journalism, Horton entered Howard University Law School in Washington, DC. He received his degree from Howard in 1956, then moved to Memphis to begin private practice in a one-room office upstairs at 145 Beale Street in Memphis, the legendary Beale Street in Memphis.

He served in private practice for 5 years from 1957 until 1962 and then was appointed Assistant U.S. Attorney in Memphis. After being Assistant U.S. Attorney, he served in other capacities. First of all, during Mayor Henry Lobe's city administration, he was the first African American member of that administration, head of health and hospitals. That was a tumultuous time in Memphis' history. During that time, Dr. King was killed in Memphis on April 4, 1968, and we will observe that tragedy soon in Memphis. But Judge Horton, as an African American, had a difficult task. As such, he ordered the desegregation of the Bowld Hospital which was the public hospital. That was a great thing that he did in bringing Memphis forward.

A year after he did that in 1968, he received the L.M. Graves Memorial Health Award for his efforts to advance

the cause of health care in Memphis. He later became a criminal court judge appointed by then-Governor Buford Ellington. After serving on the criminal court bench, he went on to serve as president of LeMoyné-Owen College, an historically black college in Memphis, a liberal arts school where he served for 4 years from 1970 to 1974.

In 1974, Judge Horton ran for Shelby County district attorney general. Although he lost by just about 4,000 votes, he came very close, and it was a historic election that set a precedent for other individuals running for office and being elected on their merits and not based on their race. He received over 23 percent of the Caucasian vote, which was unheard of at the time, and it showed the respect that he had from all sections of the community.

He returned to Federal service after being at LeMoyné-Owen and after having unsuccessfully sought the DA's job as reporter for the Speedy Trial Act Implementation Committee by the Western District Court. After that, he served as a U.S. bankruptcy judge from 1976 to 1980. Then he received the appointment from President Carter. Then from January 1, 1987, until December 31, 1993, he served as the chief judge for the Western District of Tennessee. On May 16, 1995, he took senior judge status, and 2 years later closed his Memphis office.

He is remembered in Memphis as a calm and patient judge who carefully and deliberately explained legal concepts to jurors. He was a model for judges because of his judicial temperament and set a standard in such regards. Judge Horton and his wife, Evie Randolph, were married for over 50 years and have two sons, Odell Horton, Jr., and Christopher, who graduated from his alma mater, Morehouse College in Atlanta. Judge Horton's widow spoke for so many in his profession and personal life when she stated after his death, "He was a rare and precious jewel in the crown of humanity and made all of our lives richer and better because he passed this way." Indeed, Mrs. Horton was correct.

Judge Horton received many honors for his work from different bar associations and institutions. He was a member of the American Bar Association and Chair of the National Conference of Federal Trial Judges. He served as a member of the Judicial Conference Committee on Defender Services, and Morehouse College awarded him an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws.

In the year 2000, the Memphis Bar Association awarded Judge Horton with a Public Service Award. He died February 22, 2006. In honor of Judge Horton's significant contributions to the legal community in Memphis and his pioneering career, it is both fitting and proper to designate the courthouse located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis as the Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building.

As Senator ALEXANDER mentioned on the Senate floor, it is appropriate that

this building have both the names of Judge Horton, a great pioneer of the latter half of the 20th century, and Clifford Davis, who was part of the first half of the 20th century, served as United States Congressman from 1940 to 1965. It shows a continuum of history, a growth of history, and history is a process. The naming of this building for Judge Horton as well as former Congressman Clifford Davis shows progress in Memphis, progress in race relations, and progress among human beings.

Accordingly, I ask for unanimous passage of the bill.

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

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

H.R. 753, as amended, designates the Clifford Davis Federal Building in Memphis, Tennessee, as the Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building. The bill honors Judge Horton's dedication to public service.

After service in the United States Marines during the Korean War and acquiring a law degree from Howard University, Judge Horton engaged in the private practice of law from 1957 until 1962.

□ 1415

His career included serving as an Assistant United States Attorney in Memphis, an appointment to the Shelby County Criminal Court, and serving as the President of LeMoyne-Owen College.

Judge Horton was appointed to the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee by President Carter in 1980. He served as its chief judge from 1987 to 1993 and became a senior judge on May 16, 1995. Two years later, he retired from the Federal bench; and, sadly, Judge Horton passed away last year on February 22.

I support this legislation and encourage our colleagues to do the same.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 753, a bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building".

Odell Horton was appointed to the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee by President Jimmy Carter on May 12, 1980. He was the first African-American Federal Judge appointed in Tennessee since Reconstruction.

Judge Horton was born in Bolivar, Tennessee. He grew up during the Depression and World War II in an environment he described as "typically rural Southern and typically segregated, with all the attendant consequences of that." He was the oldest of five children to hard-working parents. During his childhood, he and his brothers and sister picked cotton to help support the family.

Horton graduated from high school in 1946 and enlisted in the Marine Corps "as a vehicle to find a way out of Bolivar." Ten months later, he took advantage of an early discharge pro-

gram designed to reduce the number of men in the military, and enrolled in Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia, using Federal aid under the GI bill to finance his tuition. The Korean War was underway by the time he graduated in 1951, and he returned for a second tour of duty in the Marines.

During his second tour, he graduated from the U.S. Navy School of Journalism. After returning home, Horton entered Howard University Law School in Washington, D.C. He received his law degree in 1956 and moved to Memphis, Tennessee, where he started a private law practice.

In 1962, Horton became Assistant United States Attorney in Memphis. He remained in that position until his appointment to the Shelby County Criminal Court by Governor Buford Ellington. In 1968, Judge Horton ordered the desegregation of Bowld Hospital. A year later, he received the L.M. Graves Memorial Health Award for his efforts to advance the cause of health care in Memphis. Judge Horton stepped down from his Federal judgeship to serve as President of LeMayne-Owen College, a predominately African-American liberal arts college.

He returned to Federal service upon his appointment as reporter for the Speedy Trial Act Implementation Committee by the Western District Court of Tennessee. He later served as U.S. Bankruptcy Judge from 1976 to 1980. Judge Horton also served as Chief Judge for the Western District of Tennessee from January 1, 1987, until December 31, 1993. On May 16, 1995, he took senior status and retired two years later.

Judge Horton was a member of the American Bar Association and Chair of the National Conference of Federal Trial Judges. He also served as a member of the Judicial Conference Committee on Defender Services. Morehouse College honored him with an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws. In 2000, the Memphis Bar Association awarded Judge Horton with a Public Service Award.

Judge Horton died February 22, 2006, at Baptist Memorial Hospital in Memphis, Tennessee, and was buried in Elmwood Cemetery in Memphis.

In honor of Judge Horton's outstanding contributions to the legal community in Memphis and his exemplary professional career, it is both fitting and proper to designate the courthouse located on 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building".

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LA TOURETTE. MR. SPEAKER, I YIELD BACK THE BALANCE OF MY TIME.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 753, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAFAEL MARTINEZ NADAL
UNITED STATES CUSTOMHOUSE
BUILDING

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1019) to designate the United States Customhouse Building located at 31 Gonzalez Clemente Avenue in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the "Rafael Martinez Nadal United States Customhouse Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1019

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States customhouse building located at 31 Gonzalez Clemente Avenue in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, shall be known and designated as the "Rafael Martinez Nadal United States Customhouse Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States customhouse building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Rafael Martinez Nadal United States Customhouse Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1019.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1019 is a bill to designate the United States Customhouse Building located at 31 Gonzalez Clemente Avenue in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the Rafael Martinez Nadal United States Customhouse Building.

Although Don Rafael Martinez Nadal was born in the city of Mayaguez on April 22, 1877, he resided and passed away in Guaynabo. He received his college degree in philosophy and letters from the Provincial Institute of Secondary Education in San Juan. At 16, he was sent to Barcelona, Spain, to study law.

In August, 1904, he returned to Mayaguez and began to study coffee growing agriculture. Simultaneously, he began his first successful attempts in the media and politics with the Puerto Rican Republican Party. In 1908, he founded the political newspaper *El Combate*. In 1912, he obtained his law degree and became one of the most

prominent men in the Puerto Rican political arena. He was considered one of the most famous criminal lawyers of the time.

In 1914, he was elected as a member of the Chamber of Delegates for the city of Ponce by the Puerto Rican Republican Party. In 1920, he was chosen by the same party to serve in the Senate and was re-elected in the next five general elections. When the alliance of the Union of Puerto Rico Party and the Puerto Rican Republican Party formed in 1924, Nadal left the Republican Party and initiated a political movement called the Pure Republican Party, which registered officially as the Historical Constitutional Party.

Later, he founded the Republican Union, working to advance the ideal of statehood for Puerto Rico. In coalition with the Socialist Party, the Republican Union triumphed in the general elections of 1932 and 1936. In both terms, Nadal presided over the Senate. Before the election of 1940, because of a serious illness, he returned to his Guaynabo residence. He died there on July 6, 1941.

In honor of Rafael Martinez Nadal's outstanding contributions to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and his exemplary professional writing career, it is both fitting and proper to designate the courthouse located at 31 Gonzalez Clemente Avenue in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the "Rafael Martinez Nadal United States Customhouse Building."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1019, introduced by my friend and colleague, Congressman FORTUÑO of Puerto Rico, designates the United States Customhouse Building located at 31 Gonzalez Clemente Avenue in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the "Rafael Martinez Nadal United States Customhouse Building." This bill honors Rafael Martinez Nadal's contributions to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Rafael Martinez Nadal was born in the city of Mayaguez on April 22, 1877. In 1912, he became a lawyer and entered the Puerto Rican political arena. He was considered one of the most famous criminal lawyers in Puerto Rico at that time.

In 1914, Rafael Martinez Nadal was elected to Puerto Rico's House of Representatives for the District of Ponce. In 1920, he was elected to Puerto Rico's Senate, where he served as its President from 1932 to 1940.

Rafael Martinez Nadal was a strong defender of statehood in Puerto Rico and has been described as a political leader, a writer, a successful businessman, a brilliant orator and a distinguished lawyer. He passed away in July of 1941.

I support this legislation, congratulate my friend Congressman FORTUÑO, and urge our colleagues to do the same.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1019, a bill to des-

ignate the United States customhouse building located at 31 Gonzalez Clemente Avenue in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the "Rafael Martinez Nadal United States Customhouse Building".

Don Rafael Martinez Nadal was born in the city of Mayaguez on April 22, 1877. He received his college degree in Philosophy and Letters from the Provincial Institute of Secondary Education in San Juan.

He pursued studies in Barcelona, Spain, and Paris, France. He returned to Mayaguez in 1904 and began studying the cultivation of coffee. Simultaneously, he pursued his interest in media and politics and joined the Puerto Rican Republican Party. In 1908, he founded the political newspaper *El Combate*. In 1912, he obtained his law degree, and became one of the most prominent men of the Puerto Rican political arena. He was considered one of the most famous criminal lawyers in Puerto Rico of his time.

In 1914, he was elected as a member of the Chamber of Delegates for the city of Ponce by the Puerto Rican Republican Party. In 1920, he was chosen by the same party to serve in the Senate and was re-elected in the next five general elections. Nadal left the Puerto Rican Republican Party and launched a political movement that became known as the Historical Constitutional Party. Later, he founded the Republican Union, working to advance the cause of Puerto Rican statehood. In coalition with the Socialist Party, the Republican Union triumphed in the general elections of 1932 and 1936. In both terms, Martinez Nadal presided over the Senate. Before the election of 1940, because of a serious illness, he returned to his Guaynabo residence. He died on July 6, 1941.

In honor of Rafael Martinez Nadal's outstanding contributions to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, it is both fitting and proper to designate the courthouse located at 31 Gonzalez Clemente Avenue in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the "Rafael Martinez Nadal United States Customhouse Building".

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, if the majority has no additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here on this bipartisan Federal customs building, and I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1019.

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.

J. HERBERT W. SMALL FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1138) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "J.

Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1138

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1138.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1138 is a bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street, Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

J. Herbert W. Small, a lifelong resident of Elizabeth City, North Carolina, is a graduate of the University of Virginia Engineering School and the University of North Carolina Law School. He began the practice of law in 1949 and continued in his chosen field for over five decades. During his professional career, he was a member of the First Judicial District Bar Association, the American Bar Association and the North Carolina Bar Association.

In 1974, Judge Small was elected judge of Superior Court of the First Judicial District and served as Senior Resident Judge for 17 years. Judge Small is an active volunteer, serving on the Board of Directors of the Albenmarle Hospital and the American Red Cross. He has received numerous awards and honors from the Jaycees, Boy Scouts, Volunteer Firemen, Chamber of Commerce, and the Rotary and Elks clubs. Further, Judge Small, a World War II veteran, served in the United States Navy for 3 years.

Judge Small is an outstanding jurist, civic leader, mentor and volunteer. I support this bill and urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1138 designates the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse. The bill honors Judge Small's service to the legal profession.

Judge Small served in the United States Navy during the Second World War and received a law degree from the University of North Carolina Law School at Chapel Hill. He began the practice of law in 1949 and practiced for over five decades.

His career included serving on the Congressional Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, as county attorney for Pasquotank County, and as judge of the Superior Court of the First Judicial District. Judge Small served as Senior Resident Judge for 17 years.

I support this legislation and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the honorable gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding the time to me to speak to this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding jurist and community leader by seeking to name the Federal building in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the J. Herbert Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

I want to thank my good friend, Chairman OBERSTAR, and Ranking Member MICA for their outstanding leadership in quickly moving this legislation through their committee. I would also like to thank each member of the entire North Carolina delegation, Democrat and Republican, for their collective support of this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, J. Herbert Small is a lifelong resident of Elizabeth City, North Carolina. He has devoted 52 long years of his professional life to the practice of law and to the administration of justice in eastern North Carolina.

Herb Small began his law practice in Elizabeth City in 1949 after graduating from the School of Law at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He served as Special Counsel to the Congressional Committee on Intergovernmental Relations and later served 8 years as county attorney for the County of Pasquotank.

He was elected as district attorney for the First Judicial District of North Carolina for three consecutive terms. During his tenure, he served as chairman of the District Attorneys Advisory Committee, was President of the Dis-

trict Attorneys Association and was appointed by the Governor to the Jail Study Commission.

It was when Mr. Small was a district attorney that our paths first met. As a young lawyer, I opposed him in the courtroom on several occasions. He was a strong and effective district attorney.

In 1979, Herb Small was elected as Resident Superior Court Judge for the First Judicial District of North Carolina. He served in this capacity for 17 years. He was honored by his peers when he was elected President of the North Carolina Conference of Superior Court Judges. During this time, he represented the conference on the North Carolina Policy and Sentencing Commission.

In the early days of Judge Small's service as a trial judge, I appeared before him as a lawyer, representing both civil and criminal clients. He was a firm but fair judge, treating everyone who came before his court with respect.

And then Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being able to call Judge Small my judicial colleague. When I was elected as a Superior Court Judge in 1988, Judge Small had preceded me to the bench by several years. He welcomed me among the ranks of Superior Court Judges, and our friendship continued to evolve.

Mr. Speaker, Herb Small is a legal scholar; and our courts benefited in so many ways because of his intellect.

Now, I am very proud to call Judge Small a constituent. He is retired. He is happily retired, living in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, which is one of my 23 communities in my congressional district. Herb Small is a trusted friend and a good adviser.

Judge Small served as chairman of the Albemarle Hospital Board of Directors and as Chairman of the American Red Cross Chapter. He has been actively engaged in other civic and charitable and service organizations, including the Jaycees and the Boy Scouts and Volunteer Firemen, Chamber of Commerce and the Rotary Club and the Elks Club and the Red Men and so on. He was given the Distinguished Service Award by the Jaycees, the Volunteer of the Year Award by the Chamber of Commerce, and the Order of the Long Leaf Pine by the State of North Carolina for outstanding community involvement.

Very importantly, Mr. Speaker, during World War II, Judge Small served 3 years in the United States Navy; and our country is proud of and thanks him for his service.

Judge Small has been married to a wonderful individual, Mrs. Annette Ward Small, for many years. They have four children, Elizabeth, John Herbert, Fran and Carol; and they have nine grandchildren, Rachel, Matthew, John, Mary, Margaret, Ruth, Allison Katie, and Chris.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no finer individual and no person who is more

deserving of this high honor than Judge J. Herbert Small. I can assure you that Judge Small is humbled and honored by this recognition. The people of Elizabeth City and the First Congressional District of North Carolina are grateful for his community service, for his dedication, and his great and extraordinary leadership.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding me time, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his work on this matter.

I urge my colleagues today to vote "yes" on H.R. 1138.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume to congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for his legislation today and also to advise my friend from Tennessee I have no further speakers and if he is in the same position, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. I join in congratulating the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1138, a bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street, in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

J. Herbert W. Small is a life-long resident of Elizabeth City, North Carolina. He is a graduate of the University of Virginia Engineering School, and the University of North Carolina Law School at Chapel Hill. He began practicing law in 1949 and continued in his chosen field for more than five decades. During his professional career, he was a member of the First Judicial District Bar Association, the American Bar Association, and the North Carolina Bar Association.

He began his career as Special Counsel to the Congressional Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. Judge Small later served as County Attorney for Pasquotank County. In 1979, Judge Small was elected Judge of Superior Court of the First Judicial District and served as senior resident judge for 17 years. Judge Small is an active volunteer, serving on the Board of Director of the Albemarle Hospital and the American Red Cross. He has received numerous awards and honors from the Jaycees, the Boy Scouts, the Volunteer Fireman, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Rotary and Elks clubs. Further, Judge Small was a World War II veteran and served in the U.S. Navy for three years.

Judge Small is an outstanding mentor and volunteer. For more than five decades, he has been an exceptional jurist and civic leader. It is fitting and proper to honor his outstanding contributions with this designation.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. COHEN. 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 Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1138.

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.

MARITIME POLLUTION
PREVENTION ACT OF 2007

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 802) to amend the Act to Prevent Pollution from ships to implement MARPOL Annex VI, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 802

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 "Maritime Pollution Prevention Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to or a repeal of a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2(a) (33 U.S.C. 1901(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the paragraphs (1) through (12) as paragraphs (2) through (13), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

"(1) 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.;"

(3) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) by striking "and V" and inserting "V, and VI";

(4) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated) by striking "discharge" and "garbage" and "harmful substance" and "incident" and inserting "discharge", "emission", "garbage", "harmful substance", and "incident"; and

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (13) (as redesignated) as paragraphs (8) through (14), respectively, and inserting after paragraph (6) (as redesignated) the following:

"(7) 'navigable waters' includes the territorial sea of the United States (as defined in Presidential Proclamation 5928 of December 27, 1988) and the internal waters of the United States.;"

SEC. 4. APPLICABILITY.

Section 3 (33 U.S.C. 1902) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) with respect to Annex VI to the Convention, and other than with respect to a ship referred to in paragraph (1)—

"(A) to a ship that is in a port, shipyard, offshore terminal, or the internal waters of the United States;

"(B) to a ship that is bound for, or departing from, a port, shipyard, offshore terminal, or the internal waters of the United States, and is in—

"(i) the navigable waters of the United States;

"(ii) an emission control area designated pursuant to section 4; or

"(iii) any other area that the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary and each State in which any part of the area is located, has designated by order as being an area from which emissions from ships are of concern with respect to protection of public health, welfare, or the environment;

"(C) to a ship that is entitled to fly the flag of, or operating under the authority of, a party to Annex VI, and is in—

"(i) the navigable waters of the United States;

"(ii) an emission control area designated under section 4; or

"(iii) any other area that the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary and each State in which any part of the area is located, has designated by order as being an area from which emissions from ships are of concern with respect to protection of public health, welfare, or the environment; and

"(D) to the extent consistent with international law, to any other ship that is in—

"(i) the exclusive economic zone of the United States;

"(ii) the navigable waters of the United States;

"(iii) an emission control area designated under section 4; or

"(iv) any other area that the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary and each State in which any part of the area is located, has designated by order as being an area from which emissions from ships are of concern with respect to protection of public health, welfare, or the environment.;"

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking "paragraph (2)" and inserting "paragraphs (2) and (3)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) With respect to Annex VI the Administrator, or the Secretary, as relevant to their authorities pursuant to this Act, may determine that some or all of the requirements under this Act shall apply to one or more classes of public vessels, except that such a determination by the Administrator shall have no effect unless the head of the Department or agency under which the vessels operate concurs in the determination. This paragraph does not apply during time of war or during a declared national emergency.;"

(3) by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively, and inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) APPLICATION TO OTHER PERSONS.—This Act shall apply to all persons to the extent necessary to ensure compliance with Annex VI to the Convention.;" and

(4) in subsection (e), as redesignated—

(A) by inserting "or the Administrator, consistent with section 4 of this Act," after "Secretary";

(B) by striking "of section (3)" and inserting "of this section"; and

(C) by striking "Protocol, including regulations conforming to and giving effect to the requirements of Annex V" and inserting "Protocol (or the applicable Annex), including regulations conforming to and giving effect to the requirements of Annex V and Annex VI".

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

Section 4 (33 U.S.C. 1903) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively, and inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) DUTY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.—In addition to other duties specified in this Act, the Administrator and the Secretary, respectively, shall have the following duties and authorities:

"(1) The Administrator shall, and no other person may, issue Engine International Air Pollution Prevention certificates in accordance with Annex VI and the International Maritime Organization's Technical Code on Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides from Marine Diesel Engines, on behalf of the United States for a vessel of the United States as that term is defined in section 116 of title 46, United States Code. The issuance of Engine International Air Pollution Prevention certificates shall be consistent with any applicable requirements of the Clean Air Act or regulations prescribed under that Act.

"(2) The Administrator shall have authority to administer regulations 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 of Annex VI to the Convention.

"(3) The Administrator shall, only as specified in section 8(f), have authority to enforce Annex VI of the Convention.;"

(2) in subsection (c), as redesignated, by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4), and inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) In addition to the authority the Secretary has to prescribe regulations under this Act, the Administrator shall also prescribe any necessary or desired regulations to carry out the provisions of regulations 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 of Annex VI to the Convention.

"(3) In prescribing any regulations under this section, the Secretary and the Administrator shall consult with each other, and with respect to regulation 19, with the Secretary of the Interior.;" and

(3) by adding at the end of subsection (c), as redesignated, the following:

"(5) No standard issued by any person or Federal authority, with respect to emissions from tank vessels subject to regulation 15 of Annex VI to the Convention, shall be effective until 6 months after the required notification to the International Maritime Organization by the Secretary.;"

SEC. 6. CERTIFICATES.

Section 5 (33 U.S.C. 1904) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting "Except as provided in section 4(b)(1), the Secretary";

(2) in subsection (b) by striking "Secretary under the authority of the MARPOL protocol" and inserting "Secretary or the Administrator under the authority of this Act.;" and

(3) in subsection (e) by striking "environment" and inserting "environment or the public health and welfare.;"

SEC. 7. RECEPTION FACILITIES.

Section 6 (33 U.S.C. 1905) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) The Secretary and the Administrator, after consulting with appropriate Federal agencies, shall jointly prescribe regulations setting criteria for determining the adequacy of reception facilities for receiving ozone depleting substances, equipment containing such substances, and exhaust gas cleaning residues at a port or terminal, and stating any additional measures and requirements as are appropriate to ensure such adequacy. Persons in charge of ports and terminals shall provide reception facilities, or ensure that reception facilities are available, in accordance with those regulations. The Secretary and the Administrator may jointly prescribe regulations to certify, and may issue certificates to the effect, that a port's or terminal's facilities for receiving ozone depleting substances, equipment containing such substances, and exhaust gas cleaning residues from ships are adequate.;"

(2) in subsection (b) by inserting "or the Administrator" after "Secretary";

(3) in subsection (e) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) The Secretary may deny the entry of a ship to a port or terminal required by the MARPOL Protocol, this Act, or regulations prescribed under this section relating to the provision of adequate reception facilities for garbage, ozone depleting substances, equipment containing those substances, or exhaust gas cleaning residues, if the port or terminal is not in compliance with the MARPOL Protocol, this Act, or those regulations.;"

(4) in subsection (f)(1) by striking "Secretary is" and inserting "Secretary and the Administrator are"; and

(5) in subsection (f)(2) by striking “(A)”.

SEC. 8. INSPECTIONS.

Section 8(f) (33 U.S.C. 1907(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f)(1) The Secretary may inspect a ship to which this Act applies as provided under section 3(a)(5), to verify whether the ship is in compliance with Annex VI to the Convention and this Act.

“(2) If an inspection under this subsection or any other information indicates that a violation has occurred, the Secretary, or the Administrator in a matter referred by the Secretary, may undertake enforcement action under this section.

“(3) Notwithstanding subsection (b) and paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Administrator shall have all of the authorities of the Secretary, as specified in subsection (b) of this section, for the purposes of enforcing regulations 17 and 18 of Annex VI to the Convention to the extent that shoreside violations are the subject of the action and in any other matter referred to the Administrator by the Secretary.”

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS TO THE PROTOCOL.

Section 10(b) (33 U.S.C. 1909(b)) is amended by inserting “or the Administrator as provided for in this Act,” after “Secretary.”

SEC. 10. PENALTIES.

Section 9 (33 U.S.C. 1908) is amended—

(1) by striking “Protocol,” each place it appears and inserting “Protocol,”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “, or the Administrator as provided for in this Act” after “Secretary” the first place it appears;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, or the Administrator as provided for in this Act,” after “Secretary”; and

(C) in the matter after paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “, or the Administrator as provided for in this Act” after “Secretary” the first place it appears; and

(ii) by inserting “, or the Administrator as provided for in this Act,” after “Secretary” the second and third places it appears;

(3) in subsection (c), by inserting “, or the Administrator as provided for in this Act,” after “Secretary” each place it appears; and

(4) in subsection (f), by inserting “, or the Administrator as provided for in this Act” after “Secretary” the first place it appears.

SEC. 11. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

Section 15 (33 U.S.C. 1911) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 15. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

“Authorities, requirements, and remedies of this Act supplement and neither amend nor repeal any other authorities, requirements, or remedies conferred by any other provision of law. Nothing in this Act shall limit, deny, amend, modify, or repeal any other authority, requirement, or remedy available to the United States or any other person, except as expressly provided in this Act.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

As the chairman of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, I am pleased that the first piece of maritime legislation to be brought to the floor by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is a bill that will enable us to combat pollution emitted by ships.

The Maritime Pollution Prevention Act of 2007, H.R. 802, would institute the legal changes needed to bring the United States into compliance with the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, the MARPOL Convention Annex VI.

MARPOL Annex VI limits the emissions from ships of sulfur oxide and nitrogen oxide, which are ozone-depleting substances. The Annex VI treaty was ratified by the Senate in April 2006 and came into force internationally in May of 2006.

According to the United States Department of Transportation, ocean-going ships transport 80 percent by weight of all goods and services moved into and out of the United States. The volume of trade through U.S. ports is only expected to increase.

In fact, the United States Maritime Administration estimates that the total volume of trade handled by United States ports will double in the next 15 years. Unfortunately, the ships on which we rely to carry the trade that keeps our economy growing release excessive amounts of pollution.

In fact, according to a very disturbing study released just last week by the International Council on Clean Transportation, the sulfur oxide emissions from ocean-going ships may exceed the total amount of such emissions produced by cars, trucks and buses in the world. Further, the International Maritime Organization, also known as IMO, estimates that as much as 80 percent of all ship emissions may be released within 250 miles of shore.

That means that much of the pollution emitted by ships is affecting the residents of port communities such as my hometown of Baltimore. The emissions of sulfur oxide from ships are also high because the bunker fuel used in ships may contain as much as 3 percent sulfur content by weight, or an astounding 28,000 parts per million of sulfur.

By comparison, the new ultralow sulfur diesel fuel that is mandated for use in trucks in most of the United States is not allowed to contain more than 15 parts per million of sulfur. Given the nature of shipping, it is not possible for any single nation to unilaterally regulate emissions produced by ships.

Instead, regulations applied to ocean-going vessels are usually developed through negotiations conducted by IMO, a specialized agency of the United Nations responsible for developing multinational conventions regulating international shipping.

The member states of IMO developed the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships treaty, known as MARPOL, which was adopted in 1973. This groundbreaking convention has already successfully limited all pollution and pollution from ships' garbage and sewage. The most recent annex to MARPOL convention, Annex VI, sets limits on emissions from ships of sulfur oxide and nitrogen oxide. This annex also estab-

lishes specific limits on the sulfur content of fuel oil used in ships.

The measure before us today, H.R. 802, is a bipartisan measure that would bring United States law into compliance with the requirements of MARPOL Annex VI. The substitute amendment clarifies that the MARPOL Annex VI amendments apply only to vessels in the United States' exclusive economic zone once Annex VI becomes customary maritime law.

The amendment also requires the EPA to consult with a State when establishing an emission area and requires that regulations regarding reception facilities be jointly prescribed by the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Coast Guard. Through our participation in Annex VI, the United States will contribute to a global effort to control a large source of ozone-depleting emissions that has been virtually unregulated to this point.

Mr. Speaker, our natural resources are our most precious gifts, and we are merely the stewards of these resources, responsible for preserving them for generations yet unborn.

When you go into Sea World and Disney World, one of the things the signs that are written there say, “We do not inherit our environment from our parents; we borrow it from our children.”

I applaud Chairman OBERSTAR for his outstanding leadership on this issue and for his commitment to implementing measures that will help us combat the release of emissions from mobile sources that are contributing to global warming.

I also thank our ranking member, the very distinguished gentleman, Congressman MICA, and the ranking member of our subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, Congressman LATOURETTE, for their leadership in helping us to get this very, very important bill to the floor of the House so that we can send it on to the Senate.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 802, the Maritime Pollution Prevention Act of 2007. H.R. 802 was introduced by our full committee chairman, Jim Oberstar, and is similar language that was approved by voice vote in the House during the last Congress. I say “similar to” because there are some differences, and we noted those differences at the time of the markup of this legislation.

I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, and I also want to thank the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. CUMMINGS, for working with me and others on my side of the aisle to address our concerns with the introduced version of the bill.

The bill will implement international requirements for air emissions from

ships for purposes of U.S. law. Under this bill, the Coast Guard and the Environmental Protection Agency will be required to develop regulations that establish standards for emissions of ozone-depleting substances and other pollutants as well as marine fuel oil quality that are used in U.S. waters. I am happy to see that we are considering this legislation that will reduce our emissions from vessels operating in U.S. waters this early in the year.

Again, I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairman CUMMINGS for working with us to improve the bill. I urge our colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, such time as he may consume.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I especially want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Affairs for his leadership, absorbing so quickly in such a short period of time the complexities under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. I also would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his partnership and working so diligently to bring this important legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is an international issue. In fact, just moments ago, just before arriving to the floor, I had a meeting with a representative of the transportation ministry of the European Union. He is the deputy in charge of the Transport Ministry of the European Union, and we were discussing the MARPOL legislation and the need for international participation and cooperation on these issues.

In fact, the European Transport Ministry has established a new section dealing with maritime pollution issues which go beyond that of the subject of this legislation to include pollution at sea from accidents to maritime vessels, the first most serious of which was the Torrey Canyon disaster in the English Channel in 1967, which alerted all of the maritime sector to the need for double-hulled vessels, to the need for international standards on shipping.

We have moved beyond the water pollution issue, ocean pollution issue, which continues to be a matter of great concern, to that of air pollution, which is the subject of this legislation, the discharge of nitrogen oxides from maritime diesel engines, the sulfur content of diesel fuel, ozone-depleting substances, volatile organic compounds and standards for shipboard incinerators, fuel oil quality, platforms for drill rigs at sea. All of these are the subject of this legislation and of the International Maritime Pollution Convention.

At the beginning of next week, our committee will travel to Brussels to meet with members of the European Transport Ministry and members of the

European Parliament Transport Committee to discuss this issue and other issues including emissions from aircraft at altitude, which are the subject of the ongoing discussions in the international community on emissions trading and steps that the international community together can take to reduce impact on factors that are accelerating global climate change.

This legislation, in other words, is not just a relatively noncontroversial matter that we attempted to accomplish in the last Congress; but for various reasons, we were not able to do so with the other body. But this is one step in a global issue of international concern that brings the United States and its maritime partners into cooperation on matters that involve air quality at sea.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the subcommittee, for his diligent work, and Mr. LATOURETTE and Ranking Member MICA for their participation and working with us to bring this legislation to the floor. I hope that the other body will cooperate promptly and move this bill to the President.

We have incorporated recommendations by the administration in this legislation to accommodate their interests.

□ 1445

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Chairman CUMMINGS, if I could clarify, through this colloquy, the language that was included in sections 4 and 5.

First, section 4 authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Coast Guard, to designate special areas where vessels would be required to comply with vessel emission regulations under Annex VI to the MARPOL Convention. This section also directs the EPA to consult with a State if such an area is established in an area that is under the jurisdiction of that State.

Is it the chairman's understanding that the committee does not intend to require the agencies to consult with a State or to give a State any authority over a special area that is not wholly established outside of the three or, in some cases, nine nautical mile belt of waters that fall within the jurisdiction of a State?

Mr. CUMMINGS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the chairman.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, section 5 of the bill grants the EPA certain authorities to establish, administer and enforce regulations to implement MARPOL Annex VI. Is it the chairman's understanding that this language does not replace or reduce the Coast Guard's parallel authorities to administer and enforce regulations to

implement Annex VI or other regulations under the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships?

Mr. CUMMINGS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the chairman very much for his response. And, again, my congratulations to both chairmen, the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. CUMMINGS, for bringing this legislation forward. And, again, my thanks for working with us to make the slight improvements to the bill.

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

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

Again, I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR and certainly Ranking Member MICA. But I also thank you very much, Mr. LATOURETTE, for your cooperation in moving this bill along.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, although it has been discussed previously before I reached the Chamber, I just want to be sure to emphasize the important change to allow EPA to enforce the standards in addition to the Coast Guard. These are changes requested by the administration. The Coast Guard acknowledging that EPA has far more experience than does the Coast Guard on air quality emission standards.

It is important for EPA to develop standards jointly with the Coast Guard because, on the Coast Guard side, they have more knowledge and understanding and expertise in vessel safety issues that have to be incorporated into any air quality emission standards that may be promulgated.

I want to emphasize this role of EPA, an important step forward, and I am very pleased the administration was emphatic in asking for an EPA role, and Coast Guard similarly has been very insistent on including EPA in this process. I think this will, overall, strengthen the result of the legislation that we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support H.R. 802, the "Maritime Pollution Prevention Act of 2007". The gentleman from Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, and I introduced this legislation in February to provide the U.S. Coast Guard and the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") with the legal authority they need to implement Annex VI of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships.

Global climate change is a critical issue, not only for the United States, but for every man, woman, and child that live on this planet called Earth. The international maritime community has recognized this problem and developed an international convention to help address air pollutants from diesel ships.

For many years, the International Maritime Organization, an organization of the United Nations, has been developing international standards to prevent pollution from ships that ply the world's oceans. The international convention is called the International Convention

for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973. The United States has implemented these environmental laws by enacting and amending the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships ("APPS").

On May 19, 2005, Annex VI of that Convention came into force internationally. Annex VI limits the discharge of nitrogen oxides from large marine diesel engines, governs the sulfur content of marine diesel fuel, prohibits the emission of ozone-depleting substances, regulates the emission of volatile organic compounds during the transfer of cargoes between tankers and terminals, sets standards for shipboard incinerators and fuel oil quality, and establishes requirements for platforms and drilling rigs at sea. In April 2006, the Senate ratified this treaty by unanimous consent.

H.R. 802 is the necessary implementing legislation for Annex VI of that Convention. This legislation will give the Coast Guard and the Environmental Protection Agency the authority they need to develop the U.S. standards and to enforce these requirements on the thousands of U.S.- and foreign-flag vessels that enter the United States each year from overseas.

Everyone here recognizes the challenge that the world faces in combating global climate change. We must pursue all avenues in the effort to turn around the rising temperatures on this planet. I am pleased that the International Maritime Organization stepped up to the plate and developed amendments to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships to regulate air pollution from ships.

Last year, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reported H.R. 5811, the MARPOL Annex VI Implementation Act of 2006, favorably to the House. This bill was subsequently added to H.R. 5681, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2006, and passed the House on October 28, 2006.

H.R. 802 is very similar to H.R. 5811, but includes changes to allow the EPA to enforce the standards, in addition to the Coast Guard. These changes were requested by the Administration. The Coast Guard acknowledges that the EPA has far more experience than they do on air quality emission standards. However, it is important for the EPA to develop the standards jointly with Coast Guard because of the Coast Guard's expertise over vessel safety issues.

During Committee consideration of the bill, the Committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute that clarifies that MARPOL Annex VI will only apply to vessels in the United State's 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone when the Executive Branch determines that MARPOL Annex VI is customary international law. In addition, the amendment clarified that MARPOL Annex VI will not apply to public vessels owned by the U.S. Government until the head of the agency that operates the vessels agrees with the EPA Administrator that MARPOL VI should apply to that agency's vessels.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute that the House considers today further clarifies that the application of MARPOL VI to the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone and territorial sea takes effect when it becomes customary international law; requires EPA to consult with a State when establishing an emission area; and requires the regulations regarding reception facilities to be jointly prescribed by EPA and the Coast Guard.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank our new Chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, Mr. CUMMINGS, for his help in developing this bill.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 802, the Maritime Pollution Prevention Act of 2007.

Mr. CUMMINGS. 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 802, 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. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 802.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL WORK MONTH AND WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 266) supporting the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 266

Whereas social workers have the demonstrated education and experience to guide individuals, families, and communities through complex issues and choices;

Whereas social workers connect individuals, families, and communities to available resources;

Whereas social workers are dedicated to improving the society in which we live;

Whereas social workers are positive and compassionate professionals;

Whereas social workers stand up for others to make sure everyone has access to the same basic rights, protections, and opportunities;

Whereas social workers have been the driving force behind important social movements in the United States and abroad; and

Whereas Professional Social Work Month, and World Social Work Day, which is March 27, 2007, will build awareness of the role of professional social workers and their commitment and dedication to individuals, families, and communities everywhere though

service delivery, research, education, and legislative advocacy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(2) acknowledges the diligent efforts of individuals and groups who promote the importance of social work and who are observing Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(3) encourages the American people to engage in appropriate ceremonies and activities to further promote awareness of the life-changing role of social workers;

(4) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring individuals who have chosen to serve their communities through social work; and

(5) encourages young people to seek out educational and professional opportunities to become social workers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to House Resolution 266 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to offer House Resolution 266, which honors the dedication and compassion of professional social workers. Our highest calling as humans is to provide service to others, especially those less fortunate than ourselves.

At the turn of the 20th century, thousands of people lived in despair and poverty, and it was the early progressive moment in which the social work movement was born, providing food, clothing, health care and education to the less fortunate.

Social workers had a role in civil rights and in women's freedom. Today, social workers continue this fight to ensure that vulnerable families have the support and the health care that they need.

Social workers are everywhere in our society, caring for all of us. They help people in all stages of life, from children to the elderly, and in all situations, from adoption to hospice care. You can find social workers in hospitals, police departments, mental health clinics, military facilities and corporations.

Professional social workers are the Nation's largest providers of mental health care services. They provide

more mental health services than psychologists, psychiatrists and psychiatric nurses combined.

More than 600,000 people in the United States hold social work degrees. The Veterans Administration employs more than 4,400 social workers to assist veterans and their families with individual and family counseling, client education, end-of-life planning, substance abuse treatment, crisis intervention and other services.

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

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 266. This resolution would recognize the important work of our Nation's social workers and support the goals and ideals of Professional Social Worker Month and World Social Worker Day.

Social work is a profession for those with a strong desire to help improve people's lives and play a valuable role in the Nation's health care system. Social workers help people function the best way they can in their environment, deal with their relationships, and solve personal and family problems.

Social workers often see clients who face life-threatening disease or social problems such as inadequate housing, unemployment, a serious illness, a disability, or substance abuse. Social workers also assist families that have serious domestic conflicts, sometimes involving a child or spousal abuse.

For example, child, family and school social workers provide social services and assistance to improve the social and psychological functioning of children and their families and to maximize the family well-being and academic functioning of children. They assist single parents, arrange adoption, or help find foster homes for neglected, abandoned or abused children.

In schools, they address problems such as teenage misbehavior and truancy and advise teachers on how they can cope with problem students. Social workers also specialize in services for senior citizens, running support groups for family caregivers or for the adult children of aging parents, advising elderly people or family members about choices in areas such as housing, transportation, and long-term care and coordination and monitoring of these services.

Through employee assistance programs, they may help workers cope with job-related pressures or with personal problems that affect the quality of their work.

Medical and public health social workers provide persons, families, and vulnerable populations with psychosocial support needed to cope with chronic, acute and terminal illnesses such as Alzheimer's disease and cancer. They also assess and treat individuals with mental illness or substance abuse, including abuse of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs. They also may help plan for supportive services to ease patients' return into the community.

In my State of Tennessee, we have a long tradition of recognizing the vital role of social workers. In 2005, the Tennessee legislature, of which I was honored to serve as a member for many years, passed important legislation which required social workers to have received a B.S. or master's degree in social work from an accredited school, received a doctorate or Ph.D. in social work, or have a specialized certificate or license from the State.

As a society, we have come to trust that the people using a certain title have completed specific training to prepare them for their work in assisting the public. Thanks to this legislation, Tennessee now ensures that positions requiring the skills and training of professional social workers are filled with fully qualified professionals.

In addition, the East Tennessee State University Department of Social Work has a long and proud history of preparing the majority of social workers in the region that I represent. In addition to providing high-quality education to future social workers, the Department hosts a Social Work Career Day where students, community agencies and practitioners come together and share educational experience and information on a career in social work. Students and faculty are also involved in a number of community based interdisciplinary learning and service activities.

According to the United States Department of Labor, the need for additional social workers is expected to increase faster than the average of all other occupations through the year 2014 due to the rapidly growing elderly population which is expected to create greater demand for health and social careers. The growth in social work is expected to occur most rapidly in home health care services, assisted living and senior living communities and the school setting. In addition, there is expected to be a significant need for those social workers specializing in substance abuse.

Nearly 50 percent of the United States population, age 15 to 54, report having at least one psychiatric disorder. Both severe and persistent mental disorders, including addictions, have profound consequences for individuals, their families and society, affecting their ability to learn, to grow into healthy adults and to nurture children, to work and secure housing and to engage in other routines of living. Recognizing the prevalence of mental disorders and the cost they exact on our society, social workers provide more than 40 percent of all mental health services available to Americans, making them an integral part of our Nation's health care delivery system.

So we stand here to recognize the importance of our Nation's social workers and support the Professional Social Worker Month and World Social Worker Day. We also stand to encourage more young adults to seek out educational

and professional opportunities as social workers where they can play a positive impact on changing people's lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in highlighting the contributions of social workers and to support House Resolution 266.

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

□ 1500

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Today we thank all those who have toiled in the fields of our community, including my maternal grandmother, who left the comfort of her home each day at the turn of the century and went to the Lower East Side to help immigrants. And we praise all of those who reach out to others every day in their community.

Social workers' service makes our communities stronger. March is National Professional Work Month, and Tuesday, March 27 is World Social Worker Day. I honor their service and thank them for caring for all of us each day.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 266.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. 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.

DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS DISASTER ELIGIBILITY ACT

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1468) 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, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1468

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 "Disadvantaged Business Disaster Eligibility Act".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PARTICIPATION TERM FOR VICTIMS OF HURRICANE KATRINA.

(a) RETROACTIVITY.—If a small business concern, while participating in any program or activity under the authority of paragraph (10) of section 7(j) of the Small Business Act

(15 U.S.C. 636(j)), was located in a parish or county described in subsection (b) and was affected by Hurricane Katrina of 2005, the period during which the small business concern is permitted continuing participation and eligibility in such program or activity shall be extended for an additional 18 months.

(b) PARISHES AND COUNTIES COVERED.—Subsection (a) applies to any parish in the State of Louisiana, or any county in the State of Mississippi or in the State of Alabama, that has been designated by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration as a disaster area by reason of Hurricane Katrina under disaster declaration 10176, 10177, 10178, 10179, 10180, or 10181.

(c) REVIEW AND COMPLIANCE.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall ensure that the case of every small business concern participating before the date of the enactment of this Act in a program or activity covered by subsection (a) is reviewed and brought into compliance with this section.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Katrina forced evacuation of individuals and business owners who are only recently recovering and rebuilding. Clearly, through no fault of their own, these firms have been disrupted.

A number of these businesses are participants in the SBA's 8(a) program, the primary way that minority entrepreneurs enter the Federal marketplace. 8(a) is a business development initiative, and that is what the companies in the gulf region need right now.

Because of the magnitude of the disaster, these companies need additional time in the 8(a) program. This will counterbalance the period of inoperability these firms experienced due to Hurricane Katrina. And I commend my colleague Mr. JEFFERSON from Louisiana for offering this solution.

As currently structured, the program allows businesses to participate for a limited length of time. They are given 9 years and 9 years only. Even if the companies fail, they can never reapply and get back in.

In this way 8(a) is different than any other SBA procurement initiative, which allow companies to be certified for increments of 3 years. As long as they meet the eligibility criteria, they can continue being recertified without end.

It is because of this limitation that the 8(a) program is simply not struc-

tured to respond to companies that have been victimized by disasters.

This bill is targeted and narrow. It applies only to 8(a) program participants in Alabama, Mississippi, or Louisiana that were impacted by this disaster. At most, this represents barely 4 percent of all 8(a) participants. Eighteen months is not a significant amount of time, but it could play a major role in ensuring that these businesses are able to participate in the rebuilding of their home States.

I urge support of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1468, the Disadvantaged Business Disaster Eligibility Act. This legislation, as the chairwoman indicated, would simply extend for 18 months the period of time that 8(a) Small Business Development Program participants who enrolled in the program prior to August 29 of 2005 could stay in the program by 18 months if they had their businesses primarily located in the area devastated by Hurricane Katrina.

The 8(a) Small Business Development Program, administered by the Small Business Administration, provides a useful mechanism for aspiring entrepreneurs and existing small business owners who, for social or economic reasons, may not have the same opportunities other small business owners have had and face challenging barriers to their success.

Entrepreneurs who participate in the 8(a) program undergo an extensive 9-year process, where they obtain specialized business training, counseling, marketing assistance, and high-level executive development. They also receive additional help in the form of low-interest loans, access to government surplus office equipment, and bonding assistance.

The Small Business Development Program provides many of the tools needed for any small business to succeed. Most significantly, the program assists these entrepreneurs in obtaining Federal Government contracts as a base from which to grow their businesses. Given the devastation to the gulf coast region by Hurricane Katrina, access to Federal Government contracts constitutes an important component of the region's rebirth, and I think we all agree that we all want to see the rebirth in that area occur.

Tragically, as every American remembers, the late summer of 2005 proved to be one of the most catastrophic in American history. The 9.7 million Americans residing on the gulf coast of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi were victims of an unprecedented natural disaster, which, unfortunately, has become a nightmare that is etched in all our memories and a daily challenge for those who lived through it.

The storms of 2005 drowned 80 percent of New Orleans in seawater, killed

in excess of 1,600 people, destroyed more than 200,000 gulf coast homes, and displaced more than 1 million of our fellow Americans. Starting a new business is challenging under normal circumstances. Only two-thirds of them make it through their first 2 years. And needless to say, the devastation along the gulf coast compounds this difficulty exponentially.

This legislation provides some additional time for those businesses facing the 9-year participation deadline provided for in the 8(a) program to get back on their feet. Nothing in the Small Business Act currently allows for an extension of participation as a result of extraordinary circumstances such as those created by Hurricane Katrina.

For business owners that may not have had access to their businesses or their customers for months, the rigidity of the Small Business Act seems unduly harsh. An additional 18 months of assistance to firms who face an uphill battle before the storms hit who are now hanging on by a thread after the storms have passed is truly the least that we can do.

Today I encourage my colleagues to support this necessary legislation.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

Mr. JEFFERSON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I am pleased to sponsor H.R. 1468, the Disadvantaged Business Disaster Eligibility Act. I would like to thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ as well as Ranking Member CHABOT for their leadership in committee on this important bill. I would also like to thank the other members of the committee for voting in a bipartisan spirit to bring this measure to the floor in an expeditious manner.

This bill provides that if a small business affected by Hurricane Katrina that participates in any section 8(a) business development program, the eligibility period for its participation in such program is extended by 18 months.

The 8(a) program was designed as a 9-year business development program geared toward small businesses owned by citizens who are socially and economically disadvantaged. This program is of benefit to emerging African American, Hispanic, Asian American, and nonminority women-owned firms included in the program's coverage. Once the eligibility for the 9-year program has run out, the small business participating in the program is ineligible to re-enter it. When Hurricane Katrina ripped through New Orleans on August 29, 2005, it left 80,000 businesses damaged or destroyed, 97 percent of which were small businesses. A significant percentage were participating in the 8(a) program and were forced to shut down for an extended period of time, losing time in the program

through a series of events far beyond their control. It is only right and fair that we extend the period of eligibility so that the affected disadvantaged businesses are allowed to grow and flourish and enjoy the full 9 years of the program.

Nineteen months since Katrina struck, most of our 8(a) firms across the gulf coast are still struggling to return.

This bill is about equity and fairness at a time when the road to recovery has been anything but fair for disadvantaged firms in the region. For example, in the time just following the storm, 90 percent of the \$2 billion in initial contracts were awarded to companies based outside of the three primary affected States and to large concerns. Minority businesses received just 1.5 percent of the first \$1.6 billion spent there. Women-owned businesses received even less. This was the outcome in spite of laws such as the Stafford Act, which require contracting officials to prioritize awards to local businesses and to reach a goal of 5 percent of contracts to minority-owned businesses.

The continued recovery from Katrina is made up of many interconnected issues, and we cannot fully recover without addressing all of them. Helping small businesses, as this and other bills such as the RECOVER Act do, restores jobs that our citizens can return home to and puts our businesses back on track. It broadens the tax base of our region and helps with our recovery.

I look forward to continuing to work on the Small Business Committee with Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. CHABOT to address the needs of small businesses in the gulf region.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for his support and cooperation in helping expedite 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 gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1468, 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR) at 5 p.m.

ANIMAL FIGHTING PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 137) to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 137

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 "Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. ENFORCEMENT OF ANIMAL FIGHTING PROHIBITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 49. Enforcement of animal fighting prohibitions

"Whoever violates subsection (a), (b), (c), or (e) of section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 3 years, or both, for each violation."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 48 the following:

"49. Enforcement of animal fighting prohibitions."

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE ANIMAL WELFARE ACT.

Section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2156) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking "interstate instrumentality" and inserting "instrumentality of interstate commerce for commercial speech";

(2) in subsection (d), by striking "such subsections" and inserting "such subsection";

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

"(e) It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly sell, buy, transport, or deliver in interstate or foreign commerce a knife, a gaff, or any other sharp instrument attached, or designed or intended to be attached, to the leg of a bird for use in an animal fighting venture."

(4) in subsection (g)—
(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "or animals, such as waterfowl, bird, raccoon, or fox hunting"; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) the term 'instrumentality of interstate commerce' means any written, wire, radio, television or other form of communication in, or using a facility of, interstate commerce;" and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) The criminal penalties for violations of subsection (a), (b), (c), or (e) are provided in section 49 of title 18, United States Code."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 137 is a bipartisan effort by the Judiciary Committee, led by the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) as the chief sponsor and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) as the lead Democratic sponsor. Both have worked long and hard on this issue. I would also like to express my appreciation to Chairman CONYERS, Ranking Member SMITH, and Subcommittee Ranking Member FORBES for their leadership and support in moving this matter forward, and also the former chairman of the committee, Mr. COBLE, who is with us today.

The Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007 addresses the growing problem of staged animal fighting in this country. It increases the penalties under the current Federal law for transporting animals in interstate commerce for the purpose of fighting and for interstate and foreign commerce in knives and gaffs designed for use in cockfighting.

Specifically, H.R. 137 makes violations of the law a felony punishable by up to 3 years in prison. Currently, these offenses are limited to misdemeanor treatment with the possibility of a fine and up to 1 year of imprisonment. Most States make all staged animal fighting illegal. Just one State currently allows cockfighting to occur legally.

The transport of game birds for the purpose of animal fighting and the implements of cockfighting are already prohibited by Federal law, though the current law only allows, as I have indicated, the misdemeanor treatment. In 1976 Congress amended title 7, U.S. Code, section 2156, the Animal Welfare Act, to make it illegal to knowingly sell, buy, transport, deliver, or receive a dog or other animal in interstate or foreign commerce for the purposes of participation in an animal fighting venture or knowingly sponsoring or exhibiting an animal in a fighting venture if any animal in the venture was moved in interstate or foreign commerce. Amendments to the Animal Welfare Act contained a loophole, however, that allowed shipments of birds across State lines for fighting purposes if the destination State allowed cockfighting.

While Congress did amend section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act to close this

loophole in 2002, the penalty section and other provisions of the act have not been updated since their original enactment in 1976. This bill is designed to address those shortfalls to more effectively cover modern problems associated with animal fighting ventures.

As I have already mentioned, the legislation increases current penalties to provide a meaningful deterrent. One of the primary reasons for enacting the increased penalties under title 18 is the reluctance of U.S. Attorneys to pursue animal fighting cases under the current misdemeanor provisions because they view the penalties as ineffective against an animal fighting industry, which has continued unabated nationwide.

H.R. 137 further makes it a felony to transport cockfighting implements in interstate or foreign commerce. These implements take the form of razor-sharp knives, known as slashers; or gaffs, instruments shaped in the form of curved ice picks that are attached to birds' legs for fighting. Proponents of these implements within the game fowl community apparently contend that they inflict cleaner wounds upon the birds which are then quicker and easier to heal.

Since penalties against animal fighting were codified in 1976, Federal authorities have pursued less than half a dozen animal fighting cases, despite the fact that the USDA has received numerous tips from informants and requests to assist with State and local prosecutions.

In addition, despite the fact that all 50 States have banned dog fighting and all but one State has banned cockfighting, the animal fighting industry continues to thrive within the United States. Numerous nationally circulated animal fighting magazines advertise fighting animals, and paid lobbyists continue to advocate for animal fighters' interests. Thankfully, H.R. 137 will seek to bring an end to these practices.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill affects matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and the Judiciary Committee. Both committees have worked closely together to ensure that all matters are dealt with appropriately. We appreciate their assistance in bringing this bill expeditiously to the floor, and I will insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an exchange of letters between Chairman PETERSON of the Agriculture Committee and Chairman CONYERS of Judiciary.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2007.

Hon. COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the Agriculture Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 137, the "Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007," which the Committee on the Judiciary reported by voice vote. As ordered reported, the bill establishes criminal penalties for violations of Federal prohibitions on animal fighting.

I appreciate your willingness to discharge the bill from further consideration by your Committee, in order to expedite its floor consideration. I understand and agree that this is without prejudice to your Committee's jurisdictional interests in this or similar legislation in the future. In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, I would support your request for an appropriate number of conferees.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your cooperation as we work towards enactment of H.R. 137.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2007.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter regarding Judiciary Committee action on H.R. 137, a bill to establish criminal penalties for violations of Federal prohibitions on animal fighting.

In the interest of expediting the consideration of H.R. 137, I agree to the discharge of the bill from further consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I do so with the understanding that the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over this or similar matters. In the event a conference with the Senate is requested on this bill, the Committee on Agriculture reserves the right to seek appointment of conferees.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 137, the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007, creates Federal felony penalties for animal fighting. The distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) is the lead sponsor of this bill with over 300 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle.

The Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act increases criminal penalties for illegal dog fighting and cockfighting. The act, furthermore, imposes penalties for the interstate promotion of animal fighting and the interstate transportation of animals for use in an animal fighting venture.

All 50 States, Mr. Speaker, prohibit dog fighting, and 48 States prohibit cockfighting. Louisiana and New Mexico, the two States that do, in fact, allow cockfighting, may take up legislation to ban the practice as early as this year.

According to the Humane Society, animal fighting, particularly cockfighting, has become an interstate venture with small syndicates of cockfighters moving across the country staging these different fights. Ani-

mal fighting is also linked oftentimes with other criminal conduct such as drug trafficking, illegal firearms sales, and gang activity.

By raising this offense from a misdemeanor to a felony, we are more likely to deter illegal animal fighting and increase the likelihood that Federal prosecutors will pursue these cases.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, to subcommittee Chairman BOBBY SCOTT we owe a debt of gratitude, as well as to subcommittee Ranking Member COBLE and, of course, the author of this bill, ELTON GALLEGLY, who through the years has persevered to make us finally come to this day. I guess we should also thank about 303 Members of the House of Representatives that have stuck with us and supported this legislation all this time. My congratulations to all of you. I never thought that a measure that was not considered as grave and large as some of the issues that come before the House Judiciary Committee would meet with so much encouragement and support to get us to this day. I congratulate the House of Representatives and the leadership on both sides.

I join, of course, in this measure and would like to make this point: this legislation includes a special provision clarifying the fact that it only supersedes State law in the case of a direct or irreconcilable conflict. The Humane Society is with us. The American Veterinary Medical Association is with us. The National Association of Sheriffs is with us, and hundreds and hundreds of local law enforcement agencies in every State of the Union have all come out in support of this basic, commonsense, long overdue legislation.

I thank those who have worked so tirelessly across the years to bring us to this day where this bill has now come before the floor.

I'm pleased to join the growing list of supporters, including the 30 or so Members of the Judiciary Committee, that have decided to lend their support to this measure.

For far too long, the sponsors of abusive animal fighting events (including cockfight and dog fight promoters) have been permitted to freely engage in such activities without any real fear of prosecution. Fortunately, the bill before us seeks to change that.

First, the legislation provides up to the three years in jail for people who transport animals in interstate commerce with the purpose of participating in an animal fighting venture. Current law only treats such offenses as a mere misdemeanor. However, research has shown us that simple misdemeanor criminal penalties

don't provide enough of a meaningful deterrent, especially when thousands of dollars are wagered on a single dog or cock fight.

Second, the legislation makes it unlawful to sell or ship instruments in interstate commerce that are designed to be attached to the leg of a bird for use in an animal fighting venture. Razor sharp knives, commonly known as "slashers", are oftentimes attached to the legs of a bird to make cockfights even more violent. This provision would prohibit such activity, and subject any violators to a term of imprisonment of up to three years in jail.

Finally, the legislation includes a special provision clarifying that this measure only supersedes state law in the case of a direct or irreconcilable conflict.

The Humane Society, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Sheriffs Association, and nearly 400 local law enforcement agencies covering all 50 states have all come out in support of this legislation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to lend their support to this bipartisan, commonsense measure as well.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), member of the House Judiciary Committee and original sponsor of this legislation.

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As you know, along with my good friend EARL BLUMENAUER and ROSCOE BARTLETT, we have been trying to federally criminalize this brutal, inhumane practice of animal fighting for the past several Congresses.

When Congress enacted legislation to tighten Federal animal fighting laws, we left in place weak penalties that have proven ineffective and allowed the barbaric practice to thrive, in spite of bans in virtually every State. Misdemeanor penalties simply don't provide a meaningful deterrent. Animal fighters consider misdemeanor penalties as a "slap on the wrist" or merely the "cost of doing business."

State and local law enforcement officials are increasingly concerned about animal fighting not only because of the animal cruelty involved but because of the other crimes that often go hand in hand with animal fighting, including illegal gambling, drug trafficking, and acts of human violence. In the last 6 months, virtually every reported arrest in an animal fight has also led to additional arrests for at least one of these criminal activities.

Cockfighting has also spread diseases that jeopardize poultry and even public health. California experienced this firsthand when cockfighters spread exotic Newcastle disease in 2002 and 2003. That outbreak cost U.S. taxpayers nearly \$200 million to eradicate, and the cost to the U.S. poultry industry was in the millions. Cockfighting has been identified as the major contributor to the spread of avian flu throughout Thailand and other parts of Asia, where the strain originated.

I want to express my sincere thanks to you, EARL BLUMENAUER, and to ROSCOE BARTLETT for their work on this legislation. I also commend and thank my good friend and neighbor Mr. JOHN CONYERS, the chairman of the committee; LAMAR SMITH, the ranking member; BOBBY SCOTT, the chairman of the subcommittee; and RANDY FORBES, the ranking member, for recognizing the importance of this issue and moving H.R. 137 through the Judiciary Committee so quickly.

□ 1715

Also I want to recognize COLLIN PETERSON on the Ag Committee for his assistance.

Finally, more important than all, is recognizing the 303-plus Members that have co-sponsored this legislation. It is hard to believe that we have that many people agreeing on something like this when it is not often that we have that many people in the House agreeing on what day of the week it is. So I want to thank all of them for their support.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with all of us in passing this legislation when we bring it to a vote here in a couple of minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), the lead Democratic sponsor of this measure.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. SCOTT's courtesy in permitting me to speak and the leadership in taking what is seemingly a simple and innocuous bill and bringing it to the floor of the House. I appreciate working with my friend, ELTON GALLEGLY. This has been a long haul, lots of ups and downs, but today we reach an important milestone.

This is my fifth year of working on this issue. We were exposed to it during the last farm bill. We found that this got caught up in back-room machinations that really just defy description.

You have already heard about the despicable cruelty. You have heard about the association with illegal activity, gambling, violence, drugs and firearms trade. Louisiana is now poised to become the last State to make it illegal, making it illegal in every State in the Union.

Why then is this even an issue? Well, it is an underground and pervasive activity. It is in fact active across the country.

I just heard from one of our floor staff as we walked in today that he saw accounts from small town newspapers in Alabama the last 2 weeks in articles there. In Portland, Oregon, in recent months we have had officers break into a meth and coke den where there were 43 live chickens and all the equipment, as well as illegal weapons and large amounts of cash. In another high-profile case in my community, a professional basketball player was involved with illegal fighting of his pit bull.

This is something that has been an area, frankly, where Congress has

shamefully been complicit. We have ignored the fact that inadequate penalties, as has been said by the chairman of the committee, by my friend from California, which have just been the "cost of doing business," We have looked the other way.

This is an important vote today. I am confident with over 300 co-sponsors it will pass, and it will pass overwhelmingly. But the battle is not done. Never underestimate the power of the apologists, the allies and the enablers of this vicious and cruel, I won't even call it a "sport," it is a vicious practice.

I am hopeful that we will move forward with not just voting today, but make sure that it passes the other body, and it is not subjected, as it has been time and time again over the last 5 years, to some other devious action.

Do not sell short the people who are apologists for this sport. Join with us not just with your vote but to make sure that we get this legislation enacted and then enforced around the country.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlelady from California, Ms. SANCHEZ.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud support of H.R. 137, the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007, because it is time for the Federal Government to up the ante in its efforts to curb this cruel and gruesome abuse of animals.

The current misdemeanor penalties in Federal law have not been effective. They are considered a cost of doing business by the animal fighting industry, which continues to operate across the country.

This bill addresses the growing problem of animal fighting by amending Federal law to prohibit moving animals through interstate commerce for the purpose of fighting.

Do we want to make a Federal case out of this? Yes, we do. Those who profit from animal fighting often drug dogs and roosters to make them hyper-aggressive and to keep fighting even after suffering severe injuries. The animals are in a closed pit from which they cannot escape. Often, they die during the fight. This is a gruesome and inhumane practice. The American people agree. Dog fighting is illegal in 50 States and cockfighting is illegal in most.

Current law is simply not strong enough. Animal fighting often leads to additional criminal behavior. It is associated with illegal gambling, narcotics trafficking, public corruption, gang activity, and violent behavior toward people.

The National Sheriffs' Association supports the legislation, and more than 400 individual sheriffs and police departments in every State in the country have endorsed it. They recognize that animal fighting often involves movement of animals across interstate

and foreign borders, and they can't do the job on their own. They need the Federal Government to do its part to curb this dangerous activity.

I am proud to be a part of this bipartisan effort to curb this appalling treatment of animals. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on H.R. 137.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for this time.

This is my first year in the Congress. In my 24 years in the State senate, I was the leading spokesperson for animal welfare legislation, and I took great pride in that. So I am particularly appreciative of standing up on this bill.

I incorporate by reference all the things that have been said about the harmful effects of this practice, and they are well known. I think that the spread of avian flu and all the other pertinent conduct is to be prohibited.

But the main thing is, dogs are our best friends. Harry Truman said, if you want a friend in Washington, get a dog. So far, I haven't been here 90 days, I have made lots of friends. I haven't needed a dog yet, but I have thought about the day. I saw a Congressman come in the other day, Congressman WHITFIELD from Kentucky, he had his dog with him. He has been here more years than me.

Dogs are our friends. We all have dogs that we feel that are part of our families. We shouldn't treat any of God's creatures the way that people treat dogs and cocks; and I guess if I was from Kentucky, Congressman YARMUTH, I could speak more fondly about chickens, because the Colonel and KFC have done a lot for his district.

But my particular interest is dogs, and we should treat them well. They are our friends. You can go back in TV lore, Lassie and Asta, and you think about Snoopy. To teach them to fight, to require them to fight, to watch them die is just not what God intended and not what we should encourage and condone.

Children shouldn't be exposed to this, and sometimes they are. This type of conduct leads to other types of harmful conduct and violence against women, violence against seniors. People who enjoy this type of violence and watching it are more often than not going to be the most likely people to pick on others who are unable to take care of themselves.

I am very proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 137. I look forward to its passage and the day that we don't have people who get some type of great enjoyment out of watching dogs, cocks or any other of God's creatures fight to the death and find pleasure and enjoyment in it and teach their children by that

association that violence is something good, when it isn't.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am advised the distinguished gentleman from Virginia would like me to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) which I am pleased to do.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank both my friend from North Carolina and my friend from Virginia, as well as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for bringing this forward, as well as those who have spoken on behalf of this bill.

This is not just a nuisance industry. This is a malicious industry that represents a very, very serious public health threat. We are very much concerned that the interstate or international transport, especially of birds used for cockfighting, could spread an influenza outbreak. The World Health Organization has reported at least nine confirmed human cases of avian flu in Thailand and Vietnam that they expect is related directly to cockfighting activity.

The American Veterinary Medical Association, the poultry industry, all the animal protection associations, of course, but the National Sheriffs' Association as well has urged us to pass this bill.

Yes, there are 50 different State bills against dog fighting, 49 against cockfighting, but many of them are different. And the fact is there is a great deal of interstate commerce that takes place, so you need a Federal law banning this, because it is so closely associated, and this is what the National Sheriffs' Association tells us, so closely associated to illegal gambling, trafficking of narcotics, public corruption, dangerous gang activity. There are so many reasons why we should ban this practice.

As has been said, it is cruel, and it is inhumane. They drug these animals so that they are hyper-aggressive, so that they will continue fighting until they kill or are killed. That is not right. It is not moral. But even beyond the cruel and inhumane aspect of this practice, it represents a very dangerous public health threat, as well as a source of a great deal of other illegal criminal activity.

This House would be well-served to listen to the more than 300 Members who have cosponsored this legislation and pass it today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the author of the bill and certainly the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, the chairman of the full committee and ranking members as well.

I rise to enthusiastically support H.R. 137 and announce that it is impacting so many different communities

that it is imperative that there be a Federal prohibition on transporting animals interstate. There is a question of disease, there is a question of violence, and certainly with the increasing numbers of dangerous animals that attack human beings, fighting animals certainly pose a severe threat to the community.

This is a good bill. I am delighted to be a co-sponsor. The good news is that we are getting it through the House today. This bill has been around since the last session. I congratulate all of the authors. It is time now to spell relief by passing this bill and protecting the lives of our children and saving the lives of those who would be endangered by cockfighting and other dangerous activities with animals.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 137, the "Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007." I was a co-sponsor of this legislation when it was considered in the 109th Congress and a strong supporter and cosponsor when the bill was re-introduced in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 137 establishes felony-level jail time (up to 3 years) for violators of the Federal animal fighting law. The bill amends Title 18 of the U.S. Code to strengthen the maximum jail time from the 1-year misdemeanor level in current law. The bill also prohibits interstate and foreign commerce in cockfighting weapons.

1. DOGFIGHTING AND COCKFIGHTING ARE INHUMANE AND BARBARIC ACTIVITIES

In a typical fight, animals are drugged to heighten their aggression and forced to keep fighting even after injuries such as pierced lungs and gouged eyes—all for the amusement and illegal wagering of handlers and spectators. Dogfighting and cockfighting are also associated with other criminal conduct, such as drug traffic, illegal firearms use, and violence toward people. Children are often present at these spectacles. Some dogfighters steal pets to use as bait for training their dogs; some allow trained fighting dogs to roam neighborhoods and endanger the public.

2. FELONY PENALTIES ARE NEEDED

Misdemeanor penalties don't provide a meaningful deterrent; they're considered a "slap on the wrist" or a "cost of doing business." And prosecutors are reluctant to pursue animal fighting cases carrying only a misdemeanor penalty. Since the Federal animal fighting law was first enacted in 1976, authorities have pursued only a handful of cases, despite receiving innumerable informant tips about illegal interstate activity and requests to assist with state and local busts and prosecutions.

3. THE ANIMAL FIGHTING PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT ACT BRINGS FEDERAL LAW IN LINE WITH STATE LAWS

When the Federal animal fighting law was enacted in 1976, only one state had felony penalties for animal fighting. Today, dogfighting is a felony in 48 states, and cockfighting is a felony in 33 states. State laws commonly authorize jail time of 3 to 5 years or more for animal fighting.

4. OTHER RECENT FEDERAL ANIMAL PROTECTION LAWS THAT AMENDED TITLE 18 OF THE U.S. CODE HAVE FELONY PENALTIES

In 1999, Congress authorized imprisonment of up to 5 years for interstate commerce in videos depicting animal cruelty, including animal fighting (P.L. 106-152), and mandatory

jail time of up to 10 years for willfully harming or killing a federal police dog or horse (P.L. 106–254).

5. THERE IS NO REASON TO ALLOW INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN SHARP IMPLEMENTS DESIGNED EXCLUSIVELY FOR COCKFIGHTS

Razor-sharp knives known as “slashers” and ice pick-like gaffs are attached to the legs of birds to make cockfights more violent. These weapons, used only in cockfights, are sold through cockfighting magazines and through the Internet.

6. THE ANIMAL FIGHTING INDUSTRY CONTINUES TO THRIVE ACROSS THE U.S.

All 50 states ban dogfighting, 48 states ban cockfighting, and there has been a dramatic increase in the number of animal fighting raids by state and local authorities. Yet numerous nationally circulated animal fighting magazines still promote these cruel practices and advertise fighting animals and the accoutrements of animal fighting. There are also several active websites for animal fighting enthusiasts, and paid lobbyists advocating animal fighters' interests.

7. COCKFIGHTERS HAVE SPREAD DISEASES AND POSE A CONTINUING THREAT TO FARMERS AND PUBLIC HEALTH

As former Agriculture Secretary Ann Veneman wrote in a May 2004 letter indicating the Bush Administration's endorsement of the animal fighting felony legislation:

“[cockfighting has] been implicated in the introduction and spread of exotic Newcastle disease in California in 2002–2003, which cost U.S. taxpayers nearly \$200 million to eradicate, and cost the U.S. poultry industry many millions more in lost export markets. . . . We believe that tougher penalties and prosecution will help to deter illegal movement of birds as well as the inhumane practice of cockfighting itself.”

According to government officials, interstate and international transport of fighting birds posed the greatest risk of transmission, since cockfighters move their birds often and participants from as many as a dozen states gather at illegal fighting derbies.

Cockfighting also has been implicated in the deaths of at least 9 people in Asia who were reportedly exposed through cockfighting activity to bird flu. The National Chicken Council, which represents 95% of U.S. poultry producers/processors, has called on Congress to enact the animal fighting felony legislation, noting “we are concerned that the nationwide traffic in game birds creates a continuing hazard for the dissemination of animal diseases.” We can't afford not to act. The economic consequences of an avian influenza outbreak are staggering—with U.S. losses estimated at between \$185 and \$618 billion (Congressional Budget Office) and worldwide losses projected from \$1.5 to \$2 trillion (The World Bank).

8. H.R. 137 ENJOYS OVERWHELMING BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

H.R. 137 currently has more than 300 sponsors. More than 400 local and state law enforcement agencies covering every state in the country have endorsed this legislation, along with animal welfare, poultry industry, and other organizations. Enacting this animal fighting legislation is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 137.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this

legislation. It is bipartisan legislation. We have listened to all of the people who have worked long and hard on this legislation. I hope it will be the pleasure of the House to pass the bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I support the Animal Fighting Prohibition Act, which would raise the penalty for violators of the federal animal welfare law, from a class 1 misdemeanor to a felony. In an industry where thousands of dollars change hands with each fight, misdemeanor fines and charges are simply considered “the costs of doing business”. This bill would close this loophole and keep criminals from traveling to states with weaker penalties to conduct their business.

Animal fights are not only despicable for their cruelty to animals, but they are commonly associated with illegal gambling, drug traffic, firearms trades, and numerous other illicit activities. Recently in Oregon, officers found meth, cocaine, \$10,000 in cash, along with 43 live chickens, cockfighting equipment including metal spurs and gaffs in a Portland man's home. Drugs are often the impetus for the discovery of gamecocks and illegal weapons. In another high profile Oregon case, a former Portland Trailblazer pled guilty to animal abuse for fighting his pit bull. Officials found her bloody, scarred, and covered in tar which is used by fighters as a cheap antiseptic to fresh wounds.

But animal fighting doesn't just pose a threat to the people and animals who engage in them, it has enormous costs to the United States health and economy. Cockfighting has been implicated in the introduction and spread of exotic Newcastle disease in California in 2002–2003, which cost the U.S. taxpayers nearly \$200 million to eradicate. The disease spread further to large scale egg farms in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas; costing the U.S. poultry industry many millions of dollars in lost export markets. Cockfighting has also been implicated in the deaths of at least 9 people in Asia who contracted avian flu after exposure to fighting birds. If avian flu were to reach the shores of America, the economic and human consequences would be staggering.

This bill has widespread support across the country, including 303 cosponsors in the House and 35 cosponsors in the Senate. HR 137 is endorsed by the Humane Society of the United States, the National Chicken Council which represents 95 percent of the Nation's poultry producers, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Sheriff's Association, and more than 400 local law enforcement agencies. Currently there is only one bastion left for cock fighters; the State of Louisiana. Although gamblers have attempted to use tribal lands as exemptions from state and federal laws, a federal jury recently convicted four men for their participation in a cockfight, and 70 others entered guilty pleas. It is my understanding that the increase in penalties contained within this bill would be equally applicable to animal fights held on tribal lands or Indian Reservations.

It is far past time that Congress give our law enforcement agencies the tools they need to end this barbaric and consequential practice.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 137, the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act, of which I am also a cosponsor. The way a society treats its animals speaks to the core values and priorities of its

citizens. I am committed to animal welfare because I believe humankind has an obligation to all animals.

Currently, it is a misdemeanor to sell, buy, or transport an animal to be used in a fight.

This legislation would make the crime a felony and increase the imprisonment penalty from 1 year to 3 years. The legislation also makes it unlawful to ship in interstate commerce a knife, gaff, or other sharp instrument used in cockfighting, and makes it a felony to use the postal service to promote an animal fight.

Dog fighting is banned in 50 states and cockfighting is banned in all but two, so I believe the Federal government is simply codifying a value that our States governments have already individually expressed.

Animal fighting is a cruel pastime where, in a typical fight, animals are drugged to heighten their aggression and forced to keep fighting, even after injuries, for the amusement and illegal wagering of handlers and spectators. We must put an end to this form of entertainment, which results in the brutal treatment of animals.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Friends of Animals Caucus, I will continue to work on a bipartisan basis to help protect animals at the Federal level.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. BLUMENAUER, I have introduced H.R. 137 to establish felony-level jail time of up to 3 years for those who violate the law against animal fighting. H.R. 137 would amend current law to toughen the maximum jail time from a one-year misdemeanor.

The penalties in the existing federal animal fighting statute are too weak. The upgraded penalty better aligns federal law with state law. Almost all states have established felony-level penalties for illegal animal fighting activities. State laws commonly authorize jail time of 3 to 5 years or more for animal fighting.

George Bernard Shaw once stated, “The worst sin toward our fellow creatures is not to hate them, but to be indifferent to them, that's the essence of inhumanity.” We should not be indifferent to the reprehensible underground organized crime of animal fighting, which is not only cruel but poses threats to public health and safety.

The Humane Society of the U.S. estimates that there are at least 40,000 dogfighters in America. Cockfighting has been tied to the spread of bird flu. Animal fighting spawns a number of other criminal activities, such as illegal gambling and using and selling drugs. Even more disturbing is the conclusion by many experts that acts of cruelty against animals are precursors to violence against humans. The felony-level penalties against animal fighting in H.R. 137 are necessary, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 137, the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007.

As many of my colleagues know, I have had a lifelong love and compassion for animals of all kinds. That is why I am simply shocked that it is not already illegal to take animals across state lines for the purpose of fighting. This is an inhumane and cruel practice that must not be allowed to continue. Another reason why this practice must be outlawed is because animal fighting spreads disease and poses an enormous public health risk. At a time when

avian flu is at the forefront of this county's health-related worries, it should be of the utmost concern to people that animal fighting is occurring all across the country. It makes one wonder, what kind of person could enjoy a "sport" like this?

In the forty-eight states where animal fighting is already outlawed, illegal gambling goes hand-in-hand with this gruesome activity. H.R. 137, the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007, makes it a felony to knowingly sponsor or exhibit an animal or to use interstate commerce for the purposes of fighting. This bill would impose a prison sentence of up to 3 years.

I have supported this legislation since 2003. I am pleased that this legislation has overwhelming bipartisan support, with 303 cosponsors. Obviously we need stronger laws on this because this practice still continues.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 137, the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 137, the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007. It is hard to believe that an act as horrendous and brutal as animal fighting still takes place today.

H.R. 137 would make engaging in animal fighting a felony. This legislation will ensure that those who choose to fight animals illegally will be met with the appropriate penalty when they disregard the law.

Despite the fact that the vast majority of states have banned this atrocious and deplorable act, animal fighting continues to plague our communities. Animals such as dogs and chickens are fought to the death in the name of sport. This is unhealthy, violent behavior on the part of humans and is inhumane and merciless to the animals.

I commend both local and state officials for stepping up raids on animal fighting rings. Now it is time for this body of Congress to do our part by making these offenses a felony under Federal law. I urge my colleagues to join me and vote in favor of the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act, H.R. 137.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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 Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 137, 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. WESTMORELAND. 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.

□ 1730

INTERIM APPOINTMENT OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 580) to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to provide for a

120-day limit to the term of a United States attorney appointed on an interim basis by the Attorney General, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 580

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

SECTION 1. INTERIM APPOINTMENT OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Section 546 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsections:

"(c) A person appointed as United States attorney under this section may serve until the earlier of—

"(1) the qualification of a United States attorney for such district appointed by the President under section 541 of this title; or

"(2) the expiration of 120 days after appointment by the Attorney General under this section.

"(d) If an appointment expires under subsection (c)(2), the district court for such district may appoint a United States attorney to serve until the vacancy is filled. The order of appointment by the court shall be filed with the clerk of the court.

"(e) *This section is the exclusive means for appointing a person to temporarily perform the functions of a United States attorney for a district in which the office of United States attorney is vacant.*"

SEC. 2. APPLICABILITY.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) *APPLICATION.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Any person serving as a United States attorney on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act who was appointed under section 546 of title 28, United States Code, for a district may serve until the earlier of—

(A) the qualification of a United States attorney for that district appointed by the President under section 541 of that title; or

(B) 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) *EXPIRED APPOINTMENTS.*—If an appointment expires under paragraph (1)(B), the district court for the district concerned may appoint a United States attorney for that district under section 546(d) of title 28, United States Code, as added by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the measure before us today has been introduced by the gentleman from California, a ranking member of the committee and a subcommittee Chair, HOWARD BERMAN. It

is intended to restore the historical checks and balances to the process by which interim U.S. Attorneys are appointed. It will repair a breach in the law that has been a major contributing factor in the recent termination of eight able and experienced United States Attorneys and their replacement with interim appointments. It has gathered much attention across this Nation, and not just in government and legal circles.

The full circumstances surrounding these terminations are still coming to light, but what we know is already very troubling. The reports about these terminations are particularly troubling in that the United States Attorneys are among the most powerful government officials we have. They have the power to seek convictions and bring the full weight of the United States Government against any citizen or company that they deem important and eligible for prosecution. They can negotiate plea agreements. They can send people to prison for years and years. And frequently, the mere disclosure of a criminal investigation can destroy reputations and careers.

These are awesome powers. And so we on the Judiciary Committee consider it absolutely essential that the American people have full confidence in those entrusted to exercise these powers and that they do so with complete integrity and free from political influence of any kind.

The committee's investigation into these troubling circumstances is continuing. The longer time goes on, the more we know; and the more we know, the more we are troubled about what has been going on in the Department of Justice. It has already become abundantly clear that the gaping vulnerability in the law, which has placed the independence and integrity of our prosecutorial system in jeopardy, needs to be repaired as quickly as possible; and that is what we are here to do today.

What helped bring these troubling circumstances about, what helped make it possible for high-level Justice Department and White House officials to even entertain the notion that they could, as appears to be the case, target certain U.S. Attorneys for an unprecedented mid-course purge was an obscure provision adequately and anonymously slipped into the USA PATRIOT Reauthorization Act conference report in March of 2006. Without any debate, let alone the benefit of a single hearing in either body, this provision, added at the behest of the Justice Department's top political appointees to significantly enhance the power to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys without having to subject their appointments to customary safeguard of Senate confirmation. It was a middle-of-the-night insertion, and we are here to correct that.

Indeed, the administration's plan to exploit the new provision to bypass the Senate confirmation process is now well documented. As bluntly explained

by internal e-mails we received, and they now number in the hundreds, although we get them late on Friday nights, by the Attorney General's then-chief of staff, for example, discussing their plan to install the former Republican National Committee political operative, the new provision would enable them to "give far less deference to home State Senators and thereby get our preferred person appointed and do it far faster and more efficiently at less political cost to the White House."

This is outrageous. The Senate has already acted. The time is now. We need to move as rapidly as we can to correct this very serious error that casts a question upon the integrity of a very, very important part of our government, the Department of Justice.

Speaker, the bill before us today, introduced by my friend HOWARD BERMAN, will restore the historical checks and balances to the process by which interim U.S. Attorneys are appointed. It will repair a breach in the law that has been a major contributing factor in the recent termination of eight able and experienced United States Attorneys and their replacement with interim appointments.

The full circumstances surrounding these terminations are still coming to light, but what we know already is very troubling.

In one instance, the primary apparent qualification for the President's chosen replacement was that he had been an aggressive political operative at the Republican National Committee, thereby putting himself on Karl Rove's A list. In several other instances, the U.S. Attorney was in the midst of a sensitive public corruption investigation, and there were reportedly complaints from Republicans that the investigation was being pursued too aggressively against a fellow Republican, or was not being pursued aggressively enough against a Democrat.

The reports about these terminations are particularly troubling in that U.S. Attorneys are among our most powerful government officials. They not only have power to seek convictions and negotiate plea agreements that can send people to prison for years. The mere disclosure of a criminal investigation can destroy reputations and careers.

These are awesome powers, and it is absolutely essential that the American people can have full confidence those entrusted to exercise these powers do so with complete integrity and free from improper political influence.

The Committee's investigation into these troubling circumstances is continuing, and we will know more, and we will leave extended discussion of them for another day. But it has already become abundantly clear that the gaping vulnerability in the law, which has placed the independence and integrity of our prosecutorial system in jeopardy, needs to be repaired as quickly as possible. And that is what we are here to do today.

What helped bring these troubling circumstances about—what helped make it possible for high-level Justice Department and White House officials to even entertain the notion that they could, as appears to be the case, target certain U.S. Attorneys for an unprecedented mid-course purge—was an obscure provision quietly and anonymously slipped into the USA PATRIOT Reauthorization Act conference report in March 2006.

Without any debate, let alone the benefit of a single hearing in either body, this provision was added at the behest of the Justice Department's top political appointees, to significantly enhance their power to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, without having to subject the appointments to the customary safeguard of Senate confirmation.

Indeed, the Administration's deliberate plan to exploit the new provision to bypass the Senate confirmation process is now well documented. As bluntly explained in an internal e-mail by the Attorney General's then chief of staff, for example, discussing their plan to install the former RNC political operative, the new provision would enable them to "give far less deference to home-State Senators and thereby get (1) our preferred person appointed and (2) do it far faster and more efficiently, at less political cost to the White House."

Traditionally—since the Civil War—when ever a U.S. Attorney left office, and until the Senate could confirm a replacement, the local federal district court has appointed someone to fill the position on an interim basis. This was a neutral means of ensuring that permanent appointments remained the shared responsibility of the President and the Senate—to encourage the President to send a nomination to the Senate promptly, and to encourage the Senate to act promptly on the nomination.

In 1986, at the request of Attorney General Ed Meese, the law was modified to authorize the Attorney General to make short-term interim U.S. Attorney appointments, for up to 120 days. But if a permanent U.S. Attorney had not been confirmed by the end of that 120 days, the district court retained authority to make the appointment for the remainder of the interim period. This procedure, codified in 28 U.S.C. § 546, preserved the incentives on the Executive and Legislative Branches to work together on the nomination and confirmation of a permanent replacement.

That balanced approach was unceremoniously jettisoned a year ago, and with it respect for the Senate's role in ensuring that the President's power to hire and fire U.S. Attorneys at will was not abused at the expense of prosecutorial integrity.

The stealth provision in the 2006 USA PATRIOT Reauthorization Act completely removed the district court as a backstop in the interim appointment process, turning over sole power to the Attorney General, to unilaterally make interim appointments, for an unlimited time, with no obligation to involve the Senate, or the Judicial Branch, or anyone else.

H.R. 580 will restore the checks and balances that have historically provided a critical safeguard against politicization of U.S. Attorneys. First, it repeals the 2006 change to section 546, keeping the Attorney General's interim appointment role, but limiting it to 120 days, as it was before.

Second, the bill clarifies that section 546 is the only way to make interim U.S. Attorney appointments. This additional change has become necessary in light of indications, documented by the Congressional Research Service, that the Justice Department has used, and could again use, the Federal Vacancies Reform Act to evade the intent of a tightened section 546.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an important step in restoring legal safeguards against abuse of Executive power to politicize core government functions that need to be above political cal-

culations in their execution. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in mild opposition to H.R. 580, primarily against the process rather than substantively.

Scrutiny over the dismissal of several U.S. Attorneys in recent days may have triggered this legislation. While we are still learning the facts surrounding those dismissals, it does remain clear that the U.S. Attorneys do indeed serve at the pleasure of the President. Some are calling for oversight investigation because of the political appearance surrounding those dismissals, and this is fine; but amending the appointment process for interim U.S. Attorneys I believe is the wrong response.

Prior to 1986, the district court appointed interim U.S. Attorneys to fill vacancies until a Presidential appointee had been nominated and confirmed by the Senate. In 1986, the process was changed to authorize the Attorney General to appoint an interim United States Attorney for 120 days, at which time, if the Senate had not confirmed a new United States Attorney, the district court would then appoint an interim to serve until a new permanent United States Attorney was indeed confirmed.

This process was not infallible. Some said authorizing the judiciary to appoint the prosecutors before their court created a conflict of interest, and I think a good argument can be made for that. Others said the Executive could maneuver the Constitution by terminating a court-appointed interim by repeatedly substituting its own interim for 120-day stints. A good argument could well be made for that as well.

In 2005, the process for appointing interim United States Attorneys, however, was changed once again. This was an amendment to section 546 of title 28, which eliminated the 120-day time limit for an Executive-appointed interim to serve and eliminated the authority for the district court to appoint an interim.

Unfortunately, one of these responses to the recent dismissals had been H.R. 580, which would return the process of appointing interim United States Attorneys for 120 days and authorizing the judiciary to appoint interims if a permanent United States Attorney is not confirmed prior to the 120-day passes.

The bill, H.R. 580, was accelerated through the Judiciary Committee. Only one hearing was held on the bill. That hearing focused mostly on the current U.S. Attorney controversy, not the bill itself. It was then heard by the full committee, but there was no opportunity for the Judiciary Subcommittee on Commercial Administrative Law markup to therefore improve the bill.

Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, many of us, would have liked to have worked with the Democrats in a bipartisan fashion more thoroughly, and I think we may have come at the finish line with a more favorable finished product. Given more time, we might have considered some promising ideas. For instance, this bill does not address the problem of appointing and confirming United States Attorneys in a timely fashion. Senators KYL and SESSIONS introduced amendments in the Senate proposing several other responses to inherent conflicts created by United States Attorney vacancies and possible ways to provide for interims.

In these times of the war on terror, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, and the continuing age-old war on crime, the service of the United States Attorneys, indeed the front line of Federal law enforcement, is more than ever a matter of first importance to the Nation. Their appointment is serious business. We should not have rushed to judgment in attending to this business, but instead have given the legislative process more time to work. I think we missed an opportunity to improve the bill as a result.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds only to say, Mr. HOWARD COBLE, I recognize you as a sincere and experienced and valued member of this committee, and I appreciate the circumstances that you are in this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the subcommittee chairwoman, LINDA SANCHEZ of California, and I thank her for the excellent job that she has done.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 580, a bill to revoke the Attorney General's unfettered authority to appoint U.S. Attorneys indefinitely.

This legislation would repeal a small provision, with enormous repercussions, that was placed into the USA PATRIOT Reauthorization Act conference report. The provision, which removed the 120-day limit for interim appointment of U.S. Attorneys, allows interim appointees to serve indefinitely and without Senate confirmation.

We now know that the provision was inserted into the conference report at the request of a Justice Department official. Clearly, the Justice Department's effort to insert this provision was just one part of the Bush administration's coordinated plan to purge U.S. Attorneys across the country for political reasons.

My suspicions about the role of this provision in the firing of at least eight U.S. Attorneys have been confirmed after reading the documents turned over by the Justice Department. We learned, for example, that in an e-mail to former White House Counsel Harriet Miers, former Attorney General Chief of Staff Kyle Sampson wrote: "I strongly recommend that as a matter

of administration policy we utilize the new statutory provisions that authorize the Attorney General to make U.S. Attorney appointments."

The Congressional Research Service, a nonpartisan entity, has completed a report finding that these firings are unprecedented. Prior to the forced resignation of eight U.S. Attorneys in recent months, and outside the normal turnover of U.S. Attorneys that occurs with a new administration, only 10 U.S. Attorneys were forced to resign in the last 25 years. The 10 U.S. Attorneys cited in the CRS report were all fired for cause, most under a cloud of scandal.

H.R. 580, legislation offered by my friend and colleague from California, Representative HOWARD BERMAN, provides the necessary legislative response to restore checks and balances in the U.S. Attorney appointment process by reinstating the 120-day limit on all interim appointments.

The bill also closes other potential loopholes through which Senate confirmation could be bypassed. It clarifies that section 546 of title 28 of the United States Code is the exclusive means of appointing interim U.S. Attorneys.

Additionally, the bill would apply retroactively to all U.S. Attorneys currently serving in an interim capacity. This would ensure that interim U.S. Attorneys appointed since the purge scheme was hatched are not permitted to serve indefinitely and without Senate confirmation.

At a legislative hearing on H.R. 580 before the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law on March 6, this bill received strong support from the president of the National Association of Former U.S. Attorneys, as well as a former Republican-appointed U.S. Attorney. It is also important to note that the Attorney General himself has expressed that he is not opposed to rolling back this provision of the PATRIOT Act. And if the Attorney General's claim that he was not aware of the Justice Department efforts to quietly insert this provision are true, it would seem he never wanted the PATRIOT Act changes to the U.S. Attorney selection process in the first place. Additionally, the corresponding bill in the Senate received strong bipartisan support and passed by an overwhelming margin of 94-2.

Mr. Speaker, we must begin to restore the independence of U.S. Attorneys across the country and return to the bedrock principle of our court system that justice must be served objectively and without fear or favor.

□ 1745

While the consideration of H.R. 580 will not end the Judiciary Committee's ongoing investigation of the U.S. Attorney purge scheme, the passage of this legislation is a critical step in this process to close the loophole in the PATRIOT Act that this administration has improperly exploited for political purposes.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I recognize HOWARD BERMAN, the senior member on the Judiciary Committee, and thank him for his authorship of the measure that brings us to the floor this evening. I yield to him 5 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman who cosponsored this bill with me, along with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), chairman of the Crime Subcommittee of Judiciary Committee.

H.R. 580 does only one thing, it restores the checks and balances that, until last year, had long been part of the process for filling vacancies in U.S. Attorneys' offices.

I won't go through the history of how interim U.S. Attorneys were appointed, because the chairman has spelled it out, and the gentleman from North Carolina has reaffirmed that history. But I want to address the one issue my friend from North Carolina raised, which is, were we to take a longer time, this might have been, at least to his way of thinking, a better approach.

The whole goal of this bill is to restore the status quo ante before a sneak attack change on the law utilized in the PATRIOT Act without anyone calling special attention to it, undiscussed by the conferees or by the members of either this House or the other body, change that law to give the executive bench total authority in this particular area.

The Senator, a member of the other body who was chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the other body during this time, has said that he didn't know about the provision until a colleague alerted him to it last month. The former chairman's staff told him that the Department of Justice provided the language and that it was inserted in the conference report by a member of his staff who was made U.S. Attorney in Utah only 4 months later.

Now we have a different story from the Department of Justice. Will Moschella, the former head of the Office of Legislative Affairs, now claims sole responsibility for the provision and says he pursued the change on his own, without the knowledge or coordination of his superiors at the Justice Department or the White House.

This is a Department, the Department of Justice, that says it fired eight U.S. Attorneys for not coordinating their work 100 percent with the priorities of the Department, and yet we are supposed to believe that they are permitting a relatively low-level official to fly solo in changing Federal law on the appointment of U.S. Attorneys without any other departmental involvement. It is for this reason, I say to my friend from North Carolina, that the first thing we need to do is to go back to the status quo ante, the compromise worked out in the Reagan administration with Attorney General Ed

Meese, a Democratic House and the Republican Senate in 1986, which allowed for this process where we gave for the first time the Attorney General the right to name an interim U.S. Attorney, providing the district court with the theoretical ability, should that court choose to do so, to replace or, as has been much more likely, simply reaffirm the naming of the interim U.S. Attorney if no full U.S. Attorney had been confirmed yet by the Senate.

What is clear from the e-mails provided to the Judiciary Committee is that the Department of Justice and White House employees, whatever their motivation in pushing this proposal originally, whatever their motivation, they quickly figured out that the provision created the possibility to circumvent the Senate and decided to exploit that power.

One e-mail between the Department of Justice and the White House depicts an effort to slow-walk a nomination so an interim appointee can stay in place. The two employees discussed an interim appointee in Arkansas who they knew was unlikely to get Senate confirmation.

An employee in the White House Counsel's Office writes, "If this is a section 546 appointment for unlimited duration, he can call himself U.S. Attorney. Our talkers should avoid referring to him as 'interim.'"

The Attorney General's chief of staff replies, and I quote, "We should gum this to death. Our guy is in there so the status quo is good for us. Pledge a desire for a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney and otherwise hunker down."

I suggest there is ample opportunity in the record to recognize that the change we made in the PATRIOT Act without the knowledge, as far as I can tell, of any representative of either House was an ill-considered change; and the first thing we need to do and what this bill does is bring the law back to what had existed.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 5 minutes; the gentleman from North Carolina has 15½ minutes.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I recognize the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill. I appreciate also what Ranking Member COBLE talked about in terms of outlining these issues.

But it seems to me that there was just one area where I would take modest exception with him, and that is the notion that we should have been taking more time to vet this and look at alternatives. Because I fully agree with the gentleman from California, where there was not adequate time for Congress to be involved is when this was slipped into the PATRIOT Act revis-

ions in the first place. Without the knowledge of anybody, it seems, in the House or the Senate, this change was done by the staff behind closed doors. We didn't know about it. I haven't heard yet from any of my Republican friends that did.

By restoring the status quo ante the way that it had been for years, we get back to a situation where we can remove this from the table. We can have a dispassionate discussion about what has happened with the Department of Justice and its future; and, if we want to make any change, then at least we have something that has stood the test of time.

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

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, this bill could not be more timely. As I was walking across the street in front of the Supreme Court, I saw the inscription chiseled in the marble of the Supreme Court. It says, "Equal justice under law." But we have witnessed now in the last few weeks the unpeeling of a scandal where the executive branch fired eight well-performing U.S. Attorneys because they would not do the political dirty work of the White House. And it is apparent now, as much as it has ever been, that we have to have a check and balance on the executive branch with Senate confirmation.

I want to know why this is so viscerally important. In my district in western Washington, we had a gentleman named John McKay who was doing, by all rights, a good job as a U.S. Attorney for western Washington. But then there was this contentious election out there for Governor in 2004, and a bunch of Republicans were leaning on him to start a grand jury investigation alleging voter fraud because the vote came out in favor of the Democrat. He refused to do so because he said he didn't see any evidence of voter fraud.

A little later what happens is he goes to the White House for a meeting about a prospective judgeship, and what do they ask him about? They say: How come Republicans are mad at you, at the White House. And he knows what they are mad about, is because they wouldn't go after this case where there was no evidence of voter fraud. It was apparent they were leaning on him; and, when he did not collapse, he was fired.

Now, this is a situation where it is clear that we need Senate confirmation. And, by the way, I have written a letter to the President today saying the President should reinstate that U.S. Attorney while this matter is investigated. This thing smells like a mackerel in the moonlight, and it needs to be resolved. Until it is resolved, Congress is going to be investigating; and to prevent this from hap-

pening again, we need to be sure we have Senate confirmation.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington referred to it as scandal. It may well end up being a scandal, but I think to use that word today might well be premature. But, meanwhile, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, 1 minute.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I rise with sadness to support this legislation that clears up the obviously ongoing abuse and disrespect of the integrity of the three branches of government.

We passed the PATRIOT Act that some of us did not support, but we did not intend for it to be used to avoid the constitutional Senate confirmation process. That is what has happened. We understand now that the Attorney General unfortunately may have been in meetings, may have been informed of issues dealing with the termination of U.S. Attorneys without providing that direct information to the United States Congress.

This legislation again sets the Constitution back on its feet. It allows for Senate confirmation for U.S. Attorneys, and it puts back on track the integrity in terms of the respect and integrity that is necessary for the judiciary and legal system that the American people have come to understand and believe. I believe we should support this bill, and I hope we will get back on track with the relationship between Congress, the executive, and the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 580, which amends chapter 35 of title 28 of the United States Code to restore the 120-day limit on the term of a United States Attorney appointed on an interim basis by the Attorney General. The shocking disclosures of the last few weeks provide all the justification needed to adopt this salutary measure promptly and by an overwhelming margin. Our friends in the other body passed companion legislation last week by a vote of 94-2.

Mr. Speaker, United States Attorneys are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each United States Attorney so appointed is authorized to serve a 4-year term but is subject to removal by the President without cause. The Senate's advise and consent process formally checks the power of the President by requiring the United States Attorney nominee to go through a confirmation process. In addition, Senators also play a particularly influential informal role in the nomination of United States Attorneys.

Typically, a President, prior to appointing a new United States Attorney, consults with the Senators from the State where the vacancy exists if they are members of the President's political party. The President usually accepts the nominee recommended by the Senator or other official. This tradition, called "senatorial courtesy," serves as an informal check on the President's appointment power.

Since the Civil War, the judiciary has been empowered to fill vacancies in the office of the United States Attorney. In 1966, that authority was codified at 28 U.S.C. § 546. When a United States Attorney position became vacant, the district court in the district where the vacancy occurred named a temporary replacement to serve until the vacancy was filled. In 1986, in response to a request by the Attorney General that its office be vested with authority to appoint interim United States Attorneys, Congress amended the statute to add former section 546(d).

Pursuant to this authority, the Attorney General was authorized to appoint an interim United States Attorney for 120 days and, if the Senate did not confirm a new United States Attorney within such period, the district court was then authorized to appoint an interim United States Attorney to serve until a permanent replacement was confirmed. By having the district court play a role in the selection of an interim United States Attorney, former section 546(d) allowed the judicial branch to act as a check on executive power. In practice, if a vacancy was expected, the Attorney General would solicit the opinion of the chief judge of the relevant district regarding possible temporary appointments.

Twenty years later, section 546 was amended again in the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005. This legislation amended section 546(c) to provide that “[a] person appointed as United States attorney under this section may serve until the qualification of a United States Attorney for such district appointed by the President” under 28 U.S.C. § 541. The extent of the legislative history of this provision is one sentence appearing in the conference report accompanying the act: “Section 502 [effecting the amendments to section 546] is a new section and addresses an inconsistency in the appointment process of United States Attorneys.”

Although the legislative purpose is unclear, the practical effect is not. The act amended section 546 in two critical respects. First, it effectively removed district court judges from the interim appointment process and vested the Attorney General with the sole power to appoint interim United States Attorneys. Second, the act eliminated the 120-day limit on the term of an interim United States Attorney appointed by the Attorney General. As a result, judicial input in the interim appointment process was eliminated. Even more problematic, it created a possible loophole that permits United States Attorneys appointed on an interim basis to serve indefinitely without ever being subjected to a Senate confirmation process, which is plainly a result not contemplated by the Framers.

Mr. Speaker, excluding changes in administration, it is rare for a United States Attorney to not complete his or her 4-year term of appointment. According to the Congressional Research Service, only 54 United States Attorneys between 1981 and 2006 did not complete their 4-year terms. Of these, 30 obtained other public sector positions or sought elective office, 15 entered or returned to private practice, and 1 died. Of the remaining eight United States Attorneys, two were apparently dismissed by the President, and three apparently resigned after news reports indicated they had engaged in questionable personal actions.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few months disturbing stories appeared in the news media re-

porting that several United States Attorneys had been asked to resign by the Justice Department. It has now been confirmed that at least seven United States Attorneys were asked to resign on December 7, 2006. An eighth United States Attorney was subsequently asked to resign. They include the following: H.E. Cummins, III, U.S. Attorney, E.D. Ark.; John McKay, U.S. Attorney, W.D. Wash.; David Iglesias, U.S. Attorney, D. N.M.; Paul K. Charlton, U.S. Attorney, D. Ariz.; Carol Lam, U.S. Attorney, S.D. Calif.; Daniel Bogden, U.S. Attorney, D. Nev.; Kevin Ryan, N.D. Calif.; and Margaret Chiara, W.D. Mich.

On March 6, 2007, the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing entitled, “H.R. 580, Restoring Checks and Balances in the Confirmation Process of United States Attorneys.” Witnesses at the hearing included six of the eight former United States Attorneys and William Moschella, Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General, among other witnesses.

Six of the six former United States Attorneys testified at the hearing and each testified that he or she was not told in advance why he or she was being asked to resign. Upon further inquiry, however, Messrs. Charlton and Bogden were advised later by the then Acting Assistant Attorney General, William Mercer, that they were terminated essentially to make way for other Republicans to enhance their credentials and pad their resumes. In addition, Messrs. Iglesias and McKay testified about inappropriate inquiries they received from Members of Congress concerning pending investigation, which they surmised may have led to their forced resignations.

Mr. Speaker, the USA PATRIOT Act Reauthorization provision on interim U.S. Attorneys should be repealed for two reasons. First, Members of Congress did not get an opportunity to vet or debate the provision that is current law. Rather the Republican leadership of the 109th Congress slipped the provision into the conference report at the request of the Department of Justice. Not even Senate Judiciary Chairman ARLEN SPECTER, whose chief of staff was responsible for inserting the provision, knew about its existence.

Second, it is now clear that the manifest intention of the proponents of the provision was to allow interim appointees to serve indefinitely and to circumvent Senate confirmation. We know now, for example, that in a September 13, 2006 e-mail to former White House Counsel Harriet Miers, Attorney General Chief of Staff Kyle Sampson wrote:

I strongly recommend that, as a matter of Administration policy, we utilize the new statutory provisions that authorize the Attorney General to make U.S. Attorney appointments.

Mr. Sampson further said that by using the new provision, DOJ could “give far less deference to home-State Senators and thereby get (1) our preferred person appointed and (2) do it far faster and more efficiently, at less political cost to the White House.”

Regarding the interim appointment of Tim Griffin at the request of Karl Rove and Harriet Miers, Mr. Sampson wrote to Monica Goodling, Senior Counsel to the White House and Liaison to the White House on December 19, 2006 the following:

I think we should gum this to death: ask the Senators to give Tim a chance, meet with him, give him some time in office to see

how he performs, etc. If they ultimately say, ‘no never’ (and the longer we can forestall that, the better), then we can tell them we’ll look for other candidates, and otherwise run out the clock. All of this should be done in ‘good faith,’ of course.

Finally, we now know that after gaining this increased authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys indefinitely, the administration has exploited the provision to fire U.S. Attorneys for political reasons. A mass purge of this sort is unprecedented in recent history. The Department of Justice and the White House coordinated this purge. According to an administration “hit list” released on Tuesday, U.S. Attorneys were targets for the purge based on their rankings. The ranking relied in large part on whether the U.S. Attorney “exhibit[ed] loyalty to the President and Attorney General.”

Mr. Speaker, until exposed by this unfortunate episode, United States Attorneys were expected to, and in fact did exercise, wide discretion in the use of resources to further the priorities of their districts. Largely a result of its origins as a distinct prosecutorial branch of the Federal Government, the office of the United States Attorney traditionally operated with an unusual level of independence from the Justice Department in a broad range of daily activities. That practice served the Nation well for more than 200 years. The practice that has been in place for less than 2 years has served the Nation poorly. It needs to end.

Mr. Speaker, during the full committee markup of H.R. 580, I brought to my colleagues’ attention the value of including in the bill or committee report the core congressional findings that forms the justification for this legislation. Briefly stated, those findings are as follows:

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) That United States Attorneys are “inferior officers” and therefore are subject to the Constitution’s discretionary appointment provisions authorizing the Congress to vest the appointment power in the President alone or the judiciary.

(2) Vesting the authority in the United States Attorney General to appoint an interim United States Attorney to serve an indefinite term undermines the confirmation process of the United States Senate and removes a legislative check on executive power.

(3) Vesting residual power to appoint an interim United States Attorney in the Federal district court in which the vacancy occurs constitutes an important judicial check on executive power.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 580 is a thoughtful and well crafted legislative measure which will restore public confidence in the process by which interim United States Attorneys are appointed. I strongly support the bill and urge all Members to do likewise.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the American people must have full confidence in the integrity and the independence of the United States Attorneys in charge of the Federal prosecutions throughout the country, in every State. While they owe the President their appointments, once they are in their jobs their enforcement decisions must be unquestionably above politics; and that is why we are here today.

Senate confirmation is required for each one of them in an open and public process, and it is a critical safeguard against politicization of our prosecutorial system. This safeguard has been severely compromised by the secret change that has been referred to, and this bill restores the safeguards.

□ 1800

I ask my colleagues to fully support this measure on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this legislation would return the procedures for appointing interim U.S. Attorneys to what it was before Congress reauthorized the PATRIOT Act.

Some have claimed that the PATRIOT Act's reform was used to avoid Senate confirmation of permanent U.S. attorneys. To prevent that alleged abuse, this bill, H.R. 580, was rushed headlong through the Judiciary Committee.

One hearing was held on the bill. But that hearing focused mostly on the current U.S. Attorney controversy, not the bill, itself. It was then pushed immediately to the full committee, without an opportunity for subcommittee mark-up.

Republicans on the Judiciary Committee would have liked to have worked more with the Democrats in a bipartisan fashion to improve the existing law. We might well have found a better solution.

The majority's own witnesses at the hearing, for example, testified that much of the problem with the interim appointments process is the time it takes to obtain Senate confirmation. This bill, however, does not address that problem.

Given more time, we might have considered some promising ideas from the other side of the Capitol.

Senator KYL, for example, proposed a 120-day interim appointment power for the Executive Branch, and a 120-day clock for the Senate to confirm permanent appointees. This would have addressed the principal problem.

Senator SESSIONS proposed to set qualification standards for judicial appointments of interim appointees. These standards would have helped prevent unsuitable judicial appointees—assuming, for the purposes of argument, that there should be any judicial appointees of Executive Branch prosecutors.

This bill would allow judges to appoint the very Executive Branch prosecutors practicing before them, and would raise legal, ethical and practical concerns. Surely we could have done better than return to a flawed law of the past.

The rush to legislation also led to an under-considered amendment adopted at committee mark-up. That amendment would preclude the use of the full range of tried and true tools in the Vacancy Reform Act to obtain interim U.S. Attorneys.

Specifically, it would preclude the President from reaching out to Senate-confirmed, Presidential appointees serving in other capacities, rather than just career civil servants, to serve in these important posts on an interim basis.

The amendment limits the pool of qualified individuals to serve temporarily as U.S. Attorneys, so it weakens the federal government's ability to fight crime.

In these times of the War on Terror and the continuing, age-old war on crime, the service of U.S. Attorneys—the front line of federal law

enforcement—is more than ever a matter of first importance to the Nation. Their appointment is serious business.

We should not have rushed to judgment in attending to this business, but instead have given the legislative process the time that it deserves.

We have missed an opportunity to improve this bill. The American people have not been well-served.

Mr. CONYERS. 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 Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 580, 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. CONYERS. 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.

SAFETEA-LU TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1195) to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make technical corrections, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1195

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

TITLE I—HIGHWAY PROVISIONS

SECTION 101. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) CORRECTION OF INTERNAL REFERENCES IN DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISES.—Paragraphs (3)(A) and (5) of section 1101(b) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1156) are amended by striking “paragraph (1)” each place it appears and inserting “paragraph (2)”.

(b) CORRECTION OF DISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Section 1102(c)(5) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1158) is amended by striking “among the States”.

(c) CORRECTION OF FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAYS.—Section 1119 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1190) is amended by striking subsection (m) and inserting the following:

“(m) FOREST HIGHWAYS.—Of the amounts made available for public lands highways under section 1101—

“(1) not more than \$20,000,000 for each fiscal year may be used for the maintenance of forest highways;

“(2) not more than \$1,000,000 for each fiscal year may be used for signage identifying public hunting and fishing access; and

“(3) not more than \$10,000,000 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Secretary of

Agriculture to pay the costs of facilitating the passage of aquatic species beneath forest roads (as defined in section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code), including the costs of constructing, maintaining, replacing, and removing culverts and bridges, as appropriate.”.

(d) CORRECTION OF DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL CORRIDOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT.—Item number 1 of the table contained in section 1302(e) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1205) is amended in the State column by inserting “LA.” after “TX.”.

(e) CORRECTION OF INTERSTATE ROUTE 376 HIGH PRIORITY DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1105(c)(79) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2032; 119 Stat. 1213) is amended by striking “and on United States Route 422”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1105(e)(5)(B)(i)(I) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2033; 119 Stat. 1213) is amended by striking “and United States Route 422”.

(f) CORRECTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE SECTION.—Section 1602(d)(1) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1247) is amended by striking “through 189 as sections 601 through 609, respectively” and inserting “through 190 as sections 601 through 610, respectively”.

(g) TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS DEFINED.—Section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(39) TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘transportation systems management and operations’ means an integrated program to optimize the performance of existing infrastructure through the implementation of multimodal and intermodal, cross-jurisdictional systems, services, and projects designed to preserve capacity and improve security, safety, and reliability of the transportation system.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘transportation systems management and operations’ includes—

“(i) regional operations collaboration and coordination activities between transportation and public safety agencies; and

“(ii) improvements to the transportation system, such as traffic detection and surveillance, arterial management, freeway management, demand management, work zone management, emergency management, electronic toll collection, automated enforcement, traffic incident management, roadway weather management, traveler information services, commercial vehicle operations, traffic control, freight management, and coordination of highway, rail, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian operations.”.

(h) CORRECTION OF REFERENCE IN APPORTIONMENT OF HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS.—Effective October 1, 2006, section 104(b)(5)(A)(iii) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Federal-aid system” each place it appears and inserting “Federal-aid highways”.

(i) CORRECTION OF AMENDMENT TO ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION.—Section 115 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(j) CORRECTION OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS.—Section 117 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) through (h) as subsections (e) through (i), respectively;

(2) by redesignating the second subsection (c) (relating to Federal share) as subsection (d);

(3) in subsection (a)(2)(A) by inserting “(112 Stat. 257)” after “21st Century”; and

(4) in subsection (a)(2)(B)—

(A) by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsection (c)”; and

(B) by striking “SAFETEA-LU” and inserting “Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1256)”.

(k) CORRECTION OF TRANSFER OF UNUSED PROTECTIVE-DEVICE FUNDS TO OTHER HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS.—Section 130(e)(2) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “purposes under this subsection” and inserting “highway safety improvement program purposes”.

(l) METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING.—

(1) Section 134(j)(3)(D) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting “or the identified phase” before “within the time”; and

(B) by inserting “or the identified phase” before the period at the end.

(2) Section 134(k)(2) of such title is amended by striking “a metropolitan planning area serving”.

(m) CORRECTION OF HIGHWAY BRIDGE PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 144 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the section heading by striking “**replacement and rehabilitation**”;

(B) in subsections (b), (c)(1), and (e) by striking “Federal-aid system” each place it appears and inserting “Federal-aid highway”;

(C) in subsections (c)(2) and (o) by striking “the Federal-aid system” each place it appears and inserting “Federal-aid highways”;

(D) in the heading to paragraph (4) of subsection (d) by inserting “SYSTEMATIC” before “PREVENTIVE”;

(E) in subsection (e) by striking “off-system bridges” each place it appears and inserting “bridges not on Federal-aid highways”;

(F) by striking subsection (f);

(G) by redesignating subsections (g) through (s) as subsections (f) through (r), respectively;

(H) in paragraph (2) of subsection (f) (as redesignated by subparagraph (G)) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting “BRIDGES NOT ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS”;

(I) in subsection (m) (as redesignated by subparagraph (G)) by striking the subsection heading and inserting “PROGRAM FOR BRIDGES NOT ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS”; and

(J) in subsection (n)(4)(B) (as redesignated by subparagraph (G)) by striking “State highway agency” and inserting “State transportation department”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) METROPOLITAN PLANNING.—Section 104(f)(1) of such title is amended by striking “replacement and rehabilitation”.

(B) EQUITY BONUS PROGRAM.—Subsections (a)(2)(C) and (b)(2)(C) of section 105 of such title are amended by striking “replacement and rehabilitation” each place it appears.

(C) ANALYSIS.—The analysis for chapter 1 of such title is amended in the item relating to section 144 by striking “replacement and rehabilitation”.

(n) CORRECTION OF NATIONAL SCENIC BYWAYS PROGRAM COVERAGE.—Section 162 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)(B) by striking “a National Scenic Byway under subparagraph (A)” and inserting “a National Scenic Byway, an All-American Road, or one of America’s Byways under paragraph (1)”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(3) by striking “or All-American Road” each place it appears and

inserting “All-American Road, or one of America’s Byways”.

(o) CORRECTION OF REFERENCE IN TOLL PROVISION.—Section 166(b)(5)(C) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”.

(p) CORRECTION OF RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM APPORTIONMENT EXCEPTIONS.—Section 206(d)(3)(A) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “(B), (C), and (D)” and inserting “(B) and (C)”.

(q) CONSOLIDATION OF GRANT APPLICATIONS.—Section 402(m) of title 23, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking “through” and inserting “for which”; and

(2) by inserting “is appropriate” before the period at the end.

(r) CORRECTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE.—Section 601(a)(3) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting “bbb minus, BBB (low),” after “Baa3,”.

(s) CORRECTION OF MISCELLANEOUS TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS.—

(1) Section 1401 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1226) is amended by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(2) Section 1404(e) of such Act (119 Stat. 1229) is amended by inserting “tribal,” after “local,”.

(3) Section 10211(b)(2) of such Act (119 Stat. 1937) is amended by striking “plan administer” and inserting “plan and administer”.

(4) Section 10212(a) of such Act (119 Stat. 1937) is amended—

(A) by inserting “equity bonus,” after “minimum guarantee,”;

(B) by striking “freight intermodal connectors” and inserting “railway-highway crossings”;

(C) by striking “high risk rural road,”; and

(D) by inserting after “highway safety improvement programs” the following: “(and separately the set aside for the high risk rural road program)”.

SEC. 102. MAGLEV.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 1101(a)(18) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1155) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2007; and
 (B) \$35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009.”.

(b) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Section 1307 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1217) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds authorized under section 1101(a)(18) shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if the funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code; except that the funds shall not be transferable and shall remain available until expended, and the Federal share of the cost of a project to be carried out with such funds shall be 80 percent.”.

SEC. 103. PROJECTS OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE AND NATIONAL CORRIDOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.

(a) PROJECT OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.—The table contained in section 1301(m) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1203) is amended in item number 4 by striking the project description and inserting “\$7,400,000 for planning, design, and construction of a new American border plaza at the Blue Water

Bridge in or near Port Huron; \$12,600,000 for integrated highway realignment and grade separations at Port Huron to eliminate road blockages from NAFTA rail traffic”.

(b) NATIONAL CORRIDOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT.—The table contained in section 1302(e) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1205) is amended in item number 23 by striking the project description and inserting “Improvements to State Road 312, Hammond”.

SEC. 104. IDLING REDUCTION FACILITIES.

Section 111(d) of title 23, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 105. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The table contained in section 1702 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1256) is amended—

(1) in item number 34 by striking the project description and inserting “Removal and Reconfiguration of Interstate ramps, I-40, Memphis”;

(2) by striking item number 61;

(3) in item number 87 by striking the project description and inserting “M-291 highway outer road improvement project”;

(4) in item number 128 by striking “\$2,400,000” and inserting “\$4,800,000”;

(5) in item number 154 by striking “Virginia” and inserting “Eveleth”;

(6) in item number 193 by striking the project description and inserting “Improvements to or access to Route 108 to enhance access to the business park near Rumford”;

(7) in item number 240 by striking “\$800,000” and inserting “\$2,400,000”;

(8) by striking item number 248;

(9) in item number 274 by striking the project description and inserting “Intersection improvements at Belleville and Ecorse Roads and approach roadways, and widen Belleville Road from Ecorse to Tyler, Van Buren Township, Michigan”;

(10) in item number 277 by striking the project description and inserting “Construct connector road from Rushing Drive North to Grand Ave., Williamson County”;

(11) in item number 395 by striking the project description and inserting “Plan and construct interchange at I-65, from existing SR-109 to I-65”;

(12) in item number 463 by striking “Cookeville” and inserting “Putnam County”;

(13) in item number 576 by striking the project description and inserting “Design, right-of-way, and construction of Nebraska Highway 35 between Norfolk and South Sioux City, including an interchange at Milepost 1 on I-129”;

(14) in item number 595 by striking “Street Closure at” and inserting “Transportation improvement project near”;

(15) in item number 649 by striking the project description and inserting “Construction and enhancement of the Fillmore Avenue Corridor, Buffalo”;

(16) in item number 655 by inserting “, safety improvement construction,” after “Environmental studies”;

(17) in item number 676 by striking the project description and inserting “St. Croix River crossing project, Wisconsin State Highway 64, St. Croix County, Wisconsin, to Minnesota State Highway 36, Washington County”;

(18) in item number 770 by striking the project description and inserting “Improve existing Horns Hill Road in North Newark, Ohio, from Waterworks Road to Licking Springs Road”;

(19) in item number 777 by striking the project description and inserting “Akutan Airport access”;

(20) in item number 829 by striking the project description and inserting "\$400,000 to conduct New Bedford/Fairhaven Bridge modernization study; \$1,000,000 to design and build New Bedford Business Park access road";

(21) in item number 881 by striking the project description and inserting "Pedestrian safety improvements near North Atlantic Boulevard, Monterey Park";

(22) in item number 923 by striking the project description and inserting "Improve safety of a horizontal curve on Clarksville St. 0.25 miles north of 275th Rd. in Grandview Township, Edgar County";

(23) in item number 947 by striking the project description and inserting "Third East/West River Crossing, St. Lucie River";

(24) in item numbers 959 and 3327 by striking "Northern Section," each place it appears;

(25) in item number 963 by striking the project description and inserting "For engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and reconstruction of 2 existing lanes on Manhattan Road from Baseline Road to Route 53";

(26) in item number 983 by striking the project description and inserting "Land acquisition for highway mitigation in Cecil, Kent, Queen Annes, and Worcester Counties";

(27) in item number 1039 by striking the project description and inserting "Widen State Route 98, including storm drain developments, from D. Navarro Avenue to State Route 111";

(28) in item number 1047 by striking the project description and inserting "Bridge and road work at Little Susitna River Access road in Matanuska-Susitna Borough";

(29) in item number 1124 by striking "bridge over Stillwater River, Orono" and by inserting "routes";

(30) in item number 1206 by striking "Pleasantville" and inserting "Briarcliff Manor";

(31) in item number 1281 by striking the project description and inserting "Upgrade roads in Attala County District 4 (Roads 4211 and 4204), Kosciusko, Ward 2, and Ethel, Attala County";

(32) in item number 1487 by striking "\$800,000" and inserting "\$1,600,000";

(33) in item number 1575 by striking the project description and inserting "Highway and road signage, and traffic signal synchronization and upgrades, in Shippensburg Boro, Shippensburg Township, and surrounding municipalities";

(34) in item number 1661 by striking the project description and inserting "Sheldon West Extension in Matanuska-Susitna Borough";

(35) in item number 1810 by striking the project description and inserting "Design, engineering, ROW acquisition, construction, and construction engineering for the reconstruction of TH 95, from 12th Avenue to CSAH 13, including bridge and approaches, ramps, intersecting roadways, signals, turn lanes, and multiuse trail, North Branch";

(36) in item number 1852 by striking "Milepost 9.3" and inserting "Milepost 24.3";

(37) in item numbers 1926 and 2893 by striking the project descriptions and inserting "Grading, paving roads, and the transfer of rail-to-truck for the intermodal facility at Rickenbacker Airport, Columbus, Ohio";

(38) in item number 1933 by striking the project description and inserting "Enhance Byzantine Latino Quarter transit plazas at Normandie and Pico, and Hoover and Pico, Los Angeles, by improving streetscapes, including expanding concrete and paving";

(39) in item number 1975 by striking the project description and inserting "Point MacKenzie Access Road improvements in Matanuska-Susitna Borough";

(40) in item number 2015 by striking the project description and inserting "Heidelberg Borough/Scott Township/Carnegie Borough for design, engineering, acquisition, and construction of streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting and safety upgrades, and parking improvements";

(41) in item number 2087 by striking the project description and inserting "Railroad crossing improvement on Illinois Route 82 in Geneseo";

(42) in item number 2211 by striking the project description and inserting "Construct road projects and transportation enhancements as part of or connected to RiverScape Phase III, Montgomery County, Ohio";

(43) in item number 2234 by striking the project description and amount and inserting "North Atherton Signal Coordination Project in Centre County" and "\$400,000", respectively;

(44) in item number 2316 by striking the project description and inserting "Construct a new bridge at Indian Street, Martin County";

(45) in item number 2420 by striking the project description and inserting "Preconstruction and construction activities of U.S. 51 between the Assumption Bypass and Vandalia";

(46) in item number 2482 by striking "County" and inserting "County";

(47) in item number 2663 by striking the project description and inserting "Rosemead Boulevard safety enhancement and beautification, Temple City";

(48) in item number 2671 by striking "from 2 to 5 lanes and improve alignment within rights-of-way in St. George" and inserting "St. George";

(49) in item number 2743 by striking the project description and inserting "Improve safety of culvert replacement on 250th Rd. between 460th St. and Cty Hwy 20 in Grandview Township, Edgar County";

(50) by striking item number 2800;

(51) in item number 2826 by striking "State Street and Cajon Boulevard" and inserting "Palm Avenue";

(52) in item number 2931 by striking "Frazho Road" and inserting "Martin Road";

(53) in item number 3047 by inserting "and roadway improvements" after "safety project";

(54) in item number 3078 by striking the project description and inserting "U.S. 2/Sultan Basin Road improvements in Sultan";

(55) in item number 3174 by striking the project description and inserting "Improving Outer Harbor access through planning, design, construction, and relocations of Southtowns Connector-NY Route 5, Fuhrmann Boulevard, and a bridge connecting the Outer Harbor to downtown Buffalo at the Inner Harbor";

(56) in item number 3219 by striking "Forest" and inserting "Warren";

(57) in item number 3254 by striking the project description and inserting "Reconstruct PA Route 274/34 Corridor, Perry County";

(58) in item number 3260 by striking "Lake Shore Drive" and inserting "Lakeshore Drive and parking facility/entrance improvements serving the Museum of Science and Industry";

(59) in item number 3368 by striking the project description and inserting "Plan, design, and engineering, Ludlam Trail, Miami";

(60) in item number 3410 by striking the project description and inserting "Design, purchase land, and construct sound walls along the west side of I-65 from approximately 950 feet south of the Harding Place interchange south to Hogan Road";

(61) in item number 3537 by inserting "and the study of alternatives along the North South Corridor," after "Valley";

(62) in item number 3582 by striking the project description and inserting "Improving Outer Harbor access through planning, design, construction, and relocations of Southtowns Connector-NY Route 5, Fuhrmann Boulevard, and a bridge connecting the Outer Harbor to downtown Buffalo at the Inner Harbor";

(63) in item number 3604 by inserting "Kane Creek Boulevard" after "500 West";

(64) in item number 3632 by striking the State, project description, and amount and inserting "FL", "Pine Island Road pedestrian overpass, city of Tamarac", and "\$610,000", respectively;

(65) in item number 3634 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting "FL", "West Avenue Bridge, city of Miami Beach", and "\$620,000", respectively;

(66) in item number 3673 by striking the project description and inserting "Improve marine dry-dock and facilities in Ketchikan";

(67) in item number 2942 by striking the project description and inserting "Redesigning the intersection of Business U.S. 322/High Street and Rosedale Avenue and constructing a new East Campus Drive between High Street (U.S. 322) and Matlock Street at West Chester University, West Chester, Pennsylvania";

(68) in item number 2781 by striking the project description and inserting "Highway and road signage, road construction, and other transportation improvement and enhancement projects on or near Highway 26, in Riverton and surrounding areas";

(69) in item number 2430 by striking "200 South Interchange" and inserting "400 South Interchange";

(70) by striking item number 20;

(71) in item number 424 by striking "\$264,000" and inserting "\$644,000";

(72) in item number 1210 by striking the project description and inserting "Town of New Windsor—Riley Road, Shore Drive, and area road improvements";

(73) by striking item numbers 68, 905, and 1742;

(74) in item number 1059 by striking "\$240,000" and inserting "\$420,000";

(75) in item number 2974 by striking "\$120,000" and inserting "\$220,000";

(76) by striking item numbers 841, 960, and 2030;

(77) in item number 1278 by striking "\$740,000" and inserting "\$989,600";

(78) in item number 207 by striking "\$13,600,000" and inserting "\$13,200,000";

(79) in item number 2656 by striking "\$12,228,000" and inserting "\$8,970,000";

(80) in item number 1983 by striking "\$1,600,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000";

(81) in item number 753 by striking "\$2,700,000" and inserting "\$3,200,000";

(82) in item number 64 by striking "\$6,560,000" and inserting "\$8,480,000";

(83) in item number 2338 by striking "\$1,600,000" and inserting "\$1,800,000";

(84) in item number 1533 by striking "\$392,000" and inserting "\$490,000";

(85) in item number 1354 by striking "\$40,000" and inserting "\$50,000";

(86) in item number 3106 by striking "\$400,000" and inserting "\$500,000";

(87) in item number 799 by striking "\$1,600,000" and inserting "\$2,000,000";

(88) in item number 159—

(A) by striking "Construct interchange for 146th St. and I-69" and inserting "Upgrade 146th St. to I-69 Access"; and

(B) by striking "\$2,400,000" and inserting "\$3,200,000";

(89) by striking item number 2936;

(90) in item number 3138 by striking the project description and inserting "Elimination of highway-railway crossing along the KO railroad from Salina to Osborne to increase safety and reduce congestion";

(91) in item number 2274 by striking "between Farmington and Merriman" and inserting "between Hines Drive and Inkster, Flamingo Street between Ann Arbor Trail and Joy Road, and the intersection of Warren Road and Newburgh Road";

(92) in item number 52 by striking the project description and inserting "Pontiac Trail between E. Liberty and McHattie Street";

(93) in item number 1544 by striking "connector";

(94) in item number 2573 by striking the project description and inserting "Rehabilitation of Sugar Hill Road in North Salem, NY";

(95) in item number 1450 by striking "III-VI" and inserting "III-VII";

(96) in item number 2637 by striking the project description and inserting "Construction, road and safety improvements in Geauga County, OH";

(97) in item number 2342 by inserting "and to Heisley Road" after "Interchange";

(98) in item number 161 by striking the project description and inserting "Construct False Pass causeway and road to the terminus of the south arm breakwater project";

(99) in item number 2002 by striking the project description and inserting "Providence Hospital public access road and enhancements, including access connections between the proposed Providence Regional Administration Building and Piper Street, to improve access and circulation in the Providence Southwest Campus";

(100) in item number 2023 by striking the project description and inserting "Biking and pedestrian trail construction, Kentland";

(101) in item number 2035 by striking "Replace" and inserting "Repair";

(102) in item number 2511 by striking "Replace" and inserting "Rehabilitate";

(103) in item number 2981 by striking the project description and inserting "Roadway improvements on Highway 262 on the Navajo Nation in Aneth";

(104) in item number 2068 by inserting "and approaches" after "capacity";

(105) in item number 98 by striking the project description and inserting "Right-of-way and construction for the 77th Street reconstruction project, including the Lyndale Avenue Bridge over I-494, Richfield";

(106) in item number 1783 by striking the project description and inserting "Clark Road access improvements, Jacksonville";

(107) in item number 2711 by striking the project description and inserting "Main Street Road Improvements through Springfield, Jacksonville";

(108) in item number 3485 by striking the project description and inserting "Improve SR 105 (Hecksher Drive) from Drummond Point to August Road, including bridges across the Broward River and Dunns Creek, Jacksonville";

(109) in item number 3486 by striking the project description and inserting "Construct improvements to NE 19th Street/NE 19th Terrace from NE 3rd Avenue to NE 8th Avenue, Gainesville";

(110) in item number 3487 by striking the project description and inserting "Construct improvements to NE 25th Street from SR 26 (University Blvd.) to NE 8th Avenue, Gainesville";

(111) in item number 803 by striking "St. Clair County" and inserting "city of Madison";

(112) in item number 615 by striking the project description and inserting "Roadway improvements to Jackson Avenue between Jericho Turnpike and Teibrook Avenue";

(113) in item number 889 by striking the project description and inserting "U.S. 160, State Highway 3 to east of the Florida River";

(114) in item number 324 by striking the project description and inserting "Paving a portion of H-58 from Buck Hill to 4,000 feet east of Hurricane River";

(115) in item number 301 by striking the project description and inserting "Improvements for St. Georges Avenue between East Baltimore Avenue on the southwest and Chandler Avenue on the northeast";

(116) in item number 1519 by inserting "at the intersection of Quincy/West Drinker/Electric Streets near the Dunmore School complex" after "roadway redesign";

(117) in item number 2604 by inserting "on Coolidge, Bridge (from Main to Monroe), Skytop (from Gedding to Skytop), Atwell (from Bear Creek Rd. to Pittston Township), Wood (to Bear Creek Rd.), Pine, Oak (from Penn Avenue to Lackawanna Avenue), McLean, Second, and Lolli Lane" after "roadway redesign";

(118) in item number 1157 by inserting "on Mill Street from Prince Street to Roberts Street, John Street from Roberts Street to end, Thomas Street from Roberts Street to end, Williams Street from Roberts Street to end, Charles Street from Roberts Street to end, Fair Street from Roberts Street to end, Newport Avenue from East Kirmar Avenue to end" after "roadway redesign";

(119) in item number 805 by inserting "on Oak Street from Stark Street to the township line at Mayoek Street and on East Mountain Boulevard" after "roadway redesign";

(120) in item number 2704 by inserting "on West Cemetery Street and Frederick Courts" after "roadway redesign";

(121) in item number 3136 by inserting "on Walden Drive and Greenwood Hills Drive" after "roadway redesign";

(122) in item number 1363 by striking the project description and inserting "Design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, safety improvements, handicap access ramps, parking, and roadway redesign on Bilbow Street from Church Street to Pugh Street, on Pugh Street from Swallow Street to Main Street, Jones Lane from Main Street to Hoblak Street, Cherry Street from Green Street to Church Street, Main Street from Jackson Street to end, Short Street from Cherry Street to Main Street, and Hillside Avenue in Edwardsville Borough, Luzerne County";

(123) in item number 883 by striking the project description and inserting "Design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, parking, roadway redesign, and safety improvements (including curbing, stop signs, crosswalks, and pedestrian sidewalks) at and around the 3-way intersection involving Susquehanna Avenue, Erie Street, and Second Street in West Pittston, Luzerne County";

(124) in item number 625 by striking the project description and inserting "Design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, safety improvements, parking, and roadway redesign on Sampson Street, Dunn Avenue, Powell Street, Josephine Street, Pittston Avenue, Railroad Street, McClure Avenue, and Baker Street in Old Forge Borough, Lackawanna County";

(125) in item number 372 by inserting "replacement of the Nesbitt Street Bridge, and placement of a guard rail adjacent to St.

Vladimir's Cemetery on Mountain Road (S.R. 1007)" after "roadway redesign";

(126) in item number 2308 by striking the project description and inserting "Design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, safety improvements, parking, and roadway redesign, including a project to establish emergency access to Catherino Drive from South Valley Avenue in Throop Borough, Lackawanna County";

(127) in item number 967 by striking the project description and inserting "Design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, safety improvements, parking, roadway redesign, and catch basin restoration and replacement on Cherry Street, Willow Street, Eno Street, Flat Road, Krispin Street, Parrish Street, Carver Street, Church Street, Franklin Street, Carolina Street, East Main Street, and Rear Shawnee Avenue in Plymouth Borough, Luzerne County";

(128) in item number 989 by inserting "on Old Ashley Road, Ashley Street, Phillips Street, First Street, Ferry Road, and Division Street" after "roadway redesign";

(129) in item number 342 by striking the project description and inserting "Design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, safety improvements, parking, roadway redesign, and cross pipe and catch basin restoration and replacement on Northgate, Mandy Court, Vine Street, and 36th Street in Milnesville West, and on Hillside Drive (including the widening of the bridge on Hillside Drive), Club 40 Road, Sunburst and Venisa Drives, and Stockton #7 Road in Hazle Township, Luzerne County";

(130) in item number 2332 by striking "Monroe County" and inserting "Carbon, Monroe, Pike, and Wayne Counties";

(131) in item number 2436 by striking the project description and amount and inserting "For Wilkes-Barre to design, acquire land, and construct a parking garage or parkade, streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, safety improvements, and roadway redesign at and around the Sterling Hotel in Wilkes-Barre, including on River Street, Market Street, or Franklin Street (or any combination thereof) to the vicinity of the Irem Temple" and "\$3,000,000", respectively;

(132) in item number 2723 by striking "\$4,000,000" and by inserting "\$3,150,000";

(133) in item number 61 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting "AL", "Grade crossing improvements along Wiregrass Central RR at Boll Weevil Bypass in Enterprise, AL", and "\$250,000", respectively;

(134) in item number 314 by striking the project description and amount and inserting "Streetscape enhancements to the transit and pedestrian corridor, Fort Lauderdale, Downtown Development Authority" and "\$610,000", respectively;

(135) in item number 1639 by striking the project description and inserting "Operational and highway safety improvements on Hwy 94 between the 20 mile marker post in Jamul and Hwy 188 in Tecate";

(136) in item number 2860 by striking the project description and inserting "Roadway improvements from Halchita to Mexican Hat on the Navajo Nation";

(137) in item number 2549 by striking "on Navy Pier";

(138) in item number 2804 by striking "on Navy Pier";

(139) in item number 1328 by striking the project description and inserting "Construct public access roadways and pedestrian safety improvements in and around Montclair State University in Clifton";

(140) in item number 2559 by striking the project description and inserting “Construct sound walls on Route 164 at and near the Maersk interchange”;

(141) in item number 1849 by striking the project description and inserting “Highway, traffic-flow, pedestrian facility, and streetscape improvements, Pittsburgh”;

(142) in item number 697 by striking the project description and inserting “Highway, traffic-flow, pedestrian facility, and streetscape improvements, Pittsburgh”;

(143) in item number 3597 by striking the project description and inserting “Road Alignment from IL Route 159 to Sullivan Drive, Swansea”;

(144) in item number 2352 by striking the project description and inserting “Streetscaping and transportation enhancements on 7th Street in Calexico, traffic signalization on Highway 78, construction of the Renewable Energy and Transportation Learning Center, improve and enlarge parking lot, and create bus stop, Brawley”;

(145) in item number 3482 by striking the project description and inserting “Conduct a study to examine multi-modal improvements to the I-5 corridor between the Main Street Interchange and State Route 54”;

(146) in item number 1275 by striking the project description and inserting “Scoping, permitting, engineering, construction management, and construction of Riverbank Park Bike Trail, Kearny”;

(147) in item number 726 by striking the project description and inserting “Grade Separation at Vanowen and Clybourn, Burbank”;

(148) in item number 1579 by striking the project description and inserting “San Gabriel Blvd. rehabilitation project, Mission Road to Broadway, San Gabriel”;

(149) in item number 2690 by striking the project description and inserting “San Gabriel Blvd. rehabilitation project, Mission Road to Broadway, San Gabriel”;

(150) in item number 2811 by striking the project description and inserting “San Gabriel Blvd. rehabilitation project, Mission Road to Broadway, San Gabriel”;

(151) in item number 259 by striking the project description and inserting “Design and construction of the Clair Nelson Intermodal Center in Finland, Lake County”;

(152) in item number 3456 by striking the project description and by inserting “Completion of Phase II/Part I of a project on Elizabeth Avenue in Coleraine to west of Itasca County State Aid Highway 15 in Itasca County”;

(153) in item number 2429 by striking the project description and inserting “Upgrade streets, undertake streetscaping, and implement traffic and pedestrian safety signalization improvements and highway-rail crossing safety improvements, Oak Lawn”;

(154) in item number 766 by striking the project description and inserting “Design and construction of the walking path at Ellis Pond, Norwood”;

(155) in item number 3474 by striking the project description and inserting “Yellow River Trail, Newton County”;

(156) in item number 3291 by striking the amount and inserting “\$200,000”;

(157) in item number 3635 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “GA”, “Access Road in Montezuma”, and “\$200,000”, respectively;

(158) in item number 716 by striking the project description and inserting “Conduct a project study report for new Highway 99 Interchange between SR 165 and Bradbury Road, and safety improvements/realignment of SR 165, serving Turlock/Hilmar region”;

(159) in item number 1386 by striking the project description and amount and inserting

“Pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and street lighting in Haddon Heights” and “\$300,000”, respectively;

(160) in item number 2720 by striking the project description and amount and inserting “Pedestrian and bicycle facilities and street lighting in Barrington and streetscape improvements to Clements Bridge Road from the circle at the White Horse Pike to NJ Turnpike overpass in Barrington” and “\$700,000”, respectively;

(161) in item number 2523 by striking the project description and inserting “Penobscot Riverfront Development for bicycle trails, amenities, traffic circulation improvements, and waterfront access and stabilization, Bangor and Brewer”;

(162) in item number 545 by striking the project description and inserting “Planning, design, and construction of improvements to the highway systems connecting to Lewistown and Auburn downtowns”;

(163) in item number 2168 by striking the project description and amount and inserting “Study and design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of street improvements, streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, safety improvements, along the Rt. 315 corridor from Dupont to Wilkes Barre” and “\$1,000,000”, respectively;

(164) in item number 170 by striking the project description and amount and inserting “Study of a Maglev train route from Northeast Pennsylvania through New Jersey and New York” and “\$1,600,000”, respectively;

(165) in item number 2366 by striking the project description and inserting “Design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and paving of the parking lot at the Casey Plaza in Wilkes-Barre Township”;

(166) in item number 826 by striking “and Interstate 81” and inserting “and exit 168 on Interstate 81 or the intersection of the connector road with Northampton St.”;

(167) in item number 2144 by striking the project description and inserting “Design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition and construction of streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, safety improvements, parking, and roadway redesign on Third Street from Pittston Avenue to Packer Street; Swift Street from Packer Street to Railroad Street; Clark Street from Main Street to South Street; School Street from Main Street to South Street; Plane Street from Grove Street to William Street; John Street from 4 John Street to William Street; Grove Street from Plane Street to Duryea Borough line; Wood Street from Cherry Street to Hawthorne Street in Avoca Borough, Luzerne County”;

(168) in item number 1765 by striking the project description and amount and inserting “Design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of street improvements, streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, safety improvements, parking, roadway redesign in Pittston, including right-of-way acquisition, structure demolition, and intersection safety improvements in the vicinity and including the intersection of Main and William Streets in Pittston” and “\$1,600,000”, respectively;

(169) in item number 2957 by striking the project description and amount and inserting “Design, engineering, land acquisition, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of a parking garage, streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting, safety improvements, parking, and roadway redesign in the city of Wilkes-Barre” and “\$2,800,000”, respectively;

(170) in item number 3283 by striking the project description and amount and inserting “Pedestrian access improvements, including installation of infrastructure and equipment for security and surveillance purposes at

subway stations in Astoria, New York” and “\$1,300,000”, respectively;

(171) in item number 3556 by striking the project description and amount and inserting “Design and rehabilitate staircases used as streets due to the steep grade of terrain in Bronx County” and “\$1,100,000”, respectively;

(172) by striking item number 203;

(173) by striking item number 552;

(174) by striking item number 590;

(175) by striking item number 759;

(176) by striking item number 879;

(177) by striking item number 1071;

(178) by striking item number 1382;

(179) by striking item number 1897;

(180) by striking item number 2553;

(181) in item number 3014 by striking the project description and amount and inserting “Design and Construct school safety projects in New York City” and “\$2,500,000”, respectively;

(182) in item number 2375 by striking the project description and amount and inserting “Subsurface environmental study to measure presence of methane and benzene gasses in vicinity of Greenpoint, Brooklyn, and the Kosciusko Bridge, resulting from the Newtown Creek oil spill” and “\$100,000”;

(183) in item number 221 by striking the project description and inserting “Study and implement transportation improvements in the Breezy Point neighborhood of Queens County”;

(184) in item number 2732 striking the project description and inserting “Pedestrian safety improvements in the vicinity of LIRR stations”;

(185) by striking item number 99;

(186) in item number 398 by striking the project description and inserting “Construct a new 2-lane road extending north from University Park Drive and improvements to University Park Drive”;

(187) in item number 446 by striking the project description and inserting “Transportation improvements for development of the Williamsport-Pile Bay Road corridor”;

(188) in item number 671 by striking “and Pedestrian Trail Expansion” and inserting “, including parking facilities and Pedestrian Trail Expansion”;

(189) in item number 674 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “AL”, “Grade crossing improvements along Conecuh Valley RR at Henderson Highway (CR-21) in Troy, AL”, and “\$300,000”, respectively;

(190) in item number 739 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “AL”, “Grade crossing improvements along Luxapalila Valley RR in Lamar and Fayette Counties, AL (Crossings at CR-6, CR-20, SH-7, James Street, and College Drive)”, and “\$300,000”, respectively;

(191) in item number 746 by striking “Planning and construction of a bicycle trail adjacent to the I-90 and SR 615 Interchange in” and inserting “Planning, construction, and extension of bicycle trails adjacent to the I-90 and SR 615 Interchange, along the Greenway Corridor and throughout”;

(192) in item number 749 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “PA”, “UPMC Heliport in Bedford”, and “\$750,000”, respectively;

(193) in item number 813 by striking the project description and inserting “Preliminary design and study of long-term roadway approach alternatives to TH 36/SH 64 St. Croix River Crossing Project”;

(194) in item number 816 by striking “\$800,000” and inserting “\$880,000”;

(195) in item number 852 by striking “Acquire Right-of-Way for Ludlam Trail, Miami,

Florida” and inserting “Planning, design, and engineering, Ludlam Trail, Miami”;

(196) in item number 994 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “PA”, “Construct 2 flyover ramps and S. Linden Street exit for access to industrial sites in the cities of McKeesport and Duquesne”, and “\$500,000”, respectively;

(197) in item number 1015 by striking the project description and inserting “Mississippi River Crossing connecting I-94 and US 10 between US 160 and TH 101, MN”;

(198) in item number 1101 by striking the project description and inserting “I-285 underpass/tunnel assessment and engineering and interchange improvements in Sandy Springs”;

(199) in item number 1211 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “PA”, “Road improvements and upgrades related to the Pennsylvania State Baseball Stadium”, and “\$500,000”, respectively;

(200) in item number 1345 by striking “to Stony Creek Park, 25 Mile Road in Shelby Township” and inserting “south to the city of Utica”;

(201) in item number 1501 by striking the project description and inserting “Construction and right-of-way acquisition of TH 241, CSAH 35 and associated streets in the city of St. Michael”;

(202) in item number 1525 by striking “north of CSX RR Bridge” and inserting “US Highway 90”;

(203) in item number 1847 by striking “Ferry” and inserting “Dock”;

(204) in item number 2031 by striking the project description and inserting “Construct and improve Westside Parkway in Fulton County”;

(205) in item number 2103 by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”;

(206) in item number 2219 by striking “SR 91 in City of Twinsburg, OH” and inserting “Center Valley Parkway in Twinsburg, OH”;

(207) in item number 2302 by inserting “and other road improvements to Safford Street” after “crossings”;

(208) in item number 2560 by striking the project description and inserting “I-285 underpass/tunnel assessment and engineering and interchange improvements in Sandy Springs”;

(209) in item number 2563 by striking the project description and amount and inserting “Construct hike and bike path as part of Bridgeview Bridge replacement in Macomb County” and “\$486,400”, respectively;

(210) in item number 2698 by striking the project description and inserting “Interchanges at I-95/Ellis Road and between Grant Road and Micco Road, Brevard County”;

(211) in item number 3141 by striking “\$2,800,000” and inserting “\$1,800,000”;

(212) by striking item number 3160;

(213) in item number 3353 by inserting “and construction” after “mitigation”;

(214) in item number 996 by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$687,000”;

(215) in item number 2166 by striking the project description and inserting “Design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction for I-35 and CSAH2 interchange and CSAH2 corridor to TH61 in Forest Lake”;

(216) in item number 3251 by striking the project description and inserting “I-94 and Radio Drive Interchange and frontage road project, design, right-of-way, and construction, Woodbury”;

(217) in item number 1488 by striking the project description and inserting “Construct a 4-lane highway between Maverick Junction and the Nebraska border”;

(218) in item number 3240 by striking the project description and inserting “Railroad-highway crossings in Pierre”;

(219) in item number 1738 by striking “Paving” and inserting “Planning, design, and construction”;

(220) in item number 3672 by striking the project description and inserting “Pave remaining stretch of BIA Route 4 from the junction of the BIA Route 4 and N8031 in Pinon, AZ, to the Navajo and Hopi border”;

(221) in item number 2424 by striking “Construction” and inserting “preconstruction (including survey and archeological clearances) and construction”;

(222) in item number 1216 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “PA”, “For roadway construction improvements to Route 222 relocation, Lehigh County”, and “\$1,313,000”, respectively;

(223) in item number 2956 by striking “\$1,360,000” and inserting “\$2,080,000”;

(224) in item number 1256 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “PA”, “Construction of a bridge over Brandywine Creek as part of the Boot Road extension project, Downingtown Borough”, and “\$700,000”, respectively;

(225) in item number 1291 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “PA”, “Enhance parking facilities in Chester Springs, Historic Yellow Springs”, and “\$20,000”, respectively;

(226) in item number 1304 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “PA”, “Improve the intersection at SR 100/SR 4003 (Kernsville Road), Lehigh County”, and “\$250,000”, respectively;

(227) in item number 1357 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “PA”, “Intersection signalization at SR 3020 (Newburg Road)/Country Club Road, Northampton County”, and “\$250,000”, respectively;

(228) in item number 1395 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “PA”, “Improve the intersection at SR 100/SR 29, Lehigh County”, and “\$220,000”, respectively;

(229) in item number 80 by striking “\$4,544,000” and inserting “\$4,731,200”;

(230) in item number 2096 by striking “\$4,800,000” and inserting “\$5,217,600”;

(231) in item number 1496 by striking the matters in the State, project description, and amount columns and inserting “PA”, “Study future needs of East-West road infrastructure in Adams County”, and “\$115,200”, respectively;

(232) in item number 2193 by striking the project description and inserting “710 Freeway Study to comprehensively evaluate the technical feasibility of a tunnel alternative to close the 710 Freeway gap, considering all practicable routes, in addition to any potential route previously considered, and with no funds to be used for preliminary engineering or environmental review except to the extent necessary to determine feasibility”;

(233) in item number 2445 by striking the project description and by inserting “\$600,000 for road and pedestrian safety improvements on Main Street in the Village of Patchogue; \$900,000 for road and pedestrian safety improvements on Montauk Highway, between NYS Route 112 and Suffolk County Road 101 in Suffolk County”;

(234) in item number 346 by striking the project description and by inserting “Hansen Dam Recreation Area access improvements, including hillside stabilization and parking lot rehabilitation along Osborne Street between Glenoaks Boulevard and Dronfield Avenue”; and

(235) in item number 449 by striking the project description and inserting “Route 30

and Mount Pleasant Road Interchange Safety Improvements, Westmoreland County, install light installations at intersection and consolidate entrances and exits to Route 30”.

(b) UNUSED OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unused obligation authority made available for an item in section 1702 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1256) that is repealed, or authorized funding for such an item that is reduced, by this section shall be made available—

(1) for an item in section 1702 of that Act that is added or increased by this section and that is in the same State as the item for which obligation authority or funding is repealed or reduced;

(2) in an amount proportional to the amount of obligation authority or funding that is so repealed or reduced; and

(3) individually for projects numbered 1 through 3676 pursuant to section 1102(c)(4)(A) of that Act (119 Stat. 1158).

(c) ADDITIONAL DISCRETIONARY USE OF SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDS.—Of the funds apportioned to each State under section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, a State may expend for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009 not more than \$1,000,000 for the following activities:

(1) Participation in the Joint Operation Center for Fuel Compliance established under section 143(b)(4)(H) of title 23, United States Code, within the Department of the Treasury, including the funding of additional positions for motor fuel tax enforcement officers and other staff dedicated on a full-time basis to participation in the activities of the Center.

(2) Development, operation, and maintenance of electronic filing systems to coordinate data exchange with the Internal Revenue Service by States that impose a tax on the removal of taxable fuel from any refinery and on the removal of taxable fuel from any terminal.

(3) Development, operation, and maintenance of electronic single point of filing in conjunction with the Internal Revenue Service by States that impose a tax on the removal of taxable fuel from any refinery and on the removal of taxable fuel from any terminal.

(4) Development, operation, and maintenance of a certification system by a State of any fuel sold to a State or local government (as defined in section 4221(d)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for the exclusive use of the State or local government or sold to a qualified volunteer fire department (as defined in section 150(e)(2) of such Code) for its exclusive use.

(5) Development, operation, and maintenance of a certification system by a State of any fuel sold to a nonprofit educational organization (as defined in section 4221(d)(5) of such Code) that includes verification of the good standing of the organization in the State in which the organization is providing educational services.

(d) PROJECT FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 1964 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) SPECIAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of the cost of the projects described in item numbers 1284 and 3093 in the table contained in section 1702 of this Act shall be 100 percent.”.

SEC. 106. NONMOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 1807(a)(3) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1460) is amended by striking “Minneapolis-St. Paul,

Minnesota” and inserting “Minneapolis, Minnesota”.

SEC. 107. CORRECTION OF INTERSTATE DESIGNATION.

Section 1908(a) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1469) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

SEC. 108. FUTURE OF SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.

Section 1909(b) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1471) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (9) by striking “July 1, 2007” and inserting “December 31, 2007”;

(2) in paragraph (11)(C) by striking “the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration” and inserting “the Secretary”;

(3) in paragraph (11)(D)(i) by striking “, on a reimbursable basis.”;

(4) in paragraph (15) by striking “\$1,400,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007” and inserting “\$1,400,000 for fiscal year 2006 and \$3,400,000 for fiscal year 2007”;

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (14), (15), (16), and (17) as paragraphs (15), (16), (17), and (18), respectively; and

(6) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) LIMITATIONS.—Funds made available to carry out this section may be expended only to support the activities of the Commission. No data, analyses, reports, or any other documents prepared for the Commission to fulfill its duties may be provided to or shared with other commissions or task forces until such data, analyses, reports, or documents have been made available to the public.”.

SEC. 109. BUDGET JUSTIFICATION; BUY AMERICA.

(a) BUDGET JUSTIFICATION.—Section 1926 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1483) is amended by striking “The Department” and inserting “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department”.

(b) BUY AMERICA.—Section 1928 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1484) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) the current application by the Federal Highway Administration of the Buy America test is only applied to components or parts of a bridge project and not the entire bridge project and this is inconsistent with this sense of Congress.”.

SEC. 110. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS.

The table contained in section 1934(c) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1486) is amended—

(1) in item number 436 by inserting “, Saole,” after “Sua”;

(2) in item number 448 by inserting “by removing asphalt and concrete and reinstalling blue cobblestones” after “streets”;

(3) by striking item number 451; and

(4) in item number 452 by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

SEC. 111. BIA INDIAN ROAD PROGRAM.

Section 1939(b) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1511) is amended—

(1) by striking “For the villages” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the villages”;

(2) by striking “, and the Secretary” and inserting a period and the following:

“(2) FISCAL YEAR 2006.—The Secretary”; and (3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) FISCAL YEAR 2007.—The Secretary shall pay, from amounts made available to carry out section 202(d) of title 23, United States Code, for fiscal year 2007, the tribal organizations listed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) the difference between the Federal share of the costs of the projects listed in such paragraphs and the amounts paid to the respective tribal organizations for such projects under this section in fiscal year 2006.”.

SEC. 112. I-95/CONTEE ROAD INTERCHANGE DESIGN.

Section 1961 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1518) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking “study” and inserting “design”;

(2) by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following:

“(a) DESIGN.—The Secretary shall make available the funds authorized to be appropriated by this section for the design of the I-95/Contee Road interchange in Prince George’s County, Maryland.”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b); and

(4) in subsection (b)(1) (as so redesignated) by striking “2006” and inserting “2007”.

SEC. 113. HIGHWAY RESEARCH FUNDING.

(a) F-SHRP FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009, at any time at which an apportionment is made of the sums authorized to be appropriated for the surface transportation program, the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, the National Highway System, the Interstate maintenance program, the bridge program, or the highway safety improvement program, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(1) deduct from each apportionment an amount not to exceed 0.205 percent of the apportionment; and

(2) transfer or otherwise make that amount available to carry out section 510 of title 23, United States Code.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) FUNDING.—Section 5101 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1779) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1) by striking “509, and 510” and inserting “and 509”;

(B) in subsection (a)(4) by striking “\$69,700,000” and all that follows through “2009” and inserting “\$40,400,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$69,700,000 for fiscal year 2006, \$76,400,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008, and \$78,900,000 for fiscal year 2009”;

(C) in subsection (b) by inserting after “50 percent” the following “or, in the case of funds appropriated by subsection (a) to carry out section 5201, 5202, or 5203 of this Act, 80 percent”.

(2) FUTURE STRATEGIC HIGHWAY RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 5210 of such Act (119 Stat. 1804) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(c) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds made available under this section shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if the funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, except that the Federal share shall be determined under section 510(f) of that title.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—Funds made available under this section shall be subject to any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs under sec-

tion 1102 the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (23 U.S.C. 104 note; 119 Stat. 1157) or any other Act.

(e) EQUITY BONUS FORMULA.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in allocating funds for the equity bonus program under section 105 of title 23, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009, the Secretary of Transportation shall make the required calculations under that section as if this section had not been enacted.

(f) FUNDING FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—Of the amount made available by section 5101(a)(1) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1779)—

(1) at least \$1,000,000 shall be made available for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009 to carry out section 502(h) of title 23, United States Code; and

(2) at least \$4,900,000 shall be made available for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009 to carry out section 502(i) of that title.

(g) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH.—Section 502 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking the first subsection (h), relating to infrastructure investment needs reports beginning with the report for January 31, 1999.

(2) ADVANCED TRAVEL FORECASTING PROCEDURES PROGRAM.—Section 5512(a)(2) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1829) is amended by striking “PROGRAM APPRECIATION.—” and inserting “PROGRAM APPLICATION.—”.

(3) UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH.—Section 5506 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (i)—

(i) by striking “In order to” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Nothing in paragraph (1) requires a nonprofit institution of higher learning designated as a Tier II university transportation center to maintain total expenditures as described in paragraph (1) in excess of the amount of the grant awarded to the institution.”; and

(B) in subsection (k)(3) by striking “The Secretary” and all that follows through “to carry out this section” and inserting “For each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009, the Secretary shall expend not more than 1.5 percent of amounts made available to carry out this section”.

SEC. 114. RESCISSION.

Section 10212 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (as amended by section 1302 of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-280)) (119 Stat. 1937; 120 Stat. 780) is amended by striking “\$8,593,000,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$8,710,000,000”.

SEC. 115. TEA-21 TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM.—Section 1108(f)(1) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (23 U.S.C. 133 note; 112 Stat. 141) is amended by striking “2003” and inserting “2009”.

(b) PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.—The table contained in section 1602 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 257) is amended in item number 1096 (as amended by section 1703(a)(11) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1454)) by inserting “, and planning and construction to Heisley Road,” before “in Mentor, Ohio”.

SEC. 116. DEFINITION OF REPEAT INTOXICATED DRIVER LAW.

Section 164(a)(5) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) receive—

“(i) a driver’s license suspension for not less than 1 year; or

“(ii) a combination of suspension of all driving privileges for the first 45 days of the suspension period followed by a reinstatement of limited driving privileges for the purpose of getting to and from work, school, or an alcohol treatment program if an ignition interlock device is installed on each of the motor vehicles owned or operated, or both, by the individual;

“(B) be subject to the impoundment or immobilization of, or the installation of an ignition interlock system on, each motor vehicle owned or operated, or both, by the individual;”.

SEC. 117. RESEARCH TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

Section 5506(e)(5)(C) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$2,225,000” and inserting “\$2,250,000”.

SEC. 118. BUY AMERICA.

Section 313 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) WAIVERS.—

“(1) WRITTEN JUSTIFICATIONS.—If the Secretary determines that it is necessary to waive the application of subsection (a) in accordance with subsection (b), the Secretary shall, before the waiver becomes effective—

“(A) publish in the Federal Register a detailed written justification as to why the waiver is needed; and

“(B) provide the public with a reasonable period of time for notice and comment.

“(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on any waivers granted under subsection (b).”.

SEC. 119. EFFICIENT USE OF EXISTING HIGHWAY CAPACITY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study on the impacts of converting left and right highway safety shoulders to travel lanes.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall—

(1) analyze instances in which safety shoulders are used for general purpose vehicle traffic, high occupancy vehicles, and public transportation vehicles;

(2) analyze instances in which safety shoulders are not part of the roadway design;

(3) evaluate whether or not conversion of safety shoulders or the lack of a safety shoulder in the original roadway design has a significant impact on the number of accidents or has any other impact on highway safety; and

(4) compile relevant statistics.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

SEC. 120. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act (including subsection (b)), this Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this Act (other than the amendments made by sections 103, 105, 110, and 201(o)) to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109–59; 119 Stat. 1144) shall—

(A) take effect as of the date of enactment of that Act; and

(B) be treated as being included in that Act as of that date.

(2) EFFECT OF AMENDMENTS.—Each provision of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109–59; 119 Stat. 1144) (including the amendments made by that Act) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) that is amended by this Act (other than sections 103, 105, 110, and 201(o)) shall be treated as not being enacted.

TITLE II—TRANSIT PROVISIONS**SEC. 201. TRANSIT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.**

(a) SECTION 5302.—Section 5302(a)(10) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “charter,” and inserting “charter, sightseeing.”.

(b) SECTION 5303.—

(1) Section 5303(j)(3)(D) of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting “or the identified phase” before “within the time”; and

(B) by inserting “or the identified phase” before the period at the end.

(2) Section 5303(k)(2) of such title is amended by striking “a metropolitan planning area serving”.

(c) SECTION 5307.—Section 5307(b) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A) by striking “mass transportation” and inserting “public transportation”; and

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking “section 5305(a)” and inserting “section 5303(k)”.

(d) SECTION 5309.—Section 5309(m) of such title is amended—

(1) in the heading for paragraph (2)(A) by striking “MAJOR CAPITAL” and inserting “CAPITAL”; and

(2) in paragraph (7)(B) by striking “section 3039” and inserting “section 3045”.

(e) SECTION 5311.—Section 5311 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(1)(A) by striking “for any purpose other than operating assistance” and inserting “for a capital project or project administrative expenses”; and

(2) in subsections (g)(1)(A) and (g)(1)(B) by striking “capital” after “net”; and

(3) in subsection (i)(1) by striking “Sections 5323(a)(1)(D) and 5333(b) of this title apply” and inserting “Section 5333(b) applies”.

(f) SECTION 5312.—The heading for section 5312(c) of such title is amended by striking “MASS TRANSPORTATION” and inserting “PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION”.

(g) SECTION 5314.—Section 5314(a)(3) is amended by striking “section 5323(a)(1)(D)” and inserting “section 5333(b)”.

(h) SECTION 5319.—Section 5319 of such title is amended by striking “section 5307(k)” and inserting “section 5307(d)(1)(K)”.

(i) SECTION 5320.—Section 5320 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A) by striking “intra-agency” and inserting “intraagency”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(5)(A) by striking “5302(a)(1)(A)” and inserting “5302(a)(1)”;

(3) in subsection (d)(1) by inserting “to administer this section and” after “5333(b)(2)(J)”; and

(4) by adding at the end of subsection (d) the following:

“(4) TRANSFERS TO LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES.—The Secretary may transfer amounts available under paragraph (1) to the appropriate Federal land management agency to pay necessary costs of the agency for such activities described in paragraph (1) in connection with activities being carried out under this section.”.

(j) SECTION 5323.—Section 5323(n) of such title is amended by striking “section 5336(e)(2)” and inserting “section 5336(d)(2)”.

(k) SECTION 5325.—Section 5325(b) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting before the period at the end “adopted before August 10, 2005”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(l) SECTION 5336.—

(1) APPORTIONMENTS OF FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 5336 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking “Of the amount” and all that follows before paragraph (1) and inserting “Of the amount apportioned under subsection (i)(2) to carry out section 5307—”;

(B) in subsection (d)(1) by striking “subsections (a) and (h)(2) of section 5338” and inserting “subsections (a)(1)(C)(vi) and (b)(2)(B) of section 5338”; and

(C) by redesignating subsection (c), as added by section 3034(c) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1628), as subsection (k).

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 3034(d)(2) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1629), is amended by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “subsection (a)(2)”.

(m) SECTION 5337.—Section 5337(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009”.

(n) SECTION 5338.—Section 5338(d)(1)(B) of such title is amended by striking “section 5315(a)(16)” and inserting “section 5315(b)(2)(P)”.

(o) SAFETEA-LU.—

(1) SECTION 3037.—Section 3037(c)(3) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1636) is amended by striking “Phase II”.

(2) SECTION 3040.—Section 3040(4) of such Act (119 Stat. 1639) is amended by striking “\$7,871,895,000” and inserting “\$7,872,893,000”.

(3) SECTION 3043.—

(A) PORTLAND, OREGON.—Section 3043(b)(27) of such Act (119 Stat. 1642) is amended by inserting “Milwaukie” after “Mall”.

(B) SAN DIEGO.—Section 3043(c)(105) of such Act (119 Stat. 1645) is amended by striking “LOSSAN Del Mar-San Diego—Rail Corridor Improvements” and inserting “LOSSAN Rail Corridor Improvements”.

(C) SAN DIEGO.—Section 3043(c)(217) of such Act (119 Stat. 1648) is amended by striking “San Diego” and inserting “San Diego Transit”.

(D) LIVERMORE.—Section 3043(c) of such Act (119 Stat. 1645) is amended by inserting after paragraph (102) the following:

“(102A) Livermore, California—Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority BRT.”.

(E) SACRAMENTO.—Section 3043(c)(204) of such Act (119 Stat. 647) is amended by striking “Downtown”.

(4) SECTION 3044.—

(A) PROJECTS.—The table contained in section 3044(a) of such Act (119 Stat. 1652) is amended—

(i) in item 25—

(I) by striking “\$217,360” and inserting “\$167,360”; and

(II) by striking “\$225,720” and inserting “\$175,720”;

(ii) in item number 36 by striking the project description and inserting “Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) for bus and bus-related facilities in the LACMTA’s service area”;

(iii) in item number 71 by inserting “Metropolitan Bus Authority” after “Puerto Rico”;

(iv) in item number 84 by striking the project description and inserting “Improvements to the existing Sacramento Intermodal Facility (Sacramento Valley Station)”;

(v) in item number 94 by striking the project description and inserting “Pacific Transit, WA Vehicle Replacement”;

(vi) in item number 120 by striking “Dayton Airport Intermodal Rail Feasibility Study” and inserting “Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority bus facilities”;

(vii) in item number 152 by inserting “Metropolitan Bus Authority” after “Puerto Rico”;

(viii) in item number 416 by striking “Improve marine intermodal” and inserting “Improve marine dry-dock and”;

(ix) by adding at the end—

(I) in the project description column “666. New York City, NY, rehabilitation of subway stations to include passenger access improvements including escalators or installation of infrastructure for security and surveillance purposes”; and

(II) in each of the FY08 and FY09 columns by inserting “\$50,000”;

(x) in item number 457—

(I) by striking “\$65,000” and inserting “\$0”; and

(II) by striking “\$67,500” and inserting “\$0”; and

(xi) in item number 458—

(I) by striking “\$65,000” and inserting “\$130,000”;

(II) by striking “\$67,500” and inserting “\$135,000”; and

(xii) in item number 57 by striking the project description and inserting “Wilmington, NC, maintenance, operations and administration, transfer facilities”.

(B) SPECIAL RULE.—Section 3044(c) of such Act (119 Stat. 1705) is amended—

(i) by inserting “, or other entity,” after “State or local governmental authority”; and

(ii) by striking “projects numbered 258 and 347” and inserting “projects numbered 258, 347, and 411”.

(5) SECTION 3046.—Section 3046(a)(7) of such Act (119 Stat. 1708) is amended—

(A) by striking “hydrogen fuel cell vehicles” and inserting “hydrogen fueled vehicles”;

(B) by striking “hydrogen fuel cell employee shuttle vans” and inserting “hydrogen fueled employee shuttle vans”; and

(C) by striking “in Allentown, Pennsylvania” and inserting “to the DaVinci Center in Allentown, Pennsylvania”.

(6) SAN GABRIEL VALLEY—GOLD LINE FOOTHILL EXTENSION PHASE II.—In evaluating the local share of the San Gabriel Valley—Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase II project authorized by section 3043(b)(33) of such Act (119 Stat. 1642) in the new starts rating process, the Secretary of Transportation shall give consideration to project elements of the San Gabriel Valley—Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase I project advanced with 100 percent non-Federal funds.

TITLE III—OTHER PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the designation and heading for paragraph (1) and by striking paragraph (2).

(b) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—

(1) CORRECTIONS OF REFERENCES.—Section 4107(b) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1720) is amended—

(A) by striking “Section 31104” and inserting “Section 31144”; and

(B) in paragraph (1) by inserting “(c)” after “the second subsection”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7112 of such Act (119 Stat. 1899) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(c) PROHIBITED TRANSPORTATION.—Section 4114(c)(1) of the such Act (119 Stat. 1726) is amended by striking “the second subsection (c)” and inserting “(f)”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE RELATING TO MEDICAL EXAMINERS.—Section 4116(f) of such Act (119 Stat. 1728) is amended by striking “amendment made by subsection (a)” and inserting “amendments made by subsections (a) and (b)”.

(e) ROADABILITY TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 31151(a)(3)(E)(ii) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “Act” and inserting “section”.

(f) CORRECTION OF SUBSECTION REFERENCE.—Section 4121 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1734) is amended by striking “31139(f)(5)” and inserting “31139(g)(5)”.

(g) CDL LEARNER’S PERMIT PROGRAM TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 4122(2)(A) of such Act (119 Stat. 1734) is amended by striking “license” and inserting “licenses”.

(h) CDL INFORMATION SYSTEM FUNDING REFERENCE.—Section 31309(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “31318” and inserting “31313”.

(i) CLARIFICATION OF REFERENCE.—Section 229(a)(1) of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 (49 U.S.C. 31136 note; 119 Stat. 1743) is amended by inserting “of title 49, United States Code,” after “31502”.

(j) REGISTRATION OF BROKERS.—Section 4142(c)(2) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1747) is amended by inserting “each place it appears” before the semicolon.

(k) REDESIGNATION OF SECTION.—The second section 39 of chapter 2 of title 18, United States Code, relating to commercial motor vehicles required to stop for inspections, and the item relating to such section in the analysis for such chapter, are redesignated as section 40.

(l) OFFICE OF INTERMODALISM.—Section 5503 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(2) by striking “Surface Transportation Safety Improvement Act of 2005”, and inserting “Motor Carrier Safety Reauthorization Act of 2005”; and

(2) by redesignating the first subsection (h), relating to authorization of appropriations, as subsection (i) and moving it after the second subsection (h).

(m) USE OF FEES FOR UNIFIED CARRIER REGISTRATION SYSTEM.—Section 13908 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) USE OF FEES FOR UNIFIED CARRIER REGISTRATION SYSTEM.—Fees collected under this section may be credited to the Department of Transportation appropriations account for purposes for which such fees are collected and shall be available for expenditure for such purposes until expended.”.

(n) COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE DEFINITION.—Section 14504a(a)(1)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “a motor carrier required to make any filing or pay any fee to a State with respect to the motor carrier’s authority or insurance related to operation within such State, the motor carrier” and inserting “determining the size of a motor carrier or motor private carrier’s fleet in calculating the fee to be paid by a motor carrier or motor private carrier pursuant to subsection (f)(1), the motor carrier or motor private carrier”.

(o) CLARIFICATION OF UNREASONABLE BURDEN.—Section 14504a(c)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “inter-

state” the last place it appears and inserting “intrastate”.

(p) CONTENTS OF AGREEMENT TYPO.—Section 14504a(f)(1)(A)(ii) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “or” the last place it appears.

(q) OTHER UNIFIED CARRIER REGISTRATION SYSTEM TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 14504a of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1)(B) by striking “the a” and inserting “a”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(1)(A)(i) by striking “in connection with the filing of proof of financial responsibility”.

(r) TERMINATION OF REGISTRATION PROVISIONS.—Section 4305(a) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1764) is amended by striking “12 months” and inserting “24 months”.

(s) IDENTIFICATION OF VEHICLES.—Section 14506(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “or under an applicable State law if, on October 1, 2006, the State has a form of highway use taxation not subject to collection through the International Fuel Tax Agreement”.

(t) DRIVEAWAY SADDLEMOUNT VEHICLE.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 31111(a)(4) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading by striking “DRIVE-AWAY SADDLEMOUNT WITH FULLMOUNT” and inserting “DRIVEAWAY SADDLEMOUNT”;

(B) by striking “drive-away saddlemount with fullmount” and inserting “driveaway saddlemount”; and

(C) by inserting “Such combination may include one fullmount.” after the period at the end.

(2) IN GENERAL.—Section 31111(b)(1)(D) of such title is amended by striking “a driveaway saddlemount with fullmount” and inserting “all driveaway saddlemount”.

SEC. 302. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF HAZMAT EMPLOYEES.—Section 7102(2) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1892) is amended—

(1) by striking “(3)(A)” and inserting “(3)”;

(2) in subparagraph (A) by striking “clause (i)” and inserting “clause (i) of subparagraph (A)”;

(3) in subparagraph (B) by striking “clause (ii)” and inserting “subparagraph (A)(ii)”.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 5103a(g)(1)(B)(ii) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “Act” and inserting “subsection”.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—Section 7124(3) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1908) is amended by inserting “the first place it appears” before “and inserting”.

(d) REPORT.—Section 5121(h) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking “exemptions” and inserting “special permits”; and

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking “exemption” and inserting “special permit”.

(e) SECTION HEADING.—Section 5128 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the section designation and heading and inserting the following:

“§ 5128. Authorization of appropriations”.

(f) CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—The analysis for chapter 57 of title 49, United States Code, is amended in the item relating to section 5701 by striking “Transportation” and inserting “transportation”.

(g) NORMAN Y. MINETA RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT.—Section

5(b) of the Norman Y. Mineta Research and Special Programs Improvement Act (49 U.S.C. 108 note; 118 Stat. 2427) is amended by inserting “(including delegations by the Secretary of Transportation)” after “All orders”.

(h) SHIPPING PAPERS.—Section 5110(d)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking “SHIPPERS” and inserting “OFFERORS”; and

(2) by striking “shipper’s” and inserting “offeror’s”.

(i) NTSB RECOMMENDATIONS.—Section 19(1) of the Pipeline Inspection, Protection, Enforcement, and Safety Act of 2006 (49 U.S.C. 60102 note; 120 Stat. 3498) is amended by striking “165” and inserting “1165”.

SEC. 303. HIGHWAY SAFETY.

(a) STATE MINIMUM APPORTIONMENTS FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Effective October 1, 2007, section 402(c) of the title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “The annual apportionment to each State shall not be less than one-half of 1 per centum” and inserting “The annual apportionment to each State shall not be less than three-quarters of 1 percent”.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) Section 2002(b) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1521) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as (2) and (3), respectively.

(2) Section 2007(b)(1) of such Act (119 Stat. 1529) is amended—

(A) by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C).

(3) Effective August 10, 2005, section 410(c)(7)(B) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “clause (i)” and inserting “clauses (i) and (ii)”.

(4) Section 411 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by redesignating the second subsection (c), relating to administration expenses, and subsection (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

SEC. 304. REPEAL OF NATIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Section 11142 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1961), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents contained in section 1(b) of such Act, are repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1195.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is truly a compendium of technical corrections. When you look at a bill the magnitude of SAFETEA-LU and its extraordinary importance in our economy, and I be-

lieve the signature accomplishment of the last Congress, there are bound to be some drafting errors and other minor concerns in the legislation. We recognized those quite early on and had hoped to pass this bill, this technical corrections bill, during the last Congress; but it was never considered by the Senate, as are so many things that we do around here. Hopefully, this time we will get this needed work done.

There are some essential things to be accomplished in this legislation. There is an oversight in the bill that results in the Surface Transportation Research Development and Deployment account being oversubscribed. People say, who cares.

Well, actually it means that critical programs for the Federal Highway Administration Legacy Research and research programs will not be funded, and that creates a major problem. For instance, this would mean that we would not get the biennial “Conditions and Performance Report.” If we are going to maintain and improve our Nation’s transportation infrastructure, we need to understand its status, its condition, and its need for future investment as we move toward yet another transportation bill in the coming Congress.

It provides appraisals of highways, bridges, and transit finance, their expenditures in those accounts, and compares it to the needs we have, operational performance and future investment requirements.

It also would free up additional funding for the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, something that was created as part of SAFETEA-LU and has yet to get its work accomplished. We have charged them with both looking at and assessing the future needs, building on the requirements I just mentioned, the annual reports of the Department of Transportation, but even going beyond that to determine our infrastructure needs both to maintain the current infrastructure, to enhance it, and to mitigate congestion and to move toward a less congested and more fuel-efficient transportation future.

They have also been charged with looking at how we pay for these vital investments and assessing the current revenue source, the gas tax, and some assorted excise taxes with future needs. This is again critical work to be done by that commission.

This will better fund their work and give them some of the staff assistance they need, give them the capability of obtaining the data that they need, and extend the deadline for the report to Congress, which will be a crucial building block in the next transportation bill, by 6 months. We have now set a deadline of December 31, 2007.

The bill also clarifies something regarding a sense of Congress regarding the buy America requirement. We feel that the Federal Highway Administration is not implementing the Buy America Act consistent with our,

Congress’s, statutory intent. They are beginning to break projects down into segments in a way that was not anticipated so that they can basically go around some of the buy America requirements. We want to reinforce here that the separate component test is not what we intended, and the amendment included in this bill is intended to clarify congressional intent and provide guidance to the Federal Highway Administration in the implementation of that section of the bill.

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for leading the charge on this important technical corrections bill. I want to voice my support for H.R. 1195, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

In the time that has passed since SAFETEA-LU was signed into law, we have heard from the Department of Transportation and several States regarding fixes to different programs and high-priority projects. H.R. 1195 addresses most of the areas that need correction.

It is important to note that this bill does not make substantial policy changes to SAFETEA-LU. Rather, this bill corrects provisions that were not workable in SAFETEA-LU. After we pass this bill, SAFETEA-LU will finally be able to accomplish what Congress voted to do 2 years ago.

The bulk of this bill is section 105, which makes changes to over 200 of the high-priority projects in section 1702 of SAFETEA-LU. These changes address surface transportation projects in the bill that were unable to be executed, clarifying recipients, and increasing certain project funding levels, and decreasing others to achieve budget neutrality.

The bill also makes a critical correction in the Transportation Research Program authorized in SAFETEA-LU. Errors were made in the research section of SAFETEA-LU that weakened the legacy research programs carried out by the Department of Transportation. This bill addresses that problem.

The bill also extends the reporting deadline for the National Surface Transportation Policy and Review Study Commission established in SAFETEA-LU. This important commission is tasked with recommending a new direction in funding and policy for our surface transportation programs, and we look forward to seeing their final report.

Again, thank you, Mr. Chairman, for revitalizing this technical corrections bill. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting the bill.

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

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for bringing this bill forth, and Mr. OBERSTAR, the chairman of the full committee. This was our bill. We worked on this jointly. Some people say, Why do you need a technical corrections bill?

If you remember, every highway bill we have ever passed has gone through a series of technical correction adjustments because when we write a bill, sometimes it is misinterpreted by highway departments and municipalities. This is purely a technical corrections bill. It adds nothing; it takes nothing away.

Again, we passed a good piece of legislation 2 years ago. It has been implemented, but it will be implemented in a better way with these corrections.

I have talked with the gentleman from Oregon and all he has to say is "yes" or "no." Regarding Providence Hospital of Anchorage, we are looking for a solution to a problem. I agree that we shouldn't be paying for something that is already done, but I would like to have those moneys available to improve the transportation to the center hub of health care in the city of Anchorage. It is my understanding that the gentleman has agreed to work with me in conference to try to solve that problem.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Absolutely. The gentleman from Alaska has had extensive conversation with the chairman of the committee. It is my understanding that he is fully committed to helping resolve this issue.

There is a problem with retroactive reimbursement, but we are looking at other ways to deal with critical access to a vital health facility in Anchorage.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman, and I look forward to working with the gentleman and the chairman of the full committee on the new highway bill.

I believe that the adjustments in this bill for the commission are set up for finding ways to fund, and it is crucially important to make sure that they have enough time to do that job. We are right in the process of not only finishing up SAFETEA-LU, but now we are in the process of beginning to write another bill which has to address the issue of transportation in this country.

As you know how strong I supported the funding and the methods of funding previously was not successful, I think this Congress has a responsibility to provide the transportation for the Nation as a whole that can do the job.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his leadership as chairman of the full committee as we went through that process in the last Congress, and also the fact that he is willing to get out front at the begin-

ning to begin to try to address what is actually an investment deficit so far as it goes to transportation in the United States, something that can be easily recognized if one travels to other countries and sees how committed they are, particularly to competitors like China and the investments they are making which are absolutely on a massive scale to make their economy more efficient to move their people more efficiently.

We need to not only maintain what we have and live on the benefits of our past investment; we need to ensure more robust future investments. I assure the gentleman I have begun a series of hearings that are on two tracks in the subcommittee I chair to look both at the future investment needs and also potential ways to raise the funds we need to make those investments.

I look forward to working with the gentleman and others as we go through that process.

I do want to assure Members since there is a new sensitivity around here about PAYGO that H.R. 1195 complies fully with House budget rules; and although it only addresses changes to previously authorized projects, not new projects, it also fully adheres to the new House Member earmark disclosure requirements.

This is legislation that I recommend wholly to my colleagues, and they can vote for it in good conscience. It will help build our future and realize the full dream of SAFETEA-LU as we move through its full term.

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. MICA, and certainly their staffs, for working so hard together to rectify the technical corrections that we are addressing in SAFETEA-LU. And I also want to thank our former chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), for his hard work in providing the leadership that we had in the last Congress to get the SAFETEA-LU bill done.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1195 makes technical corrections to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, or SAFETEA-LU.

This is the third time we have worked to finalize these technical corrections to SAFETEA-LU. During the 109th Congress, the House passed H.R. 5689, a bill to make technical corrections to SAFETEA-LU in June 2006.

During the summer and fall of 2006, we worked with the Senate to create H.R. 6233, which is a very similar product to the bill we are considering today. Now, we are trying again.

As my colleagues have just said, H.R. 1195 makes numerous technical corrections to Federal surface transportation programs authorized by SAFETEA-LU. The technical corrections included in this bill have been identified by the Department of Transportation and are mostly of a conforming nature, or to correct drafting errors. The most important correction

we are making is to strengthen the Federal Highway research program by ensuring the continuation of the legacy research programs carried out by the Department of Transportation.

The majority of this bill is section 105, which makes changes to over 200 of the high priority projects in sec. 1702 of SAFETEA-LU. These changes address "broken" surface transportation projects, clarifying recipients and increasing certain project funding levels and decreasing others to achieve budget neutrality.

There is one purely technical correction that is not included in this package. SAFETEA-LU inadvertently changed certain regulations for trucks with a gross vehicle weight of less than 10,000 pounds.

One of the implications of this error is that operators of these trucks no longer have to register or file insurance with DOT. Consequently, DOT can not regulate them for safety purposes.

When Congress passed SAFETEA-LU, this change was not a policy change Congress knew about or intended to make. If Congress wanted to make this change, we would have debated and discussed it. Rather, this was something we were not aware of and has had very serious unintended consequences—especially for small businesses.

I hope the Chairman, along with our colleagues in the Senate, will work with me to correct this technical problem.

Despite the omission of this important correction, I still support this legislation and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1195, a bill to make technical corrections to the surface transportation act, SAFETEA-LU.

H.R. 1195 makes technical corrections to the surface transportation act, Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), enacted in 2005. This is a non-controversial, bipartisan bill that is intended to correct drafting errors, make technical fixes, and clarify Congressional intent on several provisions of the SAFETEA-LU.

This legislation is very similar to the two bills that passed the House last year, but were never considered by the Senate.

Although H.R. 1195, as amended, only addresses changes to previously authorized projects, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, per my direction, has required Members of Congress to submit earmark disclosure certifications pursuant to Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. In addition, the bill, as amended, complies with pay-as-you-go budget rules.

SAFETEA-LU has been very successful and effective. Building on previous surface transportation acts, SAFETEA-LU provides the programmatic framework and investments necessary to begin addressing the nation's growing surface transportation needs. However, as with legislation of this magnitude, there were inadvertent drafting errors. The changes in this bill are required to ensure that all policies, programs, and projects embodied in the authorization act are implemented as intended by Congress.

In particular, this bill makes critical fixes to the transportation research program authorized in SAFETEA-LU. Errors were made in the research program funding calculations that resulted in lower than intended funding levels

in several research programs. These technical fixes will recapture critical research funds for many essential programs, including:

The Future Strategic Highway Research Program, a concentrated, results-oriented research program focused on solving the top problems of highway safety, reliability, capacity, and renewal; and

The University Transportation Center Program which advances U.S. technology and expertise in the many disciplines comprising transportation through the mechanisms of education, research, and technology.

The bill also clarifies section 1928 of SAFETEA-LU regarding the Sense of Congress concerning Buy America requirements for Federal-aid highway bridge projects. Congress does not believe that the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA") is implementing the Buy America Act consistent with the statutory intent. Specifically, the "additional cost test" should be conducted on the basis of an entire bridge project, not on separate components of the bridge project. Regrettably, FHWA has applied the test to separate components of a bridge project if the project is broken into several components for contracting purposes. The original Sense of Congress, as well as the amendment included in this bill, is intended to clarify Congressional intent and to provide guidance to the FHWA in its implementation.

Finally, H.R. 1195 modifies the Repeat Intoxicated Driver Law to allow for the use of ignition interlock devices. This change gives States more flexibility to either continue with the current one-year license suspension requirement for repeat offenders, or permit a 45-day license suspension, after which limited driving privileges are reinstated provided an ignition interlock device is placed on the offender's vehicle.

Repeat offenders are a significant part of the United States drunk driving problem, representing about one-third of all Driving Under the Influence (DUI) arrests each year. It is estimated that between 50 and 75 percent of repeat offenders whose licenses have been suspended continue to drive illegally. An ignition interlock device prevents offenders who have alcohol in their system from operating their vehicle, but allows them to continue to drive to work, school, or an alcohol treatment program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1195.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters between Mr. GORDON and myself regarding this bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, March 26, 2007.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science and Technology in matters being considered in H.R. 1195, to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make technical corrections, and for other purposes. The bill amends research portions of H.R. 3, Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (P.L. 109-59), which are within the Committee on Science and Technology's jurisdiction.

The Committee on Science and Technology acknowledges the importance of H.R. 1195

and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I agree not to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forgo a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology and that a copy of this letter and of your response will be included in the Congressional Record when the bill is considered on the House Floor.

The Committee on Science and Technology also asks that you support our request to be conferees on any provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

BART GORDON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, March 26, 2007.

Hon. BART GORDON,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GORDON: Thank you for your March 26, 2007 letter regarding H.R. 1195, to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make technical corrections, and for other purposes. Your support for this legislation and your assistance in ensuring its timely consideration are greatly appreciated.

I agree that the research provisions in the bill are of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Science and Technology. I acknowledge that by forgoing a sequential referral, your Committee is not relinquishing its jurisdiction and I will fully support your request to be represented in a House Senate conference on those provisions over which the Committee on Science and Technology has jurisdiction in H.R. 1195.

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

Sincerely,

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Chairman for revitalizing this important technical corrections bill and voice my support for H.R. 1195. I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

There were many minor errors—in policy and in Members projects—in SAFETEA-LU that need technical correction.

Most people may not remember, but the House and Senate actually passed a SAFETEA-LU technical corrections bill that was signed into law in October 2005. That bill was taken up with extreme urgency because it prevented the accidental shutdown of boat safety programs.

In the time that has passed since the October 2005 SAFETEA-LU technical corrections bill was signed into law, we have heard from DOT and various states regarding fixes to different programs and high priority projects. I believe H.R. 1195 addresses most of the areas which need correction.

It is important to note that this bill does not make substantial policy changes to SAFETEA-LU. Rather, this bill corrects provisions that were not "workable" in SAFETEA-LU. After we pass this bill, SAFETEA-LU will finally be able to accomplish what Congress voted to do 2 years ago.

H.R. 1195 addresses all of the true technical corrections except one. This bill does not include a correction to an error in the motor carrier title of SAFETEA-LU.

In SAFETEA-LU, we attempted to harmonize the definition of "commercial motor vehicle" with "motor vehicle". Unintentionally, this change removed trucks weighing 10,000 lbs or less from the truck exemption of the Fair Labor Standards Act and from DOT's safety oversight.

I am very concerned with this change in policy that was never negotiated for or discussed during the bill's original conference.

Now, small trucking business, who will have to change their business plan in order to comply with the law, are going to suffer the most. These are the small businesses who have high overhead and small profits, but are providing necessary services and products to urban areas and rural towns across the country.

This change is going to create great hardships on the small companies who are already in the business and most likely will inhibit others from entering the business.

It is disappointing this Congress has not addressed this problem, but I hope we can do so before final passage of this bill.

Again, thank you, Mr. Chairman, for revitalizing this technical correction bill and I hope all my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 1195. This bill will make essential technical corrections to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act.

I want to thank my friend, Rep. JAMES OBERSTAR, and the Members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for bringing this legislation to the floor.

This legislation will provide support for vital projects to my home state of California, and in particular to the city of San Bernardino, located in my district. I commend the Chairman for his foresight in giving states the flexibility our districts need to carry out these important transportation projects.

I am particularly pleased this bill includes a technical correction for High Priority Project # 2826. This change will allow transportation officials in the Inland Empire to double the number of grade separations constructed on the Alameda Corridor East.

There is no doubt this project will go a long way to help reduce congestion and improve road safety for residents in my home district and all Californians traveling to and from the Inland Empire. I urge my colleagues to support our local communities and cast a vote in favor of H.R. 1195.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1195, 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.

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 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR) at 6 o'clock and 30 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. 802, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 137, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 580, by the yeas and nays.

The vote on H. Res. 266 will be taken tomorrow.

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

MARITIME POLLUTION PREVENTION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 802, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 802, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 359, nays 48, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—359

Abercrombie	Blumenauer	Castor
Ackerman	Bono	Chabot
Aderholt	Boozman	Chandler
Akin	Boren	Clarke
Allen	Boswell	Clay
Altmire	Boucher	Cleaver
Andrews	Boustany	Clyburn
Arcuri	Boyd (FL)	Coble
Baca	Boyda (KS)	Cohen
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Cole (OK)
Baird	Braley (IA)	Conaway
Baldwin	Brown (SC)	Conyers
Barrow	Buchanan	Cooper
Bean	Burgess	Costa
Becerra	Butterfield	Costello
Berkley	Calvert	Courtney
Berman	Camp (MI)	Cramer
Berry	Campbell (CA)	Cranshaw
Biggert	Cannon	Cuellar
Bilbray	Capito	Culberson
Bilirakis	Capps	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Davis (AL)
Bishop (NY)	Carmahan	Davis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Carney	Davis (IL)
Blackburn	Castle	Davis, Lincoln

Davis, Tom	Kilpatrick	Regula
DeFazio	Kind	Rehberg
DeGette	King (NY)	Reichert
Delahunt	Kirk	Renzi
DeLauro	Klein (FL)	Reyes
Dent	Knollenberg	Reynolds
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Dicks	LaHood	Rogers (MI)
Dingell	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Doggett	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen
Donnelly	Lantos	Roskam
Doolittle	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Doyle	Larson (CT)	Rothman
Drake	LaTham	Roybal-Allard
Dreier	LaTourette	Royce
Duncan	Lee	Ruppel
Ehlers	Levin	Rush
Ellison	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Ellsworth	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (WI)
Emanuel	Lipinski	Salazar
Emerson	LoBiondo	Salazar
Engel	Loeb	Sánchez, Linda
English (PA)	Lofgren, Zoe	T.
Eshoo	Lowe	Sanchez, Loretta
Etheridge	Lucas	Sarbanes
Fallin	Lungren, Daniel	Saxton
Farr	E.	Schakowsky
Fattah	Lynch	Schiff
Ferguson	Mahoney (FL)	Schmidt
Filner	Maloney (NY)	Schwartz
Forbes	Manzullo	Scott (GA)
Fortenberry	Markey	Scott (VA)
Fossella	Marshall	Serrano
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Sestak
Frelinghuysen	Matsui	Shadegg
Gallely	McCarthy (CA)	Shays
Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (NY)	Shea-Porter
Gerlach	McCaul (TX)	Sherman
Giffords	McCollum (MN)	Shimkus
Gilchrest	McCotter	Shuler
Gillibrand	McDermott	Simpson
Gillmor	McGovern	Sires
Gonzalez	McHugh	Skelton
Goodlatte	McIntyre	Slaughter
Granger	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Graves	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Green, Al	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Green, Gene	McNerney	Snyder
Grijalva	McNulty	Solis
Gutierrez	Meehan	Space
Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)	Spratt
Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Stark
Hare	Melancon	Stupak
Harman	Mica	Sutton
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Tanner
Hastings (WA)	Miller (NC)	Tauscher
Hayes	Miller, Gary	Taylor
Heller	Miller, George	Terry
Hensarling	Mitchell	Thompson (CA)
Hergert	Mollohan	Thompson (MS)
Herseth	Moore (KS)	Tiahrt
Higgins	Moore (WI)	Tjiberti
Hill	Moran (KS)	Tierney
Hinchey	Moran (VA)	Towns
Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)	Turner
Hirono	Murphy, Patrick	Udall (CO)
Hobson	Murphy, Tim	Upton
Hodes	Murtha	Van Hollen
Hoekstra	Musgrave	Velazquez
Holden	Myrick	Visclosky
Holt	Nadler	Walberg
Honda	Napolitano	Walden (OR)
Hooey	Neugebauer	Walz (MN)
Hoyer	Nunes	Wasserman
Hulshof	Oberstar	Schultz
Hulshof	Inglis (SC)	Waters
Inslee	Oliver	Watson
Israel	Ortiz	Watt
Issa	Pallone	Waxman
Jackson (IL)	Pascrell	Weiner
Jackson-Lee	Pastor	Welch (VT)
(TX)	Pearce	Weldon (FL)
Jefferson	Perlmutter	Weller
Jindal	Peterson (MN)	Whitfield
Johnson (GA)	Petri	Wicker
Johnson (IL)	Pickering	Wilson (NM)
Johnson, E. B.	Pitts	Wilson (OH)
Johnson, Sam	Platts	Wilson (SC)
Jones (NC)	Pomeroy	Wolf
Jones (OH)	Porter	Woolsey
Jordan	Pryce (OH)	Wu
Kagen	Putnam	Wynn
Kaptur	Radanovich	Yarmuth
Keller	Rahall	Young (AK)
Kennedy	Ramstad	Young (FL)
Kildee	Rangel	

NAYS—48

Alexander	Davis, David	Miller (FL)
Bachmann	Deal (GA)	Miller (MI)
Baker	Everett	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Foxx	Pence
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	Poe
Barton (TX)	Gingrey	Price (GA)
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Rogers (AL)
Blunt	Goode	Sali
Boehner	Hastert	Sensenbrenner
Bonner	Brown-Waite,	King (IA)
Brown-Waite,	Ginny	Kingston
Burton (IN)	Burton (IN)	Kline (MN)
Buyer	Buyer	Lewis (KY)
Cantor	Cantor	Linder
Carter	Carter	Mack
Cubin	Cubin	McCrery
Davis (KY)	Davis (KY)	McHenry

NOT VOTING—26

Brady (PA)	Gordon	Peterson (PA)
Brown, Corrine	Hunter	Price (NC)
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Shuster
Carson	Lampson	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Marchant	Souder
Davis, Jo Ann	Millender	Udall (NM)
Edwards	McDonald	Walsh (NY)
Feeney	Neal (MA)	Wamp
Flake	Payne	Wexler

□ 1854

Mr. POE and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships to implement MARPOL Annex VI.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANIMAL FIGHTING PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 137, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 137, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 39, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—368

Abercrombie	Bartlett (MD)	Boswell
Ackerman	Bean	Boucher
Aderholt	Becerra	Boustany
Akin	Berkley	Boyd (FL)
Alexander	Berman	Boyd (KS)
Allen	Berry	Braley (IA)
Altmire	Biggert	Brown (SC)
Andrews	Bilbray	Brown-Waite,
Arcuri	Bilirakis	Ginny
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Buchanan
Bachmann	Bishop (NY)	Burgess
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Burton (IN)
Baird	Blackburn	Butterfield
Baker	Blumenauer	Buyer
Baldwin	Bonner	Calvert
Barrett (SC)	Bono	Camp (MI)
Barrow	Boozman	Campbell (CA)

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

NAYS—39

NOT VOTING—26

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

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

□ 1903

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.

INTERIM APPOINTMENT OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 580, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 580, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 329, nays 78, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—329

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Baca
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)

Boyd (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Castle

Castro
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallely
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)

Jackson-Lee
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim

Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Rogers (NY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Pastor
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woodsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—78

Aderholt	Davis (KY)	McCrery
Akin	Davis, David	McHenry
Bachmann	Deal (GA)	Mica
Baker	Doollittle	Miller (FL)
Barrett (SC)	Duncan	Musgrave
Barton (TX)	English (PA)	Myrick
Bishop (UT)	Everett	Nunes
Blackburn	Fox	Poe
Blunt	Franks (AZ)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Gingrey	Reynolds
Bonner	Granger	Rogers (AL)
Bono	Graves	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	Roskam
Brown (SC)	Hastert	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Hayes	Sali
Buyer	Hergert	Schmidt
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Jordan	Sessions
Cantor	Kingston	Smith (NE)
Carter	Kline (MN)	Tiahrt
Chabot	Lamborn	Tiberi
Coble	LaTourette	Turner
Conaway	Lewis (KY)	Westmoreland
Crenshaw	Linder	Wicker
Cubin	Manzullo	Wilson (SC)
Culberson	McCarthy (CA)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—26

Brady (PA)	Hunter	Peterson (PA)
Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Shuster
Carson	Lampson	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Marchant	Souder
Davis, Jo Ann	Millender	Udall (NM)
Feeney	McDonald	Walsh (NY)
Flake	Neal (MA)	Wamp
Gordon	Payne	Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

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

□ 1911

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.

NATO FREEDOM CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 494) to endorse further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and to facilitate the timely admission of new members to NATO, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 494

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 "NATO Freedom Consolidation Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The sustained commitment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to mu-

tual defense has made possible the democratic transformation of Central and Eastern Europe. Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization can and should play a critical role in addressing the security challenges of the post-Cold War era in creating the stable environment needed for those emerging democracies in Europe.

(2) Lasting stability and security in Europe requires the military, economic, and political integration of emerging democracies into existing European structures.

(3) In an era of threats from terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is increasingly contributing to security in the face of global security challenges for the protection and interests of its member states.

(4) In the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that "full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area should be invited to become full NATO members in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty at an early date. . . ."

(5) In the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress called for the prompt admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and declared that "in order to promote economic stability and security in Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine . . . the process of enlarging NATO to include emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should not be limited to consideration of admitting Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia as full members of the NATO Alliance".

(6) In the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that "Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic should not be the last emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe invited to join NATO" and that "Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria . . . would make an outstanding contribution to furthering the goals of NATO and enhancing stability, freedom, and peace in Europe should they become NATO members [and] upon complete satisfaction of all relevant criteria should be invited to become full NATO members at the earliest possible date".

(7) In the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-187; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress endorsed " . . . the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996".

(8) At the Madrid Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in July 1997, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were invited to join the Alliance, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization heads of state and government issued a declaration stating "[t]he alliance expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the [North Atlantic] Treaty will be excluded from consideration".

(9) At the Washington Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in April 1999, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization heads of state and government issued a

communiqué declaring "[w]e pledge that NATO will continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the [North Atlantic] Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area . . . [t]he three new members will not be the last . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration, regardless of its geographic location . . .".

(10) In May 2000 in Vilnius, Lithuania, the foreign ministers of Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia issued a statement (later joined by Croatia) declaring that—

(A) their countries will cooperate in jointly seeking membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the next round of enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

(B) the realization of membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization by one or more of these countries would be a success for all; and

(C) eventual membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for all of these countries would be a success for Europe and for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(11) On June 15, 2001, in a speech in Warsaw, Poland, President George W. Bush stated "[a]ll of Europe's new democracies, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the same chance for security and freedom—and the same chance to join the institutions of Europe—as Europe's old democracies have . . . I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibilities that NATO brings . . . [a]s we plan to enlarge NATO, no nation should be used as a pawn in the agenda of others . . . [w]e will not trade away the fate of free European peoples . . . [n]o more Munichs . . . [n]o more Yaltas . . . [a]s we plan the Prague Summit, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom".

(12) On October 22, 1996, in a speech in Detroit, Michigan, former President William J. Clinton stated "NATO's doors will not close behind its first new members . . . NATO should remain open to all of Europe's emerging democracies who are ready to shoulder the responsibilities of membership . . . [n]o nation will be automatically excluded . . . [n]o country outside NATO will have a veto . . . [a] gray zone of insecurity must not re-emerge in Europe".

(13) At the Prague Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in November 2002, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia were invited to join the Alliance in the second round of enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization since the end of the Cold War, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization heads of state and government issued a declaration stating "NATO's door will remain open to European democracies willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, in accordance with Article 10 of the Washington Treaty".

(14) On May 8, 2003, the United States Senate unanimously approved the Resolution of Ratification to Accompany Treaty Document No. 108-4, Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on Accession of Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia, inviting Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(15) At the Istanbul Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in June 2004, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

heads of state and government issued a communiqué reaffirming that NATO's door remains open to new members, declaring "[w]e celebrate the success of NATO's Open Door Policy, and reaffirm today that our seven new members will not be the last. The door to membership remains open. We welcome the progress made by Albania, Croatia, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (1) in implementing their Annual National Programmes under the Membership Action Plan, and encourage them to continue pursuing the reforms necessary to progress toward NATO membership. We also commend their contribution to regional stability and cooperation. We want all three countries to succeed and will continue to assist them in their reform efforts. NATO will continue to assess each country's candidacy individually, based on the progress made towards reform goals pursued through the Membership Action Plan, which will remain the vehicle to keep the readiness of each aspirant for membership under review. We direct that NATO Foreign Ministers keep the enlargement process, including the implementation of the Membership Action Plan, under continual review and report to us. We will review at the next Summit progress by aspirants towards membership based on that report".

(16) Georgia and Ukraine have stated their desire to join the Euro-Atlantic community, and in particular, are seeking to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Georgia and Ukraine are working closely with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its members to meet criteria for eventual membership in NATO.

(17) At a press conference with President Mikhaïl Saakashvili of Georgia in Washington, D.C. on July 5, 2006, President George W. Bush stated that "... I believe that NATO would benefit with Georgia being a member of NATO, and I think Georgia would benefit. And there's a way forward through the Membership Action Plan ... And I'm a believer in the expansion of NATO. I think it's in the world's interest that we expand NATO".

(18) Following a meeting of NATO Foreign Ministers in New York on September 21, 2006, NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer announced the launching of an Intensified Dialogue on membership between the Alliance and Georgia.

(19) At the NATO-Ukraine Commission Summit in Brussels in February 2005, President of Ukraine Victor Yushchenko declared membership in NATO as the ultimate goal of Ukraine's cooperation with the Alliance and expressed Ukraine's desire to conclude a Membership Action Plan.

(20) At the NATO-Ukraine Commission Foreign Ministerial meeting in Vilnius in April 2005, NATO and Ukraine launched an Intensified Dialogue on the potential membership of Ukraine in NATO.

(21) At the Riga Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in November 2006, the Heads of State and Government of the member countries of NATO issued a declaration reaffirming that NATO's door remains open to new members, declaring that "all European democratic countries may be considered for MAP (Membership Action Plan) or admission, subject to decision by the NAC (North Atlantic Council) at each stage, based on the performance of these countries towards meeting the objectives of the North Atlantic Treaty. We direct that NATO Foreign Ministers keep that process under continual review and report to us. We welcome the efforts of Albania, Croatia, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to prepare themselves for the responsibilities and obligations of membership. We reaffirm that the Alliance will continue with Georgia

and Ukraine its Intensified Dialogues which cover the full range of political, military, financial and security issues relating to those countries' aspirations to membership, without prejudice to any eventual Alliance decision. We reaffirm the importance of the NATO-Ukraine Distinctive Partnership, which has its 10th anniversary next year and welcome the progress that has been made in the framework of our Intensified Dialogue. We appreciate Ukraine's substantial contributions to our common security, including through participation in NATO-led operations and efforts to promote regional cooperation. We encourage Ukraine to continue to contribute to regional security. We are determined to continue to assist, through practical cooperation, in the implementation of far-reaching reform efforts, notably in the fields of national security, defence, reform of the defence-industrial sector and fighting corruption. We welcome the commencement of an Intensified Dialogue with Georgia as well as Georgia's contribution to international peacekeeping and security operations. We will continue to engage actively with Georgia in support of its reform process. We encourage Georgia to continue progress on political, economic and military reforms, including strengthening judicial reform, as well as the peaceful resolution of outstanding conflicts on its territory. We reaffirm that it is of great importance that all parties in the region should engage constructively to promote regional peace and stability."

(22) Contingent upon their continued implementation of democratic, defense, and economic reform, and their willingness and ability to meet the responsibilities of membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and a clear expression of national intent to do so, Congress calls for the timely admission of Albania, Croatia, Georgia, Macedonia (FYROM), and Ukraine to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to promote security and stability in Europe.

SEC. 3. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

Congress—

(1) reaffirms its previous expressions of support for continued enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization contained in the NATO Participation Act of 1994, the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, the European Security Act of 1998, and the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2002;

(2) supports the commitment to further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to include European democracies that are able and willing to meet the responsibilities of Membership, as expressed by the Alliance in its Madrid Summit Declaration of 1997, its Washington Summit Communiqué of 1999, its Prague Summit Declaration of 2002, its Istanbul Summit Communiqué of 2004, and its Riga Summit Declaration of 2006; and

(3) endorses the vision of further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and urges our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to work with the United States to realize a role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in promoting global security, including continued support for enlargement to include qualified candidate states, specifically by entering into a Membership Action Plan with Georgia and recognizing the progress toward meeting the responsibilities and obligations of NATO membership by Albania, Croatia, Georgia, Macedonia (FYROM), and Ukraine.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF ALBANIA, CROATIA, GEORGIA, MACEDONIA (FYROM), AND UKRAINE AS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.

(a) DESIGNATION.—

(1) ALBANIA.—The Republic of Albania is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(2) CROATIA.—The Republic of Croatia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(3) GEORGIA.—Georgia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(4) MACEDONIA (FYROM).—The Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(5) UKRAINE.—Ukraine is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The designation of the Republic of Albania, the Republic of Croatia, Georgia, the Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), and Ukraine pursuant to subsection (a) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994—

(1) is in addition to the designation of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia pursuant to section 606 of the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), the designation of Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria pursuant to section 2703(b) of the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), and the designation of Slovakia pursuant to section 4(a) of the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-187; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994; and

(2) shall not preclude the designation by the President of other countries pursuant to section 203(d)(2) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of such Act.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DESIGNATED UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.

Of the amounts made available for fiscal year 2008 under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763) such sums as may be necessary are authorized to be appropriated for assistance to the Republic of Albania, the Republic of Croatia, Georgia, the Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), and Ukraine.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1915

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 835, HAWAIIAN HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-73) on the resolution (H. Res. 269) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 835) to reauthorize the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for housing assistance for Native Hawaiians, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1401, RAIL AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-74) on the resolution (H. Res. 270) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1401) to improve the security of railroads, public transportation, and over-the-road buses in the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROTECT IMPORTANT TAX RELIEF

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my concern that the Democrats will not extend tax measures critical to the American people. Residents in my own State are at risk. Floridians currently can deduct their sales tax from the Federal income tax. However, this deduction expires this year.

As Democrats set their agenda for the coming year, there is talk of offsetting increases in Federal spending by raising taxes for millions of Americans. Quite frankly, I worry that the use of this provision will be to pay for additional spending. Constituents don't want additional taxes. They want us to be more conservative in spending.

Listen up, America. Congress needs to be sure that taxpayers do not face unnecessary tax increases. I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that our constituents are able to keep more of their hard-earned money.

GRANDMOTHER AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the U.S. Attorney General, Alberto Gonzales, is the chief law enforcement officer in this Nation. He is the most powerful prosecutor in America. As such, his credibility is based on his word. He

must never deceive, mislead or misstate.

There have been two different accounts by his office about the firings of some U.S. Attorneys. Gonzalez says he never has discussed the firings, but secret memos show a meeting to discuss such was held in his very office where he was present. Both statements cannot be true. His word is tarnished.

The issue is not whether the administration can fire U.S. Attorneys. It can do so for almost any reason under the law.

Madam Speaker, growing up, my grandmother was the Chief Law Enforcement Officer. Her word was the law. I never doubted what she said. I respected her because she was always bluntly truthful. If she had told me it was raining in my house, I would have rushed home and started putting plastic over the furniture, because she never misled or misstated the truth.

This Nation deserves better than to have an Attorney General who cannot be forthright with Congress and misleads the citizens he has been sworn to protect. He has a credibility issue. His word should be as bluntly truthful as my grandmother's.

And that's just the way it is.

AMERICA MUST BECOME ENERGY INDEPENDENT

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, in 2004, the United States of America spent \$103 billion buying oil from non-democratic countries, such countries as Venezuela, as Iran, as Russia, and even ones who are our allies like Saudi Arabia, where some of that money finds its way into the hands of terrorist groups.

We are funding both sides in the war on terrorism. It is a national security issue. We have to get off Middle East oil, and we need to reduce our oil dependency. We import 60 percent of our oil today.

Congressman ELIOT ENGEL and I have introduced H.R. 670. The goal of it is to reduce our oil consumption by 20 percent in 20 years. It has overwhelming bipartisan support, both in the House and the Senate.

Now, if you don't buy that, there is another reason to focus on this, and it has to do with your pocketbook. Just think about the flexibility that we have out there in fuel choices, from ethanol to biodiesel to battery operated cars.

Madam Speaker, we need to move in this direction. I recommend H.R. 670 to my colleagues and hope they will co-sponsor it with me.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATSON). 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.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, 110TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Committee on the Judiciary adopted these rules by voice vote, a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on January 24, 2007.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, RULES OF PROCEDURE, ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS, ADOPTED JANUARY 24, 2007

Rule I. The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary and its Subcommittees with the following specific additions thereto.

RULE II. COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee on the Judiciary for the conduct of its business shall be on Wednesday of each week while the House is in session.

(b) Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman and a regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with when, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor.

(c) At least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session) before each scheduled Committee or Subcommittee meeting, each Member of the Committee or Subcommittee shall be furnished a list of the bill(s) and subject(s) to be considered and/or acted upon at the meeting. Bills or subjects not listed shall be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or Subcommittee.

(d) In an emergency that does not reasonably allow for 24 hours' notice, the Chairman may waive the 24-hour notice requirement with the agreement of the Ranking Minority Member.

(e) Committee and Subcommittee meetings for the transaction of business, i.e. meetings other than those held for the purpose of taking testimony, shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(f) Every motion made to the Committee and entertained by the Chairman shall be reduced to writing upon demand of any Member, and a copy made available to each Member present.

(g) For purposes of taking any action at a meeting of the full Committee or any Subcommittee thereof, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of not less than one-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee, except that a full majority of the Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of reporting a measure or recommendation from the Committee or Subcommittee, closing a meeting to the public, or authorizing the issuance of a subpoena.

(h)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2), the Chairman may postpone further proceedings

when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time.

(2) In exercising postponement authority under subparagraph (1), the Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

(3) When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(i) Transcripts of markups shall be recorded and may be published in the same manner as hearings before the Committee.

(j) Without further action of the Committee, the Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE III. HEARINGS

(a) The Committee Chairman or any Subcommittee chairman shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by it on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee, or Subcommittee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or Subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman or Subcommittee chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(b) Committee and Subcommittee hearings shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(c) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence before the Committee or any Subcommittee, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of two Members.

(d) In the course of any hearing each Member shall be allowed five minutes for the interrogation of a witness until such time as each Member who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(e) The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee which are decided to be printed shall be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. Individuals, including Members of Congress, whose comments are to be published as part of a Committee document shall be given the opportunity to verify the accuracy of the transcription in advance of publication. Any requests by those Members, staff or witnesses to correct any errors other than errors in the transcription, or disputed errors in transcription, shall be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Prior to approval by the Chairman of hearings conducted jointly with another congressional Committee, a memorandum of understanding shall be prepared which incorporates an agreement for the publication of the verbatim transcript.

RULE IV. BROADCASTING

Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee or any Subcommittee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be

open to coverage by television, radio and still photography except when the hearing or meeting is closed pursuant to the Committee Rules of Procedure.

RULE V. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) The full Committee shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: anti-trust law, tort liability, including medical malpractice and product liability, legal reform generally, and such other matters as determined by the Chairman.

(b) There shall be five standing Subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, with jurisdictions as follows:

(1) Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property: copyright, patent and trademark law, information technology, administration of U.S. courts, Federal Rules of Evidence, Civil and Appellate Procedure, judicial ethics, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(2) Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties: constitutional amendments, constitutional rights, federal civil rights laws, ethics in government, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(3) Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law: bankruptcy and commercial law, bankruptcy judgments, administrative law, independent counsel, state taxation affecting interstate commerce, interstate compacts, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(4) Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security: Federal Criminal Code, drug enforcement, sentencing, parole and pardons, terrorism, internal and homeland security, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, prisons, criminal law enforcement, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(5) Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, Border Security, and International Law: immigration and naturalization, border security, admission of refugees, treaties, conventions and international agreements, claims against the United States, federal charters of incorporation, private immigration and claims bills, non-border enforcement, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member thereof shall be ex officio Members, but not voting Members, of each Subcommittee to which such Chairman or Ranking Minority Member has not been assigned by resolution of the Committee. Ex officio Members shall not be counted as present for purposes of constituting a quorum at any hearing or meeting of such Subcommittee.

RULE VI. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective Subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman and other Subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

RULE VII. NON-LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

No report of the Committee or Subcommittee which does not accompany a measure or matter for consideration by the House shall be published unless all Members of the Committee or Subcommittee issuing the report shall have been apprised of such report and given the opportunity to give no-

tice of intention to file supplemental, additional, or dissenting views as part of the report. In no case shall the time in which to file such views be less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session).

RULE VIII. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use according to the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

RULE IX. OFFICIAL COMMITTEE WEBSITE

The Chairman shall maintain an official website on behalf of the Committee for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee Members and other Members of the House. The Ranking Member is authorized to maintain a similar official website on behalf of the Committee Minority for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the Minority to Committee Members and other Members of the House.

THE NEED FOR FAIR TRADE POLICIES

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to trade policies that are unfair to American workers.

Congress must insist on a new model for trade that makes American workers the top priority. Trade agreements must also take into account protections for the environment and ensure access to life-saving medicines.

Developing trade agreements that take these priorities into account will be difficult, but we must not rush into obligations which will ultimately harm our own interests, and we must reject the false choice between expanding our trade opportunities and fairness to U.S. workers.

It is simply wrong to follow the old model that we know hurts the livelihoods of so many of our constituents. That is why Democrats are pushing for new priorities in the trade deals that the administration is negotiating with Colombia, Peru, Panama, South Korea and other countries.

Congress must continue to press the administration to change its trade policies and provide specific, constructive suggestions to advance the goals of our workers and our economy.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration doesn't act as though it believes that Congress should have a real say in trade negotiations. One example, though it is certainly not the only one, is the matter of allowing access to life-saving medications.

Congress has passed legislation directing the administration to respect

the Doha Declaration, an agreement that allows countries flexibility under WTO rules to provide for public health. Although the administration signed the Doha Declaration, USTR has completely ignored Congress' directive to respect it.

Every trade pact negotiated since 2002 has contained stringent intellectual property rules sought by the major drug companies. By keeping medicine prices high, these rules increase industry profits but restrict access to needed medicines for citizens in developing countries. Even in current free trade negotiations, USTR continues to ignore the will of Congress to respect the Doha Declaration.

That is why a new framework for trade must include a stronger role for Congress. The current model of non-binding negotiating objectives permits the President to ignore the wishes of this Congress.

It is no surprise that the administration has favored large corporate interests at the expense of American workers, the environment and global health. But it is wrong. However, our new majority in Congress will respond to workers who have been hurt by previous trade agreements. After all, trade agreements have affected my home State of Maine's manufacturing, farming and service sectors.

Soon Congress may be asked to consider renewing fast track authority. I voted against the Trade Act of 2002, which granted fast track authority to the President. I urge my colleagues to reject renewal of fast track in its current form. It is vital that Congress continue to press for change, firmly and constructively.

INJUSTICE AGAINST FORMER U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN CONTINUES

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 69th day since a great injustice took place in this country. On January 17, 2007, two U.S. Border Patrol agents entered Federal prison to begin serving 11 and 12 year sentences, respectively.

Agents Compean and Ramos were convicted last spring for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our border into Texas. These agents never should have been prosecuted. The U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents and granted immunity to the drug smuggler, who claimed he was unarmed. The illegal drug smuggler received full medical care in El Paso, Texas, was permitted to return to Mexico, and is suing the Border Patrol for \$5 million for violating his civil rights.

Madam Speaker, he is not an American citizen. He is a criminal.

Madam Speaker, it is ironic that one of the Federal prosecutors dismissed by

the Justice Department, who never should have been terminated, was criticized for not doing more to try cases of illegal immigration. Yet we have a Federal prosecutor in western Texas, Johnny Sutton, who, instead of prosecuting an illegal alien, who was also a known drug smuggler, decided to give immunity to the illegal alien drug smuggler and prosecuted the two Hispanic-American border agents who tried to apprehend the smuggler.

Madam Speaker, this makes absolutely no sense. Johnny Sutton also prosecuted another law enforcement agent, Deputy Sheriff Gilmer Hernandez. Hernandez was recently sentenced to a year in jail for shooting the tires of a car transporting illegal aliens after the driver attempted to escape a routine traffic stop by aiming the vehicle at the deputy. Hernandez was charged with violating the civil rights of one of the passengers, an illegal Mexican national, who was struck in the lip by bullet or metal fragments.

Citizens across this country and many of us in Congress want to know why does the U.S. Attorney's Office in western Texas choose to go after law enforcement officers while protecting the illegal aliens who commit crimes?

The President has the power to immediately reverse this injustice by granting a pardon to these two men, who were doing their jobs to protect the American people. But, so far, the President has refused to stand up for justice in this case.

Madam Speaker, I hope the White House will agree with many of us in Congress who believe Mr. Sutton's actions in prosecuting these agents raises serious questions and need to be investigated.

I thank House Judiciary Chairman JOHN CONYERS and his staff for their interest in this situation involving the two border agents, who should have been commended instead of indicted. I am hopeful that the House, under the leadership of JOHN CONYERS, will soon hold hearings to look into this injustice.

NEW POLLS REGARDING VIEWS OF IRAQI PEOPLE

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, on the fourth anniversary of the invasion of Iraq, several new polls looking at the opinions of the Iraqi people were released. It is important that we heed this call and that we listen to their choices, because it has been 4 years.

Some frightening stories were illuminated by the new polls. For example, one in four Iraqi adults have had a family relative murdered in the last 3 years, while 23 percent of those living in Baghdad have had a family relative kidnapped in the last 3 years.

□ 1930

More than half of Iraqis have a close friend or relative who has been hurt or

killed in the current violence. One in six say someone in their own household has been harmed. Eighty-six percent worry about a loved one being hurt, two-thirds worry deeply. Huge numbers limit their daily activities to minimize risk. Seven in 10 report multiple signs of traumatic stress. The number of Iraqis who describe their lives as good has dropped from 71 percent 3 years ago to under 40 percent today.

This is shameful, Madam Speaker. Every day the evidence against President Bush's so-called war plan mounts. It makes one wonder if there is even a plan at all. How much of the Bush Iraq policy has been forced on the Iraqi people? How much real involvement have the Iraqi people had in deciding the future of their own country. How are the Bush policies affecting Iraqi families?

I voted against the authorization to go to war. And Madam Speaker, I say to my colleagues, whether they voted "yes" or "no," now is the time to make a change in direction. Let us empower the Iraqi people; let us restore their sovereignty.

Last week, I had the opportunity to testify before the Foreign Affairs Committee about my legislation, H.R. 508, the Bring the Troops Home and Restoration of Iraq Sovereignty bill. This bill is a comprehensive proposal. It has 49 cosponsors, and it will end the occupation of Iraq within 6 months of enactment. It will accelerate the training and equipping of Iraqi military and security forces, preparing the Iraqis to take over their own security after U.S. troops and contractors leave at the end of the 6 months. It will fully fund the health care commitment to our returning veterans. It will make veterans health care an entitlement, something they deserve because, for heavens sakes, they have done so much for us.

Additionally, the legislation revokes the President's Iraq war powers, it prevents establishment of permanent bases in Iraq, and it returns the oil rights to the Iraqi people. Actually, it gives Iraq back to the Iraqis.

Madam Speaker, our most solemn obligation is to the brave and capable men and women who have been placed in harm's way. This legislation, as I said, guarantees physical and mental health care for U.S. veterans of military operations in Iraq and other conflicts. It is the least we can do. It is the very least we can do to show the gratitude of a grateful Nation.

H.R. 508 will fulfill our commitment to our Nation's brave troops and to the Iraqi people. The polls here and the polls in Iraq are clear: it is time to bring our troops home.

To those who are watching and wondering about the future of our Iraq policy, I say I will not stop, I will not rest, and I will not back down in my fight until every single last soldier and marine is home safe with his or her family.

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

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

**PRIVATE CLARENCE SPENCER
AND SERGEANT FIRST CLASS
ALLEN MOSTEIRO**

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

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the bravest and most dedicated young heroes of north Texas and of our Nation.

Army Private Clarence Spencer was killed in Bilad, Iraq while fighting against enemy forces in one of the most important conflicts our Nation has ever engaged in. Clarence Spencer gallantly and selflessly gave his life for his country while fighting alongside his fellow soldiers of the 1st Cavalry Division of Fort Hood, Texas.

Private Spencer is survived by his mother and son and his loving wife, Army Private Charlotte Spencer, who has also devoted herself to our Nation's noble military profession.

Clarence Spencer served three tours in Iraq, two of which were as a marine. Wounded in Iraq on a previous tour, he demonstrated tremendous courage by deploying into harm's way once again. Private Clarence Spencer is gone, but he will never be forgotten. His memory lives in our hearts, and America is eternally grateful for his spirit and his dedication.

As Clarence's Dunbar High School football coach said about Clarence, "I have coached faster, stronger and more talented students, but I've never coached anyone I was more proud of." That is precisely the way that the Fort Worth community and our Nation feel about soldiers such as Private Clarence Spencer, a true American hero.

Madam Speaker, I also rise to honor a second hero of the Fort Worth community and of our Nation. A graduate of Fort Worth's Eastern Hills High School, Sergeant First Class Allan Mosteiro was an 18-year veteran of the Army, who was assigned as a scout leader in the 1st Cavalry Division based at Fort Hood, Texas. He gallantly and selflessly gave his life for his country as a result of wounds he received during a fire fight against enemy forces in Taji, Iraq on February 13, 2007.

Sergeant Mosteiro is survived by his loving wife, son, parents, one brother and three sisters.

The American people recognize their sacrifice and honor the Mosteiro family's patriotism. As a career soldier and senior noncommissioned officer, Sergeant Mosteiro's leadership was instrumental in developing younger soldiers, and he did not take his responsibility lightly. A veteran of Operation Desert Storm and of the current war, Allan Mosteiro dedicated his life to securing the freedoms that all Americans so rightfully cherish.

Sergeant First Class Allan Mosteiro is gone, but he will never be forgotten.

His memory lives on through the wonderful family that he left behind and the dedicated soldiers he so ably led.

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 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 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.)

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

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 98th anniversary.

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following Senators as members of the United States Capitol Preservation commission:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN).

The Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, announced the appointment of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. AL-LARD) as a member of the United

States Capitol Preservation Commission.

FAILED TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

I rise with my colleagues here this evening to talk about our failed trade policy.

As a former mill worker at Great Northern Paper Company in East Millinocket, Maine, I know firsthand how these trade deals have crippled our manufacturing base in the State of Maine.

When I ran for Congress, I told the people of the State of Maine I would fight for them, for their jobs and for their families every single day. Mainers know that these trade deals have left them behind. You can go almost anywhere in my district and find an abandoned mill or a vacant factory. They are painful reminders of what was and is no longer to be. Their jobs have been outsourced to countries that pay slave wages. How can we compete when our own workforce has been left behind?

The election results proved that the American public is sick and tired of their jobs being outsourced. They want a Congress that fights for our workers and businesses. They want this country to move in a new direction. They want this Congress to move in a new direction.

I will be the first to say that I am concerned when I am hearing from my fellow colleagues that we can't cut side deals on trade agreements. Some say maybe we can make a few concessions on both sides and a deal is cut. The American workforce is sick of these trade deals, these side deals being cut. They don't want more trade adjustment assistance; they want their jobs.

Some say that the pending free trade agreements, that we should do a side letter to appease labor, or maybe a couple tiny provisions that fix the environment. My mom always told me, you can't fix what's broken. Our trade policies are broken.

It is time to start from the ground up. It is time to renegotiate the Peru, the Colombia and the Panama Free Trade Agreements. With the TPA deadlines quickly approaching, we cannot rush something through. The American public deserves to have the new majority renegotiate these trade deals.

This election sent a strong message. It is to change course in what the Bush administration has done with our failed trade policies. There is no quick fix to this solution, not when these agreements are based on a flawed model. These agreements compromise our port security, they privatize Social Security, they threaten our intellectual property rights, they undermine

States' rights, and they infringe on access to medicines.

I strongly agree with Chairman LEVIN that we need to address these issues, and we need to do it now. Non-binding side letters are not good enough.

Regarding the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, there is no fix that can make this agreement acceptable. It is highly offensive that the Bush administration even initiated negotiations with a country infamous for having the highest rate of trade unionists assassinated. More than 2,000 labor union activists have been murdered in Colombia since 1990. More than 2,000 labor unionists murdered since 1990, with 60 assassinated in 2006 alone, one per week. Until the Colombian Government changes this abominable situation, the United States should not offer any enhanced trade relations to Colombia.

And then let me touch on the biggest issue of them all: fast track. Fast track delegates away Congress' constitutional authority. It undermines our right to have a say in what goes on in these trade deals. We must replace this outdated, failed trade negotiating system.

Over 3 million American manufacturing jobs, one out of every six manufacturing jobs, have been lost during the fast track era. Before fast track, we had balanced trade. The United States trade deficit has exploded as imports surged. The worldwide gulf between the rich and the poor has widened since fast track.

I could go on and on and on about fast track. Fast track has put us on the wrong track, and it is time to turn it around. Any acceptable version of fast track must include the bare minimum of some of the following:

It would restore Congress' right to decide which countries it is in our national interest to negotiate new agreements. It would set mandatory requirements for what must and must not be in every agreement, including core labor and environmental standards. It would require Congress to vote on a trade agreement content before it can be signed, and it would not allow for secretive negotiations. A new negotiating system must include more oversight on how past agreements are actually working. It would reinstate our system of checks and balances.

I am pleased that some of my colleagues are here this evening to join me in this trade discussion, and I look forward to their remarks. I would like to thank them for their leadership as well in this area.

I now would like to introduce Congressman PHIL HARE, a newly elected freshman from Illinois, to be the next speaker. PHIL knows firsthand about how these trade agreements affect our manufacturing industries. Prior to working for Congressman Lane Evans, PHIL's first job was at the Seaford Clothing Factory in Rock Island. During the 13 years, he cut linen for men's suits there.

PHIL served as a union leader and as the president of Unite Here Local 617. As district director for then-Congressman Lane Evans, PHIL HARE fought for the working men and women in his district. PHIL is a leader among the freshman class on trade issues.

PHIL, I want to thank you for your tremendous leadership on this very important issue that affects men and women throughout the United States. I yield to the good gentleman.

□ 1945

Mr. HARE. I thank the gentleman from Maine, and I also want to just commend you for your leadership on this whole issue of trade.

When I first came to this body, I campaigned on the sole issue of trade; and they said there are a couple of people you need to look up right away. I needed to look up Representative MARCY KAPTUR and MIKE MICHAUD for standing up for ordinary people.

With all due respect to the President, I don't consider this fast track legislation; it is wrong track legislation. I am a card-carrying capitalist, and I have said this many, many times. But I came out of an industry, the clothing and textile industry. But, for the life of me, I don't understand, this President just doesn't seem to get it. We keep losing good-paying jobs overseas, and for the life of me we are one of the few countries I know that actually subsidize our manufacturers for going overseas, if you look at the east coast and look what happened in your area from Maine all the way down and you look what happened in the Midwest with Maytag.

Today I sat and I listened to a person from my district, Dave Bevard, who worked at the Maytag plant. He had 32 years in and his wife had 30, 62 years between the both of them. Here, these workers gave up two wage concessions, if you can believe that, to keep this plant open, \$24 million from our State of Illinois in tax breaks to this company; and at the end of the day they ended up moving to Sonora, Mexico. The CEO of the company said, "I don't care about the workers and the community. I am here to make a dollar for my shareholders." It didn't matter about the health care and the pensions.

And Dave brought up today, you know, we have trade readjustment funds and things of that nature, but, as the gentleman knows, by the time you get them you have to decide between your unemployment compensation and whether you are going to be retrained. Then they tell you, well, you should go into a field that is growing, maybe like health care. So he said, of the 2,500 people that lost their jobs at that plant, 400 people tried the medical care, thinking they were going to get into medical care. Well, that worked great for the schooling, but when it came to practical exercise to go in and be able to learn the trade and be able to do it, they only had room for 30 people. So, 370 people are left out in the cold.

Another woman wanted to go through and wanted to get into daycare and needed a 1-year program at the community college. They only had a 2-year program; and they said, well, maybe she should just try being a cosmetologist instead.

When you take a look at the way we do this and the way we treat our workers, I said today this is a moral issue that I think we in this Congress have.

I support trade. I will always support trade. I know our country needs it. But I ask, at what price? And I want to know why is it that this President feels he doesn't have to basically come to Congress for anything, as you know, but particularly when it comes to the trade issue. He can outsource it, he can fast track, and he can do whatever he wants to do, and there is no congressional accountability, no oversight. We are left with a package we can't even vote up or down half the time because he has the secret back-door deals.

I, for one, as a freshman am tired. I am tired of going back to my district and seeing people like Dave Bevard and his wife who, by the way, has cancer. He is going to lose his health care.

And I ask a question very simply of this administration and for those on the other side of the aisle and maybe some within my own party who think that this is the way to go. I want you to come to Gifford, and I want you to see what is left of that Maytag plant, and I want you to see the people whose lives have been affected by this and the lack of health care.

Their prescription programs that they had, now they have lost their prescription drug program that they had, it equals for some of them their prescriptions per month, the pension that they receive. Now, they don't even get a pension, they have no health care, and somebody is going to try to convince me that this trade deal is going to work and that this was in the best interest of our manufacturing base?

Now I can't in good conscience do that. I think we had some interesting hearings today, but, ultimately, we have to be able to stand up.

And I agree with the gentleman from Maine. We had a directive I think this past election. I campaigned on this issue, as you know; and I campaigned very strongly about it. I said, look, I support trade, I support fair trade. So I am a fair trader, and I think that is what we should all be. And I think we have an obligation, as I said before, to ask this administration but also ask of ourselves: Are we here to represent the Dave Bevard's of this country? Or are we here to represent the CEO that took the jobs to Sonora, Mexico?

And they are going to keep doing it. Every single day we read of another small factory going. My clothing factory that I worked in was shut down, and now I hear that the remaining 350 people that were working there are hanging by a thread. Translation: In about a year, that plant is going to go simply because nobody wants to have

the initiative and the courage to stand up for an industry that has been hit, or dumping its steel. It goes on and on.

I don't want to use up the whole hour, but if the gentleman would just let me conclude by saying this. I would like to ask some of our folks on the other side that call me a protectionist, and I looked in the dictionary, and I think that means you are trying to protect something, and I am, and I know we are. We are trying to protect a basic fundamental right for people to have a decent-paying job.

You know, these aren't CEOs. These are ordinary people who want to put their kids through school, have health care. They want to be able to work, and work very hard, and be able to retire and not have to worry about it.

I am not going to stop on this issue, and I again applaud the gentleman from Maine for courage that he has. And I will promise you this, that I have said many times: I don't know how long I am going to be in this body, but as long as I am I am going to continue to come to this floor, I am going to continue to talk about those lost jobs and say we have to start thinking differently than we have before.

We have an obligation, and our obligation is to stand up for ordinary people. That is what I have always been about. And I think the basic job of a Member of Congress, when you really get down to it, after all is said and done, is all of us are here to do the best we can to help ordinary people out, to make their lives better, not complicated.

So to my friends on the other side that might think I am off base, I am not going to support fast track. I will vote against it. I am not going to have any part of outsourcing one more job from my district or from this country. I am going to stand up for workers, whether they are from Illinois or Maine or Ohio or Florida or wherever they are from, because we have a responsibility to do it. It is the right thing to do.

And, again, I just can't thank you enough, Congressman, for taking the lead on this. You and Representative KAPTUR have been great inspirations to me as a freshman here and campaigned on this issue of trade.

And, by the way, I would just say to people listening, it is okay to run on things you believe in and lead with your heart and on the right issues, and every now and then the good guys do come out on top. So I thank the gentleman for allowing me to participate this evening and look forward to any questions or discussion you might have.

Mr. MICHAUD. I thank you very much, Congressman HARE.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATSON). All Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair.

Mr. MICHAUD. I apologize, Madam Speaker.

I would like to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. It is I who ought

to thank you and the freshman class for your leadership in this area. You have actually brought forward a whole new fresh discussion about trade and what it has done to this country. So I really appreciate your leadership and look forward to continuing working with you as we move forward in this area.

There is another Member I would like to recognize, not a member of the freshman class, but this Member has been a true advocate for fair trade. Congresswoman KAPTUR has been a tremendous leader in this fair trade fight.

MARCY came to Congress from a working-class background. Her family operated a small grocery where her mother worked, after serving on the original organizing committee of an auto trade union at Champion Spark Plug. MARCY knows firsthand how these unfair trade deals have affected industry throughout her congressional district in Ohio and has been a key player in our trade working group in the House.

I really appreciate all the leadership and expertise that you have brought forward on this issue, Congresswoman KAPTUR. You have been a true leader, and you have been a mentor to me ever since I got elected to Congress. So thank you, and I yield you such time as you may consume.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman MICHAUD, thank you so much for bringing us together tonight and for your great contributions to this debate. That is probably the major economic debate this Nation faces. It is a real pleasure to be here with you this evening. I thank you for yielding me some time.

And to Congressman PHIL HARE from Illinois, who has just hit the ground running here and who I think is such a tremendous addition to our membership and to this great struggle for the cause of all people in our country, the dignity of their work, the future for their families and the future of our communities.

And to Congressman STEVE LYNCH of Massachusetts, who works so respectably as an ironworker. He looks like that man that they have on that iron beam over New York City, that famous poster. Whenever I look at him, I think I see him. He is the one who is swinging the golf club with the ball or something.

It is a pleasure to be here with these gentlemen tonight, because they have all worked for a living, their families have worked for a living, and we need more people who bring this experience to the Congress of the United States.

The plant that Congressman MICHAUD discussed, Champion spark plugs, no longer exists in Toledo. Back when I was first elected, we tried so hard to get the Japanese to buy the spark plugs, the best plugs that were made in the whole country, Champion spark plugs.

I took them to Japan in 1985, and I said to Prime Minister Nakasone, "Your companies aren't buying from

our premier companies." Our trade deficit was beginning to really get bad back then, so I said, "So I would like to suggest that we give you these plugs for free for your manufacturers, and let them try them."

And we learned a lot about the keiratsu system of Japan and what a closed system indeed it is and that other companies couldn't bid into that production and that these very tight buying chains exist globally. Japan has been eating our lunch in the automotive market for a very long time now, but the Japanese market still remains closed, with less than 3 percent of the cars on their streets from anywhere else in the world. They didn't even take Yugos or bugs, VW bugs. So that market is a closed market, and we began to see how difficult it was to engage in trade with nations who truly were protectionists.

Congressman HARE talked about protectionist countries. You can see pretty clearly which ones they are when you look at what is on their shelves and what is on their streets.

I am here tonight to say that I have never supported fast track, because I don't believe Congress should ever let a fast ball go through here that we don't grab ahold of. And the problem is you can't amend a trade agreement. So even if you want to, as happened when we debated NAFTA, I can't remember a more piercing debate in this Congress other than votes on war. That NAFTA debate was the most significant economic debate we had here in 1993; and at the time that we debated that, it was purposefully brought to the floor in a way that we could not amend.

So let me just take one issue. We are going to have discussions this year on the issue of immigration. When that bill came down here, there were many of us who said we have to deal with the displacement that is going to happen in Mexico in the farm sector, because there is no transition provision in NAFTA and no currency exchange, that we knew that the Mexican farmers were going to be thrown off of their community oriented farming ejido systems. It has happened. No one wants to recognize it has happened, but over 2 million people were disgorge from their villages and towns, and they are wandering the continent, providing an endless stream of labor that is dirt cheap there and here. It is almost as if they didn't want us to talk about it because that fast track bill came through here.

Now, the NAFTA model is being used, they want to expand it to Colombia, they want to put it to Peru.

I wanted to say a word about Colombia this evening. I agree with Congressman MICHAUD. There is no nation in the world that allows the assassination of their labor leaders more than Colombia. Why would we want to sign a free trade agreement with a country that isn't free? Our cardinal rule ought to be: Free trade among free people.

When we look at what happened in Colombia recently, Chiquita brands, remember Chiquita Banana, which is headquartered in my State of Ohio, has just pleaded guilty to funding terrorism in Colombia. Several what are called unidentified high-ranking corporate officers of a subsidiary of Chiquita paid \$1.7 million from 1997 through 2004 to fund the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia, a group that our country says is a terrorist organization. And Chiquita also bribed other groups inside of Colombia.

The company has now admitted to this wrongdoing and agreed to pay \$25 million in fines. They said that the money was paid to protect employees from violent paramilitaries who fight over the banana plantations. I wouldn't wish working on a Colombian banana plantation to any living human being.

□ 2000

And yet we are about to sign a free trade agreement under fast track that we can't amend and stand up for the dignity of people in Colombia.

We know that the Colombian worker isn't safe; yet the President evidently thinks it is okay to sign an agreement where there is no transparent justice system, where bribes and protections and murders are every-day occurrences. Where are our values as a country? Why has it taken us almost 20 years from 1985 to 1995 to 2005, now it is 2007, to bring this issue up? We had to have so many casualties in this country. We tried 23 years ago so the hurt would not be so bad. And the gentlemen that are here this evening, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HARE, Mr. ELLISON, they represent those who are suffering in our country. There are people suffering in other countries, too.

I want to say I associate myself with the gentleman's remarks this evening. And what you said about those who have been murdered in Colombia, we know 72 were murdered in 2006, and the gentleman talked about prior assassinations of those who were trying to form groups there so they could earn a decent wage. Almost none have been prosecuted. It is like their lives have no meaning. So we need to set a higher standard. Maybe our Constitution really should stand for something and we should look for an agreement among the peoples of the Americas that uses democracy and liberty as its fundamental principles, not the diminishing of workers, be they farmers or industrial workers.

I oppose the Colombian free trade agreement and stand up for human rights, the middle class, the rule of law, and everything that this Nation should be committed to.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you, and I look forward to working with you as we move forward.

We also have been joined by Mr. ELLISON, who represents the Fifth District in Minnesota with distinction. Congressman ELLISON believes NAFTA and CAFTA have encouraged the move-

ment of manufacturing and agricultural jobs out of Minnesota to be done under sweat-shop conditions in other countries.

A 2003 report by the Minnesota Fair Trade Coalition reported that at least a quarter and likely one-third of the net 45,000 manufacturing jobs that Minnesota lost from 2001 to 2003 were directly attributable to trade deals such as NAFTA.

Congressman ELLISON has been a leader among the freshman class, along with Congressman HARE, in fighting for fairer trade deals. I yield to Congressman ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you. I thank you for your leadership on this issue of fair trade. I think that the time is right, the time is now to begin talking about fair trade. I want to commend all of the Members here tonight talking about this critical issue.

This election sent a strong message: no staying the course on Bush's failed trade policy. So now what do we hear, that the Bush administration wants to send to Congress NAFTA expansion agreements with Peru and Colombia. Consider the problems that Democrats have endlessly raised in writing, in hearings, on the floor, think about these problems and the administration's trade agreement model, how we have continually demonstrated that the Bush trade model is killing American jobs and is an enemy of the middle class.

Then consider what the administration chose to put in the deals anyway. Democrats are for consumers' right to affordable medicine. The 2002 trade negotiation authority instructed the Bush administration not to lard up and pack up these trade deals with new protections for big pharmaceuticals that could cut poor consumers off from access to medications and cause endless deaths in poor countries. But the administration inserted this poison pill into the FTAs. The TRIPS-plus requirement needs to come out.

Democrats are against privatization of Social Security. We believe the elderly in whatever nation they are in should have safeguards for their security as they age. Yet the Peru free trade agreement requires Peru to open its social security system for privatization. That has to come out.

Democrats believe that foreign businesses operating on U.S. soil shouldn't have greater rights than U.S. businesses. And we believe that our environmental and health safeguards cannot be exposed to attack in international tribunals. But the administration included the extreme foreign investor rights and investor state enforcement of NAFTA's Chapter 11. That needs to come out as well.

Democrats believe in the right of Congress and the President to protect this Nation's security. We have made it clear that the trade pacts cannot subject our decisions about who should operate U.S. ports to attacks in international tribunals or demands for com-

ensation. Yet although the Dubai Ports World operates Peru's ports and thus would have the right to such a claim, you included the "landslide port activities" in the Peru and Colombian agreements. That has to come out.

Democrats believe in reducing poverty in the developing world. We believe in providing farmers in the Andean nations opportunities to earn a living without resorting to illegal drugs that will end up on our streets here in the United States. But despite the warnings from Peruvian and Colombian Governments and the record of NAFTA displacing 1.7 million campesinos, the President has insisted on zeroing out corn, rice and bean tariffs in those things. That has to come out.

Democrats believe consumers have a right to safe food. But the administration included provisions allowing food imports that don't meet our standards. That needs to come out.

Democrats believe that when governments spend tax dollars, they must do so in the best interest of the taxpayers. But the administration included language in these FTA procurement texts that could expose Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws, renewable energy standards and more to challenge. That must come out.

It would only require striking a sentence here or a word there to remove the FTA terms that directly conflict with these core Democratic Party values and goals.

And then there is what is missing, the enforceable labor and environmental standards in the core of the text of the agreement equal to the commercial provisions.

Regarding the Colombia FTA, there is no fix to that and there is nothing that can make this agreement acceptable in my view. It is highly offensive that the Bush administration would exploit the enormous discretion fast track provides even to initiate negotiations with a country infamous and, unfortunately, famous for having the highest rate of trade union assassinations. More than 2,000 labor activists have been murdered in Colombia since 1990. Sixty were assassinated in 2006 alone; one per week. The Colombian Army is implicated in many of these murders, but few have been prosecuted. Until the Colombian Government changes its situation, the United States should not offer any enhanced trade relations to Colombia.

Mr. MICHAUD, thank you for your excellent work and leadership. The American people deserve fair trade agreements. The American Congress must take back its constitutional authority to make sure that any agreement that the United States engages in is an agreement that is in the best interest of the American working people.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce my co-founder of the Congressional Labor and Working Families Caucus, a member of the House Trade Working Group, Mr. STEVE LYNCH.

During his career as an ironworker, Congressman LYNCH worked at a General Motors plant in Framingham, Massachusetts, the General Dynamics shipyard in Quincy, Massachusetts, and the United States Steel plant in Gary, Indiana, all of which were shut down due to foreign competition and unfavorable trade conditions.

Mr. LYNCH's firsthand experience in seeing the effects of plant closures on American workers and on local communities has led him to focus on efforts to improve United States trade policy and help protect not only American workers but also American businesses which also feel strongly about these trade deals and have been working very closely with the United States Business and Industry Council to make sure that we have fair trade deals. I look forward to hearing Congressman LYNCH's remarks.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you very much. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to join the rest of the Members here tonight to say how proud we are of the fashion in which you have defended American workers and led this cause for all Americans.

I rise tonight to address the House on the matter of the pending trade agreements with Peru and Colombia and the general trade promotion authority.

There has been much talk over the past couple of weeks and all of us have heard it about the desire of our country to export democracy to the Middle East. I just have to say that I am a firm believer that you do not export democracy through the Defense Department, as has been suggested by this administration.

What we are talking about here in these trade agreements, this is how you export democracy. If you are going to do it at all, it is through trade agreements which give other workers in other countries a fair opportunity to have a decent standard of living, and it is really incumbent upon us through the Commerce Department and these trade agreements to make sure that at the same time we protect our own workers, we also give a fair chance at a decent living to those of our neighbors internationally.

Just like the job loss that has been described by Mr. HARE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. MICHAUD, as the gentleman from Maine indicated, I worked at a General Motors plant in Framingham, Massachusetts, and I saw the impact in Massachusetts and in Framingham of those 2,300 workers getting laid off.

The same thing happened at the General Dynamics shipyard where I worked in Quincy, Massachusetts, and I saw the impact there, as well as the steel plants in the Midwest that I worked at which have also been closed down.

What really gets me is as an ironworker hearing the talk in Washington, especially this administration, they talk about job loss like they talk about the weather, like it is something beyond their control, like it is a nat-

ural disaster that they have nothing to do with, when in reality when you look at the policies this administration has put forward, it is a deliberate cause and effect. The reason we are losing jobs is because of the policies that we have adopted.

Just like so many other so-called free trade agreements, this Colombia and Peru trade agreement contain no meaningful language or effective labor and environmental standards for workers in those countries, nor does it provide adequate protections to our own workers.

Madam Speaker, these trade agreements are based on deeply flawed models of NAFTA and CAFTA. We continually repeat the same mistakes and offer the same problematic language in our trade agreements. Instead of enforceable labor provisions, these free trade agreements merely suggest that those nations that we deal with adopt and enforce their own labor laws. They offer no assurance that existing labor problems will be resolved, and they allow labor law to be weakened or eliminated in the future with no possibility of recourse for those workers.

From our experience, we understand that attaching nonbinding side letters is not enough; especially when you consider, as my colleagues mentioned tonight, the record of deplorable labor conditions in the two countries under consideration: Peru and Colombia. They are among the worst examples of labor laws and protections and enforcements in the world.

Peru, as my colleague from Maine has pointed out, the U.S. State Department documented the failure of Peru's own labor laws to comply with U.S. internationally recognized worker rights and ILO core labor standards. Our own State Department included violations of child labor laws with an estimated one-quarter of all Peruvian children between the ages of 6 and 17 employed.

The State Department also indicated Peru's noncompliance with minimum wage guidelines with roughly half of the workforce, about 50 percent of the workforce in Peru, earning the minimum wage or below. These conditions are a far cry from free trade.

Instead, American workers are being asked to compete with underpaid, exploited and child labor workforces. One would think with such deplorable conditions in Peru, that the U.S. would insert enforceable labor standards in the agreement. However, the labor protections are weak and nonbinding.

The same goes for Colombia, a country that is infamous for having the highest trade union assassinations in the world. Mr. MICHAUD pointed out that more than 2,000 labor activists have been murdered in Colombia since 1990.

□ 2015

Until the Colombian government takes action to change this volatile situation, the United States should not

offer any enhanced trade agreements with Colombia.

We also must consider the national security implications of these agreements. Both Peru and Colombia harbor terrorist organizations with heavy involvement in narcotrafficking. While both countries have established financial intelligence units for analyzing and disseminating financial information connected with anti-terrorist financing regimes, greater cooperation from the Peruvian and Colombian government is crucial in undermining the funding mechanisms for these organizations. This crucial issue of national security cannot be overlooked when we consider these trade agreements.

Madam Speaker, while sanctions and serious remedies are granted to the commercial trade and investment provisions of these free trade agreements, the labor, environmental and international security standards are completely ineffectual.

There is no quick fix that can make trade agreements with these countries work for Colombian and Peruvian workers.

To truly strengthen the trade agreements, Congress must also strengthen its negotiating mechanism. Not only are free trade agreements flawed trade models, it is paired with a flawed blueprint for negotiation, and that is the trade promotion authority. Congress needs a new procedure for trade negotiations because we are being held responsible for the damage all over the world. Under the TPA, Congress cedes its ability to control the content of these U.S. trade pacts. Yet we are stuck time and time again with the political liability for the damage that these trade pacts cause.

This damage falls mainly to the American middle class, but also the Peruvian and Colombian agreements are replicating the same model of NAFTA and CAFTA that have been disastrous for the U.S. economy. Since NAFTA, over 1 million jobs have been lost nationwide, with over 23,000 jobs lost in my State of Massachusetts alone. This has reduced wage payments to U.S. workers by \$7.6 billion for just 2004. The administration's trade agreement model is killing the American middle class, plain and simple.

Not only has NAFTA been harmful for American workers in Mexico, it displaced 1.7 million campesinos and forced them towards overcrowded cities and to enter the U.S. illegally. Yet the administration has evidently not learned from NAFTA's mistakes. Instead, the administration insisted on zeroing out corn, rice and bean tariffs, even in the face of warnings from the Peruvian and Colombian governments. Such measures will expand the NAFTA disaster to Peru and Colombia.

In their current form, the Peru and Colombian trade agreements will only export more economic hardship rather than democracy for foreign workers.

So I urge my colleagues and I urge everyone to reject the Peru and Colombian trade agreements until the rights

of labor and the environmental issues are contained in these agreements. They should be rejected.

I believe in the potential of free trade, like my colleagues Mr. HARE and Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. MICHAUD, but along with power, as the major world power, we have a responsibility to use that power in a way that softens the impact of globalization on our own American workers, as well as the workers from Peru and Colombia.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for his comments. We have talked a lot about the individual workers, but, also, this really devastates the community.

Three days after I got sworn in as a Member of Congress, the company I worked for filed bankruptcy. The Great Northern paid approximately 65 percent of the tax base in the town of East Millinocket. That had a devastating effect on what is going to happen to the school system as far as being able to get the taxes owed because of the mill going through bankruptcy. But also other small businesses in the community actually had to close down because they relied on the workers in the mill to help keep the small businesses going and running.

When you talk about getting retrained, my colleagues I worked with at the mill, they were up in the age of 50 or 60 years old. Now they have got to go back to school. A lot of them never went to school beyond high school. Now they had to go back and try to further their education, which is very difficult, and get trained. For what?

If you look at what happened in our State, we had mill after mill, paper machine after paper machine, shut down. It has been very, very difficult to find jobs in these communities, and it is very disheartening to see grown men and women for the first time in their lives that they actually had to go and ask for help for food. They had to raise funds to fund the food bank, and it is very difficult.

I just hope that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have seen the failed trade policy that has come about starting with NAFTA, and I know it was a Democratic administration, but probably conceptually sounded good. But now we have got a track record of what NAFTA has brought us; and, hopefully, we have learned our lesson and will be able to move forward in the manner that we do have fair trade deals.

I will open it up for any discussion that my colleagues might have.

Mr. HARE. Madam Speaker, one of the things that I think we need to do here is we have to start bringing some commonsense back to all of this. I think sometimes we think in too broad of thoughts. For example, some of the questions I would ask is, why can we not make a television in this country anymore, why can we not make stereos, and why can we not have textile mills in this country? We have quality workers. They were trained. They knew what they were doing.

My colleague, Representative KAPTUR, and I have been talking about getting a group of Members of Congress to go around to areas that have been hit and to interview those workers who have lost their jobs and to put it on tape and to show that to people. I would appreciate the gentlewoman might want to comment about that.

But what we are talking about here, Madam Speaker, is letting ordinary people tell us what has happened to them. These are people who are our veterans. They fought in the wars. They have come back, and they are working in the factory. They lose everything they have ever had, and some of them with very little or no notice at all, and yet we are so quick to want to find work outside of this country when we have people going to bed in this country hungry. Those jobs in Ohio and in Maine and in Illinois, they are gone.

I think we have to start doing something proactive. We have to stop this hemorrhaging of jobs, and we have to start thinking about how we are going to keep the jobs that we have here and expanding them.

The late Senator Humphrey said that the American worker was the most productive worker in the world, and that has never changed. So I appreciate the gentleman for giving me a little bit of time. I thank you for allowing me to speak this evening, but perhaps the gentlewoman from Ohio might want to comment.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Congressman HARE and I are thinking about going to track the whole Maytag saga, starting in his home community but then going over to Iowa and the whole buyout of Maytag by Wall Street and the shedding of jobs, thousands, thousands of jobs.

Then, in my home State of Ohio, 2,000 more jobs hang in the balance at a place called Hoover Vacuum, which was part of this leveraged buyout. There was an article recently in the paper about the Maytags now being made by Samsung in South Korea, 250,000 of them being recalled in this country because they are burning up. They are actually catching on fire because water is dripping off the back onto the electrical panel. That never happened with Maytag. The Maytag repairman really was in that little room, and nobody bothered him.

I think it is important for us as Members to tell the story, whether it is Maytag, whether it is Champion, Dixon Ticonderoga, companies that Congressman MICHAUD worked for, and whether it is Maytag. We need to help America give full voice to what is happening.

It is interesting how little is on television, because some of the very same advertisers that own the airwaves do not want this story on there.

I understand Lou Dobbs is coming to Congress this week for a hearing that Congressman SHERMAN is going to have. That is one of the few reporters that even talks about this, but for the

most part you do not see this on the evening news.

So I am very anxious to travel and tell the Maytag story and then maybe tell the story of Brachs Candy and tell the story of some of our steel mills and to give these workers, first, appreciation for the fine products that they have built and it is not their fault and to say that we understand, but we know we are outnumbered sometimes, but our numbers are growing.

Mr. HARE. They are.

Ms. KAPTUR. But our numbers are growing.

We said when NAFTA passed it was the first battle in a long war, and we knew there were going to be casualties, and it literally broke our heart because we knew what was going to happen on this continent.

But now we have the next wave that came in when Congressman MICHAUD arrived; and now, with 39 new Members in your class, Congressman HARE, to come here, and you cannot imagine what that means to the more senior Members.

Our only sadness is all the casualties that are out there and all the people that have had to suffer. We had hoped to protect America from that. We had hoped to protect those families, but we did not have the votes. But now I think we have the votes.

I know one thing, we have the American people. Sometimes things get a little convoluted once it comes into this city, but we know the American people are with us. Let us make them famous. They are the ones that have lived this. Let us put it on our Web sites. Let us tell their stories. If others will not, let us do that. They surely deserve that. They have lived it.

Mr. MICHAUD. You are absolutely right. The American people, they do get it, and that is why they sent so many freshmen Members here in this Congress on the very issue that they talked about in their campaigns, and that issue is trade.

We are heading for disaster, a perfect storm. We have the largest budgetary deficit in the United States history, with over 45 percent approximately is owned by foreigners. We have the largest trade deficit in our history, over \$202 billion with China alone. It is over I think approximately, what, 7 percent of our GDP?

We are heading on a collision course. We must make sure that we have a strong manufacturing base here in the United States, and that is why I look forward to working with my colleagues here on the floor, look forward to working with a good, diverse group of the United States Business and Industry Council, labor, environmental groups, my colleagues across the aisle, Congressman WALTER JONES, DUNCAN HUNTER, TIM RYAN on our side of the aisle and BETTY SUTTON.

So I am really excited. We see new life here in Congress as it relates to trade, and we have just got to keep talking about trade so that our colleagues will start paying attention to what is going on here.

Ms. KAPTUR. I think that if we look at those people that are trying to sell off chunks of America piece by piece, I am offended by that. I am truly offended by it.

When I heard the announcement that Hershey, one of America's logo companies, right, was going to move production to Mexico, they are already making those big kisses there, I guess. I did not know that. When you think of all the dairy jobs in Pennsylvania, you think of all of the factory jobs, you think of all of the distribution jobs. I mean, this is a massive American company. It was America. It was America. And so now we are going to let that go? And then they dumbed down the recipe so the chocolate is not as good? They put more wax in it or whatever. Come on.

Do not take the American people for fools. We understand what is going on, and we know that we are being sold out. America is being sold out from under us, and the American people do not like it at all. They expect us to stand up for them.

So it is just a joy to have you here, to be a part of this effort, and to say that the Peru and Colombian free trade agreement that is supposed to come through here on fast track, again, it is more just of NAFTA. It is more of the same. We should not approve it.

But what has surprised me the most, as much as the American people have been hurt by NAFTA, if we go back, what has shocked me, what I never expected or anticipated, was all the casualties across the continent in terms of job loss and people hurt. I never thought I would see the people of Latin America rise up in Mexico, in Brazil, in these massive demonstrations. That has literally humbled me as a citizen of the continent to think that the poorest among us, many have been risking their lives, to say the pain on them is even greater than on us. Their wages have been cut in half. They are losing their little stakeholds in Mexico, for example, and they are just being thrown off their land, and yet they are going to Mexico City and demonstrating by the millions.

I never anticipated that that would happen, and I think what is going to happen here, those folks in Wall Street and other places thought they were going to be so smart. I think you are going to see another generation come behind us. They are going to create a charter for the people of the Americas that we should have created. Some of us wanted to, but we did not have the votes here, and I think that the backlash on NAFTA and on these kinds of free trade agreements that cause so much harm, I think Wall Street has only begun to see what is going to happen.

So I put my faith in the people, I put my faith in the institutions of good governance, and I hope that, I do not know how harshly God will judge those who have done so much harm, but it did not have to happen.

□ 2030

We don't have to repeat the mistakes of the past, so I thank my dear colleagues here this evening, Congressman MICHAUD and Congressman HARE and Congressman LYNCH and Congressman ELLISON, for understanding what it is going to take to turn this continent and our values to put the values forward that were the ideals.

When I think about John Kennedy and his Alliance For Progress, and you go down in Latin America and in every home there is a picture of John Kennedy because he cared for them. He cared for them first. I thought how did we go so far? Why couldn't we get a majority here? What was wrong with us back in the 1990s, that is, that we couldn't put that together? I see a rebirth of that spirit of idealism here this evening, and I know that the continent is waiting for us.

I thank my dear colleagues for sponsoring this Special Order this evening and for helping us speak on behalf of the people who expect us to be here for them.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you, and I thank Congressman HARE once again for coming to the floor this evening to talk about it. We have a lot to talk about. We have fast track, we have the trade deals we are talking about. We will be talking more about the value-added tax as that comes forward in a couple of weeks, and also the trade balancing act, which I will be resubmitting again in this Congress to look at trade in a comprehensive manner.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This is an American issue. This is an issue that is important to this country, important to our long-term stability.

2008 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Speaker, tonight, and the next 60 minutes, we are going to talk a little bit about one of the major issues that will be on the floor here in the House of Representatives as people vote later this week, and that will be the budget of the United States Government for the next fiscal year, the fiscal year that begins later this year. It's called the 2008 fiscal year budget.

There will be several budgets offered; but if history is any guide, the one that is most likely to pass is the one that is being offered by the majority party, or the majority Democrats, in this case.

That budget is a travesty. Tonight, we are going to show you why, why that is not the budget that should pass, why that is not the budget that should govern the United States taxpayers' money over the next year. This budget that we will see later this week pro-

posed by the Democrat majority has the largest tax increase in American history. Let me say that again: this budget you will see the Democrats propose this week has the largest tax increase in American history. It has no reform of any of the entitlements.

If we are going to save Medicare, we are going to save Social Security for future generations, as we will explain to you later, they are unsustainable. They have to be reformed. They have no reform whatsoever.

They do not save or preserve the Social Security surplus. You know, people pay Social Security taxes. When they do, they presume that money goes to pay for Social Security. Makes sense. That is why it's called a Social Security tax.

But, no, every year, a portion of that money is used to pay various other priorities of the Federal Government. The budget that the Democrats will propose this year for the next 5 years will not change that one little bit. Yes, this budget, Democrat budget later this week, is full of empty promises except one, to give you the largest tax increase in American history.

Now, let's bore into a few of these things. Let's look into a little bit of this in detail. In order to do that I have a few charts here. I don't want to have anyone have some flashback to Ross Perot, I know he had charts, so I have charts too. I have charts to show you what's happening.

This first one shows there is a misconception there, particularly on the Democratic side of the aisle, in spite of all the statistics, that somehow the deficit that we are in today was caused by the tax relief that was enacted back in 2003, that somehow allowing people at home to keep more of their own money to spend on their priorities, rather than Washington's priorities, that somehow allowing people to do that caused the deficit that we have today. It's absolutely not true.

If you look at this chart, you will see that total Federal revenues declined until 2003, when the tax relief was enacted, and they have risen and are now up somewhere around 46 percent. Since then, the Federal Government has 46 percent more revenue, 46 percent more money than it did in 2003.

I would ask the average American taxpayer at home, do you have 46 percent more money, more revenue, more income than you had in 2003? If you don't, you should understand, the Democrats believe that the 46 percent increase for the Federal Government wasn't enough, and that whatever you got, it was too much. Because they want to take some of what you have and put it right here in Washington, right here in the midst of the Federal Government.

So the tax relief did not cause the deficit, actually caused an increase in revenue. Spending caused the deficit, too much spending, something the budget, the Democrats are proposing the majority party does, is more. Their

proposal over the next 5 years is to spend more and more and more, yet raise your taxes to do it. So they are taking the thing that is reducing the deficit and getting rid of it, and taking the problem that has created the deficit spending and giving you more of it. Let me show you a few more things why these tax reductions actually resulted in more revenue.

They stimulate the economy. When you have more money, what do you do with it? You save it, you invest it. You spend it, you create jobs, you do all kinds of good things with it. That is why after the tax relief was enacted in 2003, we created more jobs, lots more jobs, every single month, not a single month without more jobs created in this country since the tax relief was enacted.

What else did the tax relief do? It also increased gross domestic product. That is basically the size of the total economy. If you look, after 2003, it's not so good, but after 2003, gross domestic product has increased dramatically every single quarter. So many charts, they are falling down. The chart fell down and so did the unemployment rate after the enactment of the tax decreases. Again, here they go. Unemployment up close to 6.5 percent, and where is it now? Down around 4.5 percent.

These things are not coincidences. These good things that happened to the economy did not suddenly hit just when the tax relief went into effect by coincidence. No. The tax relief left billions and billions of dollars in the American public's hands and in the American taxpayers' hands so they could use it for their purposes and help the economy grow. That is what we should be doing more of, not less of.

But the proposed Democratic budget does a lot less of that. Let's talk for a second about how much less. This proposed budget has the greatest increase in taxes in American history.

Now, I could tell average taxpayers, people at home, how much is that? Oh, it's \$392.5 billion a year. What does that mean? They don't know what that means. But let me tell you and bring it home a little better. It means \$3,035 for the average tax return in America per year, per year, folks.

As people sit at home and they watch this, imagine the Democrats' budget is saying to you, \$3,000 per year, you have to pay more here to Washington so they can spend it on more of their priorities.

We often hear, gee, in Washington, the spenders like to say, the tax and spenders like to say, oh, we need to do this, and we have to get the money. Where are we going to find the money if we don't raise taxes?

Well, I would say this, where is the average American going to find that money? Do you think they just will say, \$3,000 a year, oh, that is no problem. That is just about \$250 a month. That is nothing. I have got lots of that. That is no problem, we are happy to do that.

I don't think so. I think that would cause a tremendous impact on the average American family, a tremendous impact on their budget, and not a good one if it would have the reverse of all these effects. It would start to drive unemployment up. It would start to drive job growth down. It would start to drive the economy down. We need to stop this budget that will appear here on the floor this week.

Now, I would like to introduce the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT). Mr. BARRETT, before you begin speaking, I would like to point out to you, because I have these figures broken down by State, that the average South Carolinian under the Democrats' tax proposal would pay \$2,482.66 more tax per year. So you might tell me, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, how do you think the average taxpayer in South Carolina is going to pay for that?

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. My friend was exactly right. We are talking about the largest tax increase in our history, \$292 billion. My friend from California was exactly right. When you talk about facts and figures, it's one thing. But when you try to bring it home and let people understand exactly what it means to them personally, it's another thing.

Let me just give you some examples. Nationwide, if the Democrat budget were to happen to pass, we are talking about some nationwide impacts. Here we go, a family of four earning \$40,000 will face a tax increase of \$2,052. That is a family of four nationwide and 113 million taxpayers will see their taxes go up by an average \$2,200. Actually, \$2,216, but what the heck, it's government work, let's round it off a little bit. Over 5 million individuals and families who would have seen their income tax liabilities completely eliminated will now have to pay taxes.

So not only people that haven't paid taxes in the past now, another 5 million individuals are going to have to hit the tax rolls; 45 million families with children will face an average tax increase of \$2,864; 15 million elderly individuals, elderly. Now, most of these are on fixed incomes, will pay an average tax increase of \$2,934. And 27 million small business owners will pay an average tax increase, listen to this one now, listen to this one, \$4,712. Let me read that one again, 27 million small business owners will pay an average tax increase of \$4,712. Unbelievable.

Let's bring it home. I am from South Carolina, born and raised there. Let's put it in South Carolina terms. In South Carolina the impact of repealing the Republican tax relief would be felt. Here is how. It's higher than I thought: 1,300,000 taxpayers statewide who are benefiting from the new lower 10 percent bracket would see their taxes go up.

In South Carolina alone, 1.3 million people added to the 10 percent bracket; 447,000 married couples in the State of South Carolina would see higher taxes

because of the increase in the marriage penalty. We are penalizing people to be married; 427,000 families with children would pay more taxes because the child tax credit would expire; and 212,000 investors, including seniors, would pay more because of an increase on tax rates on the capital gains and dividends.

The gentleman from California was there last Wednesday into Thursday morning when we passed it, we voted against it, but the Democrats passed their budget. It's full of empty promises, with the exception of two, more spending and higher taxes. That is a done deal; it's going to happen. The Democrat budget says it's the largest tax increase in American history. The Republican budget will say no tax increases.

□ 2045

The Democrat budget will say, immense new spending. The Republican will say, we will hold the line and we were going to increase accountability.

Entitlements, on the Democratic side, it is a complete failure, \$77 million worth of entitlement savings, \$77 million when we are talking about literally hundreds of billions of dollars in entitlement spending that they are going to do. The Republican budget says reforms, improvements in reforms, trying to make entitlement more sustainable and adding to the longevity of it. So it is plain and simple.

Again, the figure that the gentleman from California, Madam Speaker, quoted a little bit earlier, when you bring it home in South Carolina terms where everybody can understand it, where it hits their pocketbook, we are talking per year average for 5 years if the Democratic budget passes, \$2,482.66 that my people in South Carolina will have to pay more.

And I ask the gentleman from California, I don't think that is a pretty good deal, do you?

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I don't think it is a very good deal at all. What are they going to get for that? I think that is part of the question here. What exactly are they going to get for that?

Are they going to get some of the spending like we just saw passed in the bill last week, you know, maybe some things to help shrimp and peanuts and a few things like that? Is that the sort of stuff they are going to get? Are they going to get a bunch of earmarks? What are they going to get? I don't think they are going to get very much.

I yield back to the gentleman from South Carolina. Do you see much that your South Carolinian constituents will get for their \$2,500 a year?

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding; and, no, I don't. Again, broken promises.

One of the ways that the Democrats want to fund all this new spending is reserve funds. And you talk about a

shell game. We are talking about setting up reserve funds so we can spend more money, but there is actually no money in the reserve funds because we are going to put the money in there later on.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Can you explain that to me again?

Wait a minute. A reserve fund? I mean, a reserve fund to me is something where I put some money aside. You are telling me that they are saying they are setting up a reserve fund, the Democrats are, with zero money it.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Exactly. And as the gentleman from California knows, we had an empty jar, a big empty jar in our committee to illustrate that view.

One of the ways that the Democrats in their budget spend more money is they set up this empty reserve fund to be funded later, that the committees and the agencies and organizations can draw money out to spend more money, but yet there is no money in the reserve fund to spend. So you talk about a shell game. It is a shell game at its finest.

One of the things that I was proud of several weeks ago, I guess maybe it was 2 weeks ago, I was proud to be part of an RSC, the Republican Study Committee, a press conference that we had to talk about a Taxpayer Bill of Rights.

And, Madam Speaker, what we are talking about here is giving the taxpayers across the country more accountability for their government. Four simple things, things that we have talked about and things that we would like to see come to fruition. Let me tell you what they are.

Taxpayers should have the right to a Federal government that does not grow beyond their ability to pay for it. I don't think we see that in this budget, Madam Speaker.

Taxpayers should have the right to receive back every dollar they entrust to the government for their retirement. It is incredible what we have done and what we are continuing to do, Madam Speaker, in this Democratic budget.

Number three, taxpayers have a right to expect the government to balance the budget without having their taxes raised. As the gentleman from California well knows, the Republican budget that we will present later this week will do that in 5 years. We will balance the budget, save the Social Security fund, and do it all without raising taxes. The Democratic budget does not. It does not. Now they may say one thing, but the figures show something else.

And, last, taxpayers have a right to a simple and fair Tax Code that they understand. Boy, that is a tough one there. But it is a game of trying to be responsible to the taxpayers, as my friend from California knows. It is a game of making sure that our people

keep their money. They know how to spend it more than we do in Washington, D.C., and I trust my people more.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, as my friend from California knows, this budget trusts the government more than it trusts the American taxpayer.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Will the gentleman yield one more minute?

Let me just ask you one more question, and then we will go on.

The gentleman from South Carolina, so narrow it down. There will be a Republican alternative to the Democratic budget here that everyone on this floor will vote on this week. What are the major differences? I mean, could you lay out for me and for Madam Speaker and for anyone watching what are those differences?

And I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think it is very simple. Number one, we will balance the budget without raising taxes; and, number two, we will reform entitlements. Because, as you well know, over the next 5 years, Madam Speaker, entitlement spending will grow 19 percent. Now that is without me, without my friend from California, without anybody in this House lifting a single finger. Entitlement spending will grow 19 percent.

So the budget we bring to the floor this week will be very simple. We will slow the growth, not cut. We will slow the growth, because entitlement spending will still continue to grow. We will slow the growth of entitlement spending, and we will balance the budget without raising taxes.

And I yield back.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you, Mr. BARRETT from South Carolina.

Now, Madam Speaker, so you don't think that we are just trying to do rhyming people here, we go from Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina to Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. But before I yield to Mr. GARRETT from New Jersey, you know, I am from California, and California taxpayers, under the Democrats' proposal, would pay \$3,331.09 more per taxpayer in California.

Now, I thought that was a lot. I thought that was a lot. It is one of the higher numbers on the page. But it is not as much as New Jersey. Taxpayers in New Jersey would pay \$3,779.88 more in taxes under the Democrats proposal than they do now. And that is an average, again, per tax return filed per year. Almost \$4,000.

I am glancing here and I think, Mr. GARRETT, there is only one other State that is going to pay, have more of an increase and that is Connecticut than New Jersey. So I am curious, Scott Garrett from New Jersey, what exactly do you think and what will people in New Jersey think and how will they deal with \$4,000 a year more taxes?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding.

New Jersey is proud to be number one in a number of things. But, quite honestly, we do not like to be proud, we are not proud of the fact that we are number one when it comes to paying taxes in this country, whether you are talking about local taxes, sales taxes, State income taxes, property taxes. I think we are just about number one in all of those combined.

Yet when you take that and you add what is happening here, this could be one of the most expensive weeks for the citizens of the State of New Jersey if this House proceeds with what the Democrat leadership plans to do.

Now, I have the privilege of serving with you, the gentleman from California, on the Budget Committee. And as you know, we just debated, if you will, the Democrats' budget proposal just last week. Actually, we had a number of hearings over the last 3 months now, during which time we have had a number of experts come and testify on various aspects of the Federal budget and the ramifications of not doing some things in the area of mandatory spending.

When you think about all the rhetoric that we have heard from the other side of the aisle, and maybe it was disquieting at some times, I think the one thing that maybe we can reach across the aisle here and maybe hear one language, one word that we are on the same page on at least, in rhetoric at least, is they agree with us on this one point and that is that we should get to a balanced budget at some point. The distinction, of course, is how they get there and how we get there.

Now, anyone who tuned in to C-SPAN, if people did tune in C-SPAN and listen to those budget hearings that we had, they may realize, or they watch the stuff on the floor, what have you, might realize just how complex the Federal budget is. With talk of rescissions and special orders and earmarks and everything, it is a hugely complex matter that we deal with; and I appreciate your expertise that you come to the House with to be able to handle this.

But, in reality, if you just step back for a minute, what we all do here on the House floor and in Budget Committee isn't a heck of a lot different than what every single American family, my own included, and the residents of the State of California and New Jersey have to do every single year, every week, every month when it comes to their own family budget, and that is to say they have to live within their means.

Now, Washington doesn't have a good track record on this, but that is what families have to do. When it comes to families, I guess families don't really have a choice to say whether we are going to have a balanced budget or not. Washington does. People know how much money they are earning.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Absolutely.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I was going to say, one thing that you can do here in Washington is print money. The average family can't. If the Democrats were to pass this budget and give them that \$4,000 or \$3,800 tax increase in New Jersey, your citizens in New Jersey can't print money like the Federal Government to just run a deficit, can they?

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. No, you are absolutely right on point. The average family has to sit down and say, this is what my income is going to be for the week, the month or the year for the year ahead and say I am going to live within those means. At the same time, what they have to do is they have to set priorities. And I think that what the gentleman was also trying to elicit from the Democrats during this last budget hearing was to set priorities. What are your top-ranking priorities? What must we spend on and where should we spend it? And if there are other things that you don't want to spend on now because you don't have the money, what are they?

They would never agree to do that, if the gentleman recalls. That is why I think they came up with this hollow, empty trust fund which, in reality, they could have said the trust fund is this big, since it is empty, or they could have said it is this large. Because if there is no money in it, there is no limit to how large the empty promises are.

But the family budget can't do that, just like you said.

But the other thing that the Democrats in Washington are able to do, besides print money, that the average family can't do, you know what else the family can't do? They can't raise taxes. A family cannot simply go out and say, I am short on cash this week, so I am going to raise taxes. That is why I started off by saying, as you pointed out, that this is the most expensive week for a family in the Fifth Congressional District for the State of New Jersey.

Let me just give you one other number while I stand here. It was the New York Times, that paper did a study just recently looking at what the Democrats in the House and the Senate are proposing. They looked at it a little bit slightly differently but came up with a little bit different number, but still draws the point.

They looked at an average family of four making \$70,000 in the State of New Jersey. Now, if you are from the State of New Jersey, I don't think anyone from either side of the aisle would say that a family making \$70,000 is rich by any means. It is expensive to live in our State.

But they said that family, who did very well under the Republican tax decreases in 2003 that we passed with the creation of jobs and the like, that family, under the Democrats' budget that may pass this House this week, would see their taxes go up by \$1,500.

So if you think you are rich at \$70,000, which I guess the other side of the aisle thinks New Jerseyans making \$70,000 are able to pay more in taxes, those taxes are going up by \$1,500. I think that is a burden that that average family should not have to bear in light of the property tax.

The overall average is the number that you brought out for the entire State of New Jersey, approximately \$3,000. You may have it in front of you. I don't have it here.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Will the gentleman yield? \$3,779.98 for the entire State of New Jersey.

I yield back.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. So around \$3,800 or almost \$4,000. And you think about it. What could that \$4,000 be used for? If you are the family and the husband and wife sitting down with your family, well, I would like to use that \$4,000 to go on vacation this year. I would like to be able to use it on some other niceties or what have you. Or maybe, if they can't use it on that, maybe they have health expenses.

I have a daughter in college right now. Maybe they have college expenses, other things like that. I am sure they could find a use for \$4,000 to spend.

I will yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I think this discussion we are having right now gets to the core of the difference between what Democrats in Washington, how they look at things and how we Republicans in Washington look at things. They look at it from the sense of, well, if we don't raise these taxes, how is the government going to spend more money on this or spend more money on that, or how are they going to get to take that? Because that is what it amounts to. When you tax everybody else, you come here, the 435 of us, plus the 100 people in the other body, get to spend the money on the stuff they want to spend it on.

□ 2100

And so how can we spend that money if we don't do this?

You and I, Mr. GARRETT, look at it from the standpoint of families, of taxpayers, of people. What are they not going to be able to do in New Jersey with that almost \$350 a month? I mean, that is a nice car payment. That is substantial child care. That is a chunk of a house payment. It is a lot of different things to a lot of people. And we look at everything from the sense of the family, the taxpayer. They come first and the government comes second. That is not the way the Democrats in this town look at it, is it?

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I remember one of the comments from the other side of the aisle during budget process, I think you shook your head when they said this as well, where they said, Well, if we do a tax cut, the Federal Government is

subsidizing that taxpayer. And we just shook our head at that because a tax cut is not a subsidy to the American taxpayer. A tax cut is simply saying to Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer and family that you don't have to send quite as much of your hard-earned money each week to Washington. You are able to keep \$3,800 of that money. And maybe you want to use that \$3,800 in New Jersey to go on vacation to a beautiful State like the State of California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is a matter of it is your money. When you earn it, when people earn the money, it is their money. It is not the government's money. It is their money and the government takes some of it for necessary operation to run government. But it is not like it is all the government's money and the government allows you to keep some. That is not the way we look at it.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I will just close on these thoughts: the difference that we are seeing here between what the Democrats will be proposing in their budget and the Republican alternative budget that should also come before the floor is in three areas, I think. We are both aiming towards the same goal, fortunately, of trying to reach a balanced budget by 2012, 5 years from now. But the Republican budget will reach that goal of 2012 without raising taxes by almost \$400 billion, which is what your chart behind you shows. And that is critical.

So, number one, we will not put a burden of almost \$4,000, \$3,800, on the families in the State of New Jersey, \$1,500 if you are a family of four making \$70,000.

Secondly, by not raising taxes we will not be undermining the pro-growth policies of this administration and of this government over the last 10 years. Those pro-growth policies, for New Jerseyans at least, have created tremendous employment, very low unemployment, so that that family that is making that \$70,000 a year or more or less in New Jersey at least knows that the unemployment rate is almost at historic lows at this point. So they know there is the opportunity for jobs, and because of that, there is great opportunity to improve yourselves in careers and what have you. And because of that pro-growth policy, we have seen the deficit shrink by 26 percent.

And, thirdly, and I think this is very important to everyone at home, is that we are making sure on the Republican proposal that those dollars that we do spend, because we are always going to have some spending by the Federal Government, that those dollars will not be wasted, not waste, fraud, and abuse, but will be spent on those things that are critical to my State, to your State, to national security, to homeland security, and to our veterans as well.

So balance the budget without raising taxes, make sure we continue the

pro-growth tax policies that we have had in the past to create jobs, and make sure that those dollars are wisely spent. They all come under the umbrella of one thing, and you said it: to realize that these dollars come from the family budget. And our focus should be on the family budget and not on the Washington budget all the time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) so much for his comments and his hard work on these efforts and on these proposals to recognize that it is your money first, taxpayers. It is your money first. It is not the government's first that they let you keep some of it. It is your money, and you should keep all of it except for the minimum amount necessary to properly run the government.

Now let us talk about a few more things on these taxes. Some of the rhetoric that people may hear from the majority party here is that this tax relief in 2003, 2001, this just gave tax cuts to the rich. We hear that over and over: "tax cuts to the rich." Well, as Mr. GARRETT pointed out, a \$70,000-a-year family of four in New Jersey is probably not rich, and they would be paying \$1,500 or whatever the amount was that you said.

Let us look at some of this. Now, these are numbers in billions of dollars, Mr. Speaker; so they can't relate to per person. This is the total Democrat proposed tax increase. This orange slice stands for the people who save money because of the 10 percent income tax bracket. Now, the 10 percent income tax bracket is the lowest tax bracket that exists. It is at \$15,000 of income for a married couple. So this amount of this tax is going to people with roughly a taxable income of about \$15,000. That is rich? I don't think so.

Look at this slice right here, this red slice. This is people who get the child tax credit and the marriage penalty credit, these benefits which the Democrats have proposed to raise, to cut in half the child tax credit and to eliminate what was put in place sometime ago so that people don't get a penalty, don't pay more tax if two people both earn income get married. Under the old law, a lot of them pay more tax. Now a lot fewer of them pay more tax. This would get rid of that. Both of these phase out over a certain income level. So all of these are geared only for people at lower income levels.

Let us look at this chunk. This is the death tax, which can affect all kinds of people, whether it is the person who is deceased or whether it is one of the many beneficiaries of someone who is deceased. And we know how the death tax has been destructive for family farms, family businesses, people wanting to pass their home that maybe has been in the family for generations, maybe only for a short period of time, but they want their children to have it, and they can't because the death tax got in the way.

We are scheduled to have the death tax continue to decline. But the Demo-

crat budget has proposed to put it way back into full force and effect with a rate, I believe, of up to 55 percent.

And then look at this chunk, the biggest chunk of all the marginal rates. That means seniors with dividends and capital gains income and people at all other schedules in the different tax brackets within the Tax Code. These tax increases affect everyone, not just the supposed rich.

And let us look at what this would do to certain tax rates: the 35 percent tax rate would go to 39.6. A capital gains tax rate of 15 would go to 20. The estate tax would go from 0 to 55 percent. The child tax credit, from \$1,000 to \$500. And the very lowest tax bracket starting at taxable income, technically, of 0 would go from 10 to 15 percent. So, again, tax increases on everybody all across the board.

We talked a lot about taxes tonight. But as I said when we started this conversation, the reason we have a deficit is not because we lowered taxes. Lowering taxes stimulated the economy, created more revenue for the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, the reason we have a deficit is because we spend too much. And here is a chart showing how spending drives the long-term problems:

Here is our spending today, roughly 20 percent of the economy; so already the Federal Government is spending about \$1 out of \$5 that exists in the economy. But if we leave things alone, if we allow spending to go forward and grow as it is in law now and if we just left all these things alone, it will go by 2049, you see here, up to nearly double that, nearly 40 percent of the economy. So \$4 out of every \$10 in the economy would be government spending.

Now, what this chart doesn't show is in countries where they have done this sort of thing before. The private part of the economy contracts. It doesn't have money for investment. It doesn't have money for growth. If government takes 3,331 more dollars out of each taxpayer in California, as the Democrats have proposed to do to spend on some of this stuff, they don't have that money to save. They don't have that money to invest. They don't have that money to buy things that help stimulate the economy. The government has it. The government doesn't save it. The government doesn't invest it. The government just spends it. And as we know, in a lot of cases not particularly wisely. So that is what happens if we leave spending alone. That is why we have a deficit.

Even with the Democrats' proposed tax cuts, which is the orange line here, Mr. Speaker, you see it isn't going to work. The spending increases much faster than even after those tax increases.

So I say to the people who have put together the majority budget, what do you plan to do here? Are we ever going to deal with this rapid exponential growth in spending? Or are you planning to raise these taxes further? Is the

\$3,331 per taxpayer in California just the beginning? Are we looking over a 10- or 15-year period of time at twice that? Three times that? Four times that? The sort of thing it would take to get anywhere near this spending level?

Chairman Bernanke is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. And the Federal Reserve, I think there is pretty general unanimity on both sides of the aisle, as well as with the economists, that the Federal Reserve has done a pretty good job of managing our economy for some time, interest rates and inflation; and they tend to know what could set this economy off course and what could keep it on course. And I think they deserve a lot of credit for keeping the economy on course, not just over the last 3 or 4 years but over the last 15 or 20 years.

But Chairman Bernanke said just earlier this year that "without early and meaningful action to address entitlements, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened with future generations bearing much of the cost."

What does he mean by that? When he talks about entitlements, he is talking about Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, things like that that the government does. And he said if we don't deal with it early and meaningfully, if we don't take early and meaningful action to deal with the growth in these retirements, that the economy is in trouble.

Now, the Democrat budget that will be on this floor later this week, let's see, it is a 5-year budget. What reform of entitlements does it include? Oh, yes. Zero. None. Not one change. Nothing in the entitlements over the next 5 years. Is that early reform? I don't think so. Is that meaningful reform? Well, if zero is meaningful, then maybe; but I don't think it is meaningful reform.

So let us look at what happens if we don't reform. Again, here is revenue, this black line. That is income coming into the Federal Government, roughly the same tax rates that we have today. But look at what happens to spending. It goes from a little more than we are taking in right now to nearly double. Nearly double if we don't reform. That is why Chairman Bernanke said, Mr. Speaker, that we need early and meaningful reform or this economy is in trouble, as he said, with future generations bearing much of the cost.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of discussion about children around here and what is good for children and how we are going to help children. Let me tell you something I know is not good for children, and that is sending them this kind of price tag for us, for our Medicare, our Social Security, our Medicaid over the next 15, 20 years, and asking them to pay double, at least, the tax rates, the tax burden, that we pay because we didn't act.

□ 2115

We know this is coming. This is not a Republican chart. This is not a Democratic chart. This is prepared by

the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget. Any number of nonpartisan government agencies agree. All the experts agree. On the Budget Committee that Mr. GARRETT and Mr. BARRETT and I sit on, every single expert who came in said that this entitlement spending, this planned growth in spending, is a disaster, a budget disaster, that we can see. It is a train coming down the track right into our eyes. But we are not blinded. It is not like we can't see it, Mr. Speaker. It is right here. We can see it. It is right here on this chart. We know it is coming, and we know the only way to deal with it is to reform these things.

So where are they? Where are those reforms? What will people do if that top tax rate rises?

Let me pull out one of these other charts. Just think about it. Doubling taxes. I realize it is quite a few years off, but if we don't deal with it now, we will get there. What does that mean? I guess that means the 39 percent rate would go almost 80 percent. That capital gains would have to go to 40. The estate tax, I guess you just take it all, which has happened in some countries before. The child tax credit, you probably get rid of it. And the lowest tax bracket would probably need to go up to 20 or 25 percent.

Those obviously aren't exact figures or anything like that, Mr. Speaker, but just to give a sense of what we are talking about here if we don't do something, if we don't change these processes and change this. Because if you look at this chart again, the reason we can see the train coming is, if we do nothing, absolutely nothing, to change Social Security, that is this one, Medicare and Medicaid is this one, interest on the debt is that one. If we did nothing to change existing law, it is not like you have to do more, that we have to take action to spend this money. This is the money that will get spent if we do nothing, if we leave it alone under existing law. That is why we have to take action, and it is for the kids.

Our kids can't bear this burden. People have said that if we allow this to happen that my children will be the first generation of Americans to have a lower standing of living than their parents. We have never had that happen in this country, and we should never let it happen in this country. The only way it is going to happen is if we shirk our responsibility today, because, gosh, it is 15 years off, let's deal with it later.

This isn't about destroying Social Security. This is about saving Social Security. Because you really can't pay for this. There isn't enough money in the economy. So we have to reform it. We have to change the way it works to save it.

That is why Republican budgets will say we should save the Social Security system. We shouldn't spend it. That is why it is part of the American Taxpayers' Bill of Rights, which a group of

us Republicans introduced a few weeks ago, where we said if you pay money for your retirement it should only be spent on your retirement. It shouldn't be spent on something else.

This isn't about destroying Medicare or wrecking Medicare, as you will probably hear demagoguery on the other side. It is about saving it. It won't continue this way. There isn't enough money. We have to save it, and to save it we must reform it.

You will see proposals, you will see reform, but not in the Democratic budget that we see today. And that is what is so disappointing, Mr. Speaker. We can't ignore it. We shouldn't ignore it. It is right there. It is right before us.

Our children will look back at this time in the future as to what we did with their inheritance. And I don't mean about the death tax necessarily. I mean the inheritance of optimism that is so much a part of the American ethos, the optimism that the average American can always do better, that anyone can lift themselves up, that they can move things forward.

Instead, this is saying, no, we have to take more of your money. We have to move things backwards. You may not be able to have the same things that your parents had because we need more of your money for a failed and inefficient system.

That is not the America my parents left me, it is not the America that I want to leave my children, but it is the America that this Democratic budget is heading us towards.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need the largest tax increase in American history. We need to let people keep more of their money, not less. Families will not struggle because government doesn't spend enough. Families will struggle when government spends too much and takes too much of their money.

Mr. Speaker, we need a solvent Social Security system, a solvent retirement system, not one that takes the money that that is taken out of people's paycheck for their retirement and spends it on other things and not one that is unsustainable, that won't exist 20 or 30 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, we need a Medicare system, a healthcare system, where people control their own healthcare, where people control their own destiny, not where the government is telling them what to do and telling them how to do it and using one of the most inefficient methods and high cost to do so. We have to reform that, or it won't exist in the future.

Yes, this Democratic budget is full of empty promises. You will hear about them over the next few days and weeks. You will hear that they promise to spend more money on this and spend more money on that and spend more money on the other thing, and in some cases they are definitely planning to do that. What they are not telling you is where they are getting it, and they are getting it right out of your pocket.

In some cases, they are going to say we are going to spend more money on this and spend more money on that and grow this program and grow that program; and, as Mr. BARRETT from South Carolina said earlier, they don't actually have the money in the budget to do it. They are just telling you, oh, yeah, we are going to do it. But we will find the money later.

Well, you can be sure where they are going to get that money, probably the place they get the other money, right out of the American taxpayer. It is the only place to go, unless you cut spending somewhere else, which we are very happy to talk about, very willing to do. That is always something you do in budgets, you set those priorities.

Yes, it is a budget filled with empty promises, except one, the largest tax increase in American history.

Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers deserve better, and I hope that we will defeat this budget later this week.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). All Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair.

30—SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is good to see you in the Chair this evening.

This has been a pretty amazing first 3 months for a new Member such as myself, who just joined this Chamber after having watched it from afar for a number of years. As our majority leader said at an engagement earlier tonight, this has really been one of the most remarkably productive Congresses in as long as he can remember being here. That is important. That is important to me.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to be joined later tonight by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who is just beginning her second term. I think she shares a lot of the same frustration that the new Members do, that for all of the important policy changes that this Congress has started, whether you want to talk about raising the minimum wage, starting to repeal some of these massive tax breaks we have given to the oil industry, the very important action that we took on Friday that we will talk about in terms of Iraq and the new direction that this Democratic Congress is beginning to set on what we do in Iraq, maybe the most important thing was that we started getting this place to work again and starting to give our constituents out there faith that Congress is back to work for the people of this country. Instead of sort of waiting for the special interests and

the lobbyists to line up and come into the offices of the prior leadership to tell them what they wanted, now actually we have got the American people, middle-class families, working class families, their priorities are back in charge here again. That is what makes me proud to be part of this group.

This is the hour that the 30-Something Working Group gets to spend on the floor of the House. I am proud to be a member of that group, a new member, proud that Speaker PELOSI has allowed us this opportunity.

We are going to cover I think a couple of subjects tonight. We will certainly talk about what happened here on Friday.

But I want to first just rewind for a second, to rewind to what happened when we first got here in January. Because it is interesting. I watched C-SPAN occasionally when I got home from the campaign trail, I got home from the State capital where I served in Connecticut for a few years, so I have some familiarity with some of the talk that goes on in this place.

But now I get to sort of listen it to with new ears, because now I listen to a lot of the revisionist history that gets thrown around this place late at night, listen to our friends on the other side of the aisle, and they are friends.

It is important to put up this chart, Mr. Speaker, to remind the American people that we actually can be friends when it actually comes to putting on the floor of the House of Representatives up or down votes on issues that matter to regular, middle-class families out there.

We can talk about 68 Republican votes along with the Democrats voting to implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. When we raised the minimum wage, set that bill on a path forward in this House, we got 82 Republican votes for that. Stem cell research, passed 253-174, 37 Republicans. Better prescription drug programs for our elderly, 24 Republicans. And on and on and on.

When it matters, where you put up-or-down votes in front of this House for things that make lives better for regular people out there, you are going to have Republicans and Democrats agreeing. So we are friends. We are friends when we put things before us we can all agree on.

But there has been some revisionist history. There has been some interesting 20-20 hindsight happening on this floor often. We heard just a little bit of it before. A lot of the decrying about the situation that our Federal budget has gotten into is pretty curious, seeing that the reason that I am here in large part is because a whole bunch of people out in northwestern Connecticut who voted for one person for 24 years decided that the budget priorities, along with the priorities on our foreign policy, were gravely out of whack.

A \$9 trillion deficit, Mr. Speaker. A President that inherited a budget sur-

plus, who ran on very fiscally conservative principles, managed to turn that into a record deficit in his first 6 years in office. A Republican Congress, I am sure there were some Democrats that were at the trough as well, but a Republican-led Congress that was complicit in racking up record amounts of debt that we know are not owned in large part by domestic banks but are increasingly owned by foreign banks, Asian banks and, in fact, it will put us in a very difficult position with when we are sitting down at a table to negotiate foreign policy with a lot of these foreign debt holders that have fairly decent leverage over us.

So we hear a lot about how we need to do something about this deficit. How it is our children, our children are going to be crippled under the weight of this deficit. They absolutely are. They absolutely are.

□ 2130

We had 6 years with a Republican President, 6 years with a Republican House, a Republican Senate for much of that time. Could have fixed it during that time; didn't get the job done.

Let's take a look at this chart for just one second. Let's make this clear, when we borrow money, all of this debt that we have racked up over the past several years, it is owned by Japan, China, the United Kingdom, Caribbean nations, Taiwan, OPEC nations, right down the line. That is who owns our foreign debt. That is what places us in incredibly compromising positions when we try to bring them to the table to be a multilateral player in actions throughout this world.

So here is why I am here: I am here because people in northwestern Connecticut wanted us to finally challenge this President on his disastrous policy in Iraq. I am here because they were sick and tired of the programs that make communities strong, the health care programs, education programs, job training programs, we are getting slashed and burned and cut to the bone by this Congress, while they gave away more and more massive tax breaks to their friends in the upper .1 percent of income earners in this Nation.

But they are also upset because the party that I think they thought was, you know, you see it in the polls, people for years and years and years thought that the Republicans were the ones that could manage their money and the Democrats they weren't so sure on. Well, they finally wised up after a while to realize that this place wasn't so responsible even under Republican rule; that in fact after budget after budget that got put before here, that President Bush put before this Congress was rubber-stamped over and over and over again and led to some of the most fiscally irresponsible policies that this Congress has ever seen, that this Nation, in fact, has ever seen. Largest Federal debt in the history of this country, growing by the day.

Now, here is the good news: it's changing. Now, as many times as folks

on the other side of the aisle want to talk and use the term "biggest tax increase in the history of the Federal Government," well, I'm still searching through that budget resolution, I'm still searching through what I am going to vote on this week and I don't see it. I don't see it because it's not there because we are actually going to do the responsible thing. Because what happened to create this Federal budget deficit was not just these massive tax breaks that they gave away to the folks way at the top, top, top of the income bracket, but they also spent money in a way that would have your eyes spin to the back of your head if you dug into some of the things they were doing here.

A Medicare prescription drug program that deliberately ties the hands of the Federal Government, doesn't allow the Federal Government to negotiate lower prices with the drug industry, Mr. Speaker, making millions, hundreds of millions, in dollars in profit for the drug industry at the expense of American taxpayers.

A defense policy which asks virtually no questions of how we spend our money in Iraq. We find out that there was \$9 billion sent over to Iraq on pallets, thrown out of SUVs in duffel bags, unaccounted for; disappeared in that country. Stories of these pork barrel projects that would make your head spin, the "bridge to nowhere" in Alaska, simply the tip of the iceberg when it comes to some of the frivolous spending that happens from this supposedly fiscally conservative Congress.

You could run through the examples over and over and over again. Mr. Speaker, we just had a hearing in the Government Oversight Committee that I sit on where we found out that the government does audits, each Department does an audit every year to try to make sure that we are spending money in a fiscally sound manner, just like any business would, that government should act like a business. Well, the analogy isn't particularly apt in a lot of facets. But when you are talking about at least having generally accepted accounting principles to make sure that money comes in and goes out in an efficient manner, well, yes, we should start acting like a business does.

The only agency in the Federal Government that can't give a clean audit year after year after year, the Department of Defense. Nobody here is putting pressure on them to account for how they spend money, to make sure that the billions of dollars that we hand to the Department of Defense in order to protect this country is being spent in the means that make sure that we are not saddling our children or grandchildren with the enormous amount of debt that we have racked up in this Congress.

I mean, you want to talk about spending money wisely, our friends on the other side of the aisle have to look themselves in the mirror, have to wonder why this election happened. I know

that this war was a major factor in people's choice at the polls. I also know that there were a lot of people in my district, and I have got the run of the economic spectrum in the Fifth Congressional District, from people living in places like New Britain and Waterbury that used to have good, solid middle-class jobs who are still struggling to get back to that level of sustenance, to folks that are doing pretty well with their lives that have made a buck in this economy. Those folks at the upper end of the economic spectrum are wondering how this government is spending their money.

So this week we are going to put a budget before this House. And Mr. MEEK, who has joined us and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who sits on the Appropriations Committee, can talk more intelligently than I can about this. We are going to finally put a budget before this House that is going to start to reflect the priorities of the American people; we are going to get our financial ship in order. All the things that folks over there talk about are actually going to be reality in this budget.

We are going to make sure that we invest in the programs that make America strong. We are going to make sure that we end this disastrous policy of unbalanced budgets. We can do it in the next 5 years. That budget says that we can and we will. And it is going to continue at a pretty important precedent that we have set in this Congress, which is to change course on some of the most disastrous policies of this administration, particularly the vote that we took on Friday on the war in Iraq, and I know that we will talk about that, but also start to get our fiscal ship in order, to put our money where our mouth is.

It is one thing for people to come up to this dais day after day after day and talk about fiscal responsibility. It is another thing to actually do it and put it into practice.

The budget that we are going to vote on will be, as I have learned, this place calls a pay-as-you-go budget. It is simply this, what every family lives with every day. You want to spend some new money, show how you are going to pay for it. You want to cut some taxes, show how you are going to account for it. Pretty simple budget rule, Mr. Speaker. But not to be too partisan here, it took a Democratic Congress in order to start playing by those very simple rules.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to want to hand it over to Mr. MEEK for some words, who normally gets to kick off this hour. But let me say that it has been a proud first three months. Probably the proudest day I have had was on Friday, when we came together to stand up to the President's policy in Iraq. It is going to be another proud week this week when we set the budget policies of this country straight and we finally stand up to the President and don't do what every other Congress has

done, which is take this massive document, throwing our deficit into an increasingly upward spiral, throwing our families into turmoil. We are going to finally take this very weighted document and hold it up to the light, not just rubber-stamp it.

It is going to be another good week here, Mr. Speaker. And with that, I yield to Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so very much, Mr. MURPHY. It is an honor to be here on the floor with you. I look forward to having a discussion not only with you, but also other Members of the House about what is coming up this week. I know that you alluded to last week's action that took place here on this floor. Democrats and Republicans and the majority were able to pass an emergency supplemental war bill that would not only put benchmarks in to make sure that the Iraqi Government is doing all that they should do to make sure that they carry out their responsibility since the U.S. taxpayer will be spending over \$100 billion and counting over in Iraq in this piece of legislation, this supplemental, but also the \$400-plus billion that have already been spent.

And also security for the troops, making sure that Department of Defense regulations, Mr. Speaker, that have been put forth to protect our troops, that they have what they need: the up-armor that they need, the training that they need, the equipment that they need, the personal equipment that they need.

And also making sure that our troops, as it relates to their rotation into theater, that they actually get an opportunity to have a Defense Department that has to do what they said they would do, and making sure they have enough time to be with their families, make sure they are able to maintain a job, those that are Reservists and National Guard men and women back home. And to also make sure that their families have an opportunity to be a part of their father or their mother's lives, or their parents having an opportunity to enjoy their son or daughter. And I think that is so very, very important as family values, and it is also standing by our word.

If we can't stand by our word while they are enlisted or federalized to serve in Iraq and Afghanistan, then how do they expect for us to stand next to them and behind them when they are veterans and they are out in the world of veterans health care?

I can tell you also, Mr. Speaker, that I am very pleased with the fact that we did put something in the legislation that will hopefully point towards redeployment of our troops. This war will continue and continue and continue if left up to the President of the United States. But before I start talking about the action really that we took, passing that legislation, seeing the voice vote that took place in the Senate last week, moving on legislation even with a closer time line and different bench-

marks, which, Mr. Speaker, you know we will come together in conference to talk about a little further and iron out and be able to get a work product to the President.

But as you know, today, March 26 of 2007, the number stands at 3,235 U.S. servicemen and women that have died in Iraq; some 13,415 of U.S. troops have been injured and returned back to battle. You have to think about it, injured and then returned back to battle; 10,000 U.S. troops have been injured and have not been able to return back to battle.

Hearing those numbers and hearing how they continue to move up, Mr. Speaker, even speaks further to the kind of oversight that this Congress must have in this conflict in Iraq, this civil war in Iraq, I must add, that we are officiating.

We know that the President had a press conference after we took our action here on the floor. I want to commend the Members again who voted in the affirmative to make sure that we were able to take action, the first time the U.S. Congress has taken action with benchmarks, even against profiteering with U.S. contractors that are the third largest, you may call it coalition partner, or the second largest outside of U.S. servicemen and women in Iraq. You would assume that there are other countries in the world, since this is such a world issue that the United States is involved in, you would assume that there would be a number of countries before U.S. contractors, but U.S. contractors are the second largest number of individuals that are there.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk about these numbers and when we talked about the action last week, the President, then he sprung into action. He had a press conference talking about how the Congress is now holding dollars back from our men and women in theater and asking us to please stop. Well, I am glad that I lived long enough over the weekend to come back here to the floor, Mr. Speaker, to not only share with the President, but those that may think that by us standing up on behalf of veterans health care, by us making sure that Walter Reed Hospital gets the necessary dollars they need to be able to take on the influx of men and women coming back from theater that are injured of the 10,772 that cannot and will not go back to theater and the 13,415, when that number continues to increase, that when they get their care in the field and then they move on to Germany and they get even further care, and some of them have to come back here to Washington, D.C. to even get physical therapy and all the things that they need to get back to the theater, if that is stopping the dollars from getting to the troops, then I think that we need to go back to a civics lesson of what this is all about.

We are putting dollars in what the Republican majority did not put in. Anything that the President asked for, the Republican majority rubber-stamped it. As a matter of fact, the Republican majority in the last Congress

was so loyal to the President of the United States that whatever he said, whatever he wanted, they did it. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? I am here to report that that is one of the big reasons why we have a Democratic majority right now in the U.S. House of Representatives and in the Senate. Some 30-odd seats were lost living under that philosophy. And all of the hours that we spent on this floor, all of the hours that we spent in committee saying that if you give us the opportunity to lead, we will lead. Democrats, Republicans, Independents and some Americans who never voted before in their life went out and voted last November.

Now, the President can have a press conference, that's fine, he is the President of the United States. I can go out and have a press conference. The bottom line is let's not have the people of the United States of America feel that the U.S. House and the Senate are holding money back from the troops. As a matter of fact, we have given more than what the President called for as it relates to armor. We've given the troops more as it relates to troop safety and force protection. We've added three new brigades to the Marines. We've added 36,000 more soldiers to the Army to make sure we are at the readiness level. Under the Republican majority of the 109th and the 108th Congress, as this war started and continued to escalate to the numbers of where it is now, our readiness levels, and when I speak of readiness levels, Mr. Speaker, I speak of the fact that if we had to go into another conflict, we are not ready.

□ 2145

There is not a National Guard unit right now that is ready to go to battle. Now, what do we mean by readiness? Making sure that they have the equipment, making sure that they have enough personnel to be able to rise to the occasion, all the specialists that are needed, all the striker brigades that are needed. We have 100 of them, but we are not at the readiness level that we need to be, and we haven't been at this low level that we are now since the Vietnam war. I am not giving out any national secrets. Everyone knows that this is the case. So if we know the obvious, why not take care of it?

We are doing more than what the President has asked for. The President just has a problem. Do you know what the problem is? It is the fact that the Congress has said: Guess what, Mr. President. I know you have been saying a lot over the last 4 or 5 years of this war, now within its fifth year, the third escalation of troops that you have sent over to Iraq; and we pass a nonbinding resolution in the majority and Republicans voted for that, too, saying that we disagree with that philosophy. The American people are far beyond the President on this issue. So we are here to represent the American people.

The second point, when you look at this issue of the binding resolution, it

says that if the Iraqi government does not meet the benchmarks set by who, the President of the United States, George W. Bush, then the redeployment of troops will start. The clock will start at that point for a redeployment of a number of troops within 6 months.

What else took place? The President said that it is important that we are not there forever. Well, still living under going in the old direction, the President wants the prerogative to be able to say, well, they are going to be there as long as they need to be there, and there is not necessarily a plan, and you haven't given an opportunity for the plan to work of the new escalation of troops.

Well, guess what? We saw plan one, and the violence did not go down. We sat here and watched plan two, and the violence did not subside. They weren't using Vice President CHENEY's, the enemies are in the last throes of their insurgency, later to find out that that is not the truth.

So I guess we are just are supposed to continue to go on and on and on.

So, Mr. MURPHY, I guess when we start looking at the benchmarks, that is the problem. Why doesn't the President say, that is my problem; I have a problem with the fact that the U.S. Congress is saying they no longer want to go with my original thoughts? There is nothing wrong with that. He is an American. He can say it.

But the bottom line is every last one of us sitting in these seats here in Congress and across the hall in the Senate, our obligation is to the individuals that have sent us here. Our constituents that have Federalized us here to make decisions on their behalf.

We are not generals. Some of us served in the military, some of us did not serve in the military, some of us never wore a uniform in our lives, but I can tell you this much. We have been sent here to watch over the U.S. taxpayer dollars, have the well-being of our U.S. troops that are allowing us to salute one flag, and to make sure that our number one obligation is to be loyal to the American people, and not one person.

So I speak very firmly and I stand very firmly on this point. Because I sat here the last 4 years in the minority not having an opportunity to be a part of the decisionmaking, not even being able to agenda a bill in committee or subcommittee, not able to bring a bill up here on the floor that the Republican majority did not allow me to. I mean, under the rules, they didn't allow me to. To now say, well, the President says that we are holding up dollars, emergency dollars for the war in Iraq?

Let me just share a few other things, and then possibly we can go into an exchange.

In the summer of 2005, there was a shortfall as it relates to veterans' health care, \$2.7 billion.

In March of 2006, the President's budget cut funding by \$6 billion over 5

years that was passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. And the first time, Mr. MURPHY, that we had an opportunity to do anything, when I say the Democratic majority, the first action, and it was because of the inaction by the Republican Congress that did not pass the appropriations bills on time, that we passed a continuing resolution to keep this government running, and what did we do?

Well, we went into that bill and we made sure some of the special interest tax breaks and all of the things that the Republicans had in place, being loyal to individuals that had great influence in this House, and I am not talking about Members, I am talking about outside forces. We took \$3.6 billion of the U.S. taxpayer dollars to increase the VA health care program and to make sure that their budget was in place so that our veterans would have somewhere that they can get care and their families.

That was our action. The President didn't ask for that. As a matter of fact, the President didn't even want it. But we did it because it was the right thing to do, and that was prior to the Walter Reed.

I keep saying that because that is so very, very important. People think that politicians and some folks do things just because somebody was looking or somebody said that you should do it or you are under some political pressure. That was a natural thing for the Democratic majority to do, and we did it.

And for the President to stand and say, well, you know, there is things in there that should not be in there and things that I didn't ask for. Well, guess what, we have to ask for it. I am even going to go down memory lane again.

January of 2003, the same administration, President Bush cuts veterans' health care for 164,000 veterans.

March of 2003, Republican budget cut \$14 billion from veterans' health care, passed by the Congress, with 199 Democrats voting against it. That is House Concurrent Resolution 95, vote number 82.

March, 2004, Republican budget shortchanged veterans health care by \$1.5 billion. It was passed by the Congress, 201 Democrats voting against it. That is House Concurrent Resolution 393, vote number 92.

March, 2005, President Bush's budget shortchanged veterans' health care by more than \$2 billion for 2005 and cut veterans' health care by \$14 billion over 5 years. That was passed with 201 Democrats voting against it. That is House Concurrent Resolution, vote number 88.

I think it is very important that we outline that.

Just like I said here earlier when I talked about the 2005 shortfall, after Democrats pressured the Bush administration and finally acknowledged that the 2006 shortfall for veterans' health care totaled \$2.7 billion, Democrats fought all summer to make sure that

those dollars were placed back in the right direction as it relates to veterans' health care.

Also in March, 2006, President Bush's budget cut veterans' funding by \$6 billion over 5 years, passed by the Republican-controlled Congress and, like I said, at \$3.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, we come to the floor and we mean business. We are not coming here to have a press conference and talk to some folks that may not quite understand exactly what is going on day to day in Congress. That is why we are here. We are here to make sure the American people know exactly what is going on here.

The reason why we speak very passionately about, you may say, well, it is Iraq, Iraq, Iraq, Iraq and, guess what, that other issue, Iraq. The reason we speak very passionately about that is that we have seen so much on this floor and so many words that Mr. MURPHY talked about earlier, Members going on passing out inaccurate information every now and then, or the spirit of the information, whichever way you want to frame it, and to see the hard-core reality of these issues are still not addressed.

I had something here where all of the veteran groups, I must add here, Mr. Speaker, "This much-needed funding increase will allow the Department of Veterans Affairs to better meet its needs for the men and women returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as all veterans who have served in the past." That is from the National Commander of Disabled American Veterans. That press release was March 21, 2007. "The American Legion and its 2.8 million members applaud the Budget Committee for the budget resolution recommendation for \$43.1 billion in discretionary funding for veterans. Your recommendations are close with the views that are estimated, that was estimated by the American Legion earlier this year." That is by the legislative director and the lead on the American Legion.

I think it is very, very important that Members understand that. Veteran groups are 110 percent, 110 percent, Mr. Speaker, about what this Democratic-controlled Congress is doing; and we are just getting started. This is Monday. We are talking about the things that we need to put in place to make sure that our men and women need to have what they need to have when they are in theater and when they are out of theater.

I challenge the President to think within his heart and within his mind that he would turn a new leaf, and making sure that when we send this emergency supplemental to his desk, if he vetoes it, it will be his action that will be delaying the dollars to go to our men and women in harm's way.

I have said once before last week, Mr. Speaker, I voted for two emergency supplementals, a lot that I did not agree with, but the last thing I wanted to do was to leave our men and women

in harm's way without the necessary funding that they need. So if I, someone that has a different opinion than the President and the old Republican majority as it relates to this war in Iraq, we are all Americans first and, guess what, life is not perfect and everything is not going to come the way you want it to come when you want it to come.

There are other people in this democracy that have something to say about it, and I know there are Republicans in America that feel the way the way that we feel. I know that there are Independents in America that feel the way we feel, and I know that there are Democrats and those that are looking to vote in coming elections to be a part of this democracy.

So I come very proud of the work that has been done and the work that will continue to be done here in this House.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. MEEK, just as a transition to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I would just say, elections matter; and there is probably no better example of that in recent history than the election in November. Things have just changed here. The air is different, the priorities are different, the rate of action is different.

And, Mr. MEEK, I get why we had to have an election in order to change course in Iraq. I understand that this is a very difficult subject that has divided people for a number of years. Over the past several years, people, large numbers of people came to the conclusion that we needed to change course from the President's policy, that we needed to put a Congress here that is going to start standing up to this guy and insisting that there are some other fights that matter in this world, and that we need to invest back in Afghanistan, that we need to make sure that our borders here are protected and that we needed to start redeploying our forces.

So I get that we had to go to a national referendum in order to set a new course. That is an important issue that has divided people.

Now, people have come down pretty firmly in the past 12 or 18 months on the side of a new direction. That is why Friday, to me, was maybe the most gratifying day in the short number that I have been here. But, Mr. MEEK, I don't get why we had to have an election to decide to support veterans.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If I may, and then I will yield and you can share all the great information. And Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ happens to be in between us today, so all we need is Mr. RYAN down here, and she will have a real challenge. But I can tell you from past experience of serving with her for 12 plus years now that she is very capable of rising to the occasion here.

Let me just point out, just today, Mr. MURPHY and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we took a vote. We took a vote saying that we would like for the appointed U.S. District Attorneys to come and be confirmed before Congress. Something

that is very, very important, giving the chief judge an opportunity to appoint a temporary U.S. District Attorney, for that opportunity to take place because of what is happening now in the Justice Department. And I think it is important. I saw Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ earlier talking today about this very subject.

But, on the Republican side, you have some Republicans that are saying it is just horrible of what is happening. Because if what we think or believe what happened, these political appointees and then they got taken out because they were either going after someone that the administration did not want them to go after or they weren't going after certain individuals as it relates to political motivation. And under what we may call regular order in the 109th Congress or the 108th Congress or beyond, the kind of grip that this administration had over the House and the Senate, the chokehold that they had over the House and Senate, this would have never been an issue. It never would have been followed up on. There never would have been a hearing.

Guess what? Now, Mr. Speaker, there are hearings in both House and Senate, and now the Attorney General is getting caught in his own words. One minute he had nothing to do with it, and he didn't know what anyone was talking about. Now we understand that he led a meeting even talking about this issue.

So when you look at it, and Mr. MURPHY and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, 329 Members of the House. It goes to show you, with the right leadership in place, we have a Democratic majority, Republicans will vote, some Republicans will vote and move in the right direction. Only one Member of the Republican leadership voted for this commonsense approach. There are still Members on the Republican side that are in the leadership that are still holding on to what used to be. The election took place last November. You would think, well, maybe the American people are not with this.

So I am just saying that this issue is continuing to evolve, and I bring these examples up so that the Members can see that we have a lot of work to do. It is not about partisanship. This is about leadership, and we are providing the leadership here.

I know Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ who serves on the Judiciary Committee can speak more eloquently on this issue. But this is one example amongst many. You called out those bipartisan votes at the beginning of the hour. We have to continue to embrace bipartisanship because that is what the American people want. They don't want us to be Democrats and Republicans. They want us to be Members of Congress watching out for the better good.

□ 2200

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. MEEK and Mr. MURPHY, it is great to be here again.

I had an opportunity to engage in some dialogue with the caucus chairman on the Republican side, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM). I fully expected to be engaged in a point-counterpoint discussion on the U.S. Attorney General and the U.S. Attorney scandal, and that he would be defensive, as many of his colleagues have been. But knowing Mr. PUTNAM as we do, he was very frustrated. He expressed deep concern. He was beyond comprehension how the administration could have dealt with this problem in the way that they did.

I was asked how I felt about it as a member of the Judiciary Committee. Quite honestly, under normal circumstances the President does have the right to appoint and unappoint and ask for the resignation of U.S. Attorneys that serve at his pleasure. Had it been a matter of him just saying, yes, I asked for their resignation, we have some other needs, we are moving in a different direction, whatever he said, just be straight with the American people. Just be straight with the Congress. If he had said, yes, I asked for their resignation, I can do that, I am the President. Fine.

But, instead, it is fabrication, it is distortion, it is no, it was not him, it was the guy behind the tree. It was his mother. Just own up to what you did.

Now, if the problem is what you did, you asked for their resignation because they were too good at their job and they were pursuing public corruption cases against Republicans, and we have colleagues that picked up the phone and put some pressure on these U.S. Attorneys whose resignation ultimately was asked for, that is a horse of a different color.

But this would have never exploded to the level it has if they had just said, yes, we did. What I pointed out in my conversation with Mr. PUTNAM, in past years, and I was happy to see he was frustrated and concerned and there is bipartisan concern about the action that this administration has taken repeatedly on the war in Iraq, on the U.S. Attorney firings, and on the handling of the Valerie Plame issue, and the list goes on and on.

Had there not been Democrats in charge of the Congress, this would have been another thing that would have been swept aside. They would have moved on or waited it out. They would have squeezed their eyes tight shut and hoped that this, too, would pass.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I know that some of this administration are supposedly not great students of history; but if you read of recent Presidencies, you might find out if you tell the truth right off the bat, you get yourself in a lot less trouble than if you try to place the blame.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I want to go back to my "mom" analogy that I had last week. It is like how I deal with my kids. I told them, as all little kids, they get nervous when they have done something wrong. Sometimes

they might not be completely truthful. And I have sat them down time and again, and said, listen, honey, if you just tell me the truth right away, it is going to be easier. I might be a little mad, but I am going to be more upset if I find out you lied on top of a lie. Young kids might not completely understand this, but grownups like the President and the Attorney General can certainly understand the more you stretch the truth, because we have to be careful about the words we use here, the harder it is to remember the last one you told, the last version of the truth you told.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, there is going to be a lot of stuff over the next couple months about Executive privilege and who said what, and there may be a lot of terms that may not seem like it matters to regular people.

The heart of the matter is the difference between America and some Third World nations out there is we have a system of blind justice which holds people accountable for their actions based on whether they were right or wrong, whether they broke the law or didn't break the law; not whether they have some powerful friend sitting in the halls and corridors of power in Washington, D.C. or their State legislature. That is what separates this country from a lot of other places in the world where you can get hauled off to jail simply because you have fallen in disfavor with someone who is in a high political position. That is the essence of the genius of this country, that we have made sure that our legal system operates separate from our political system.

There is going to be a lot of commotion about Executive privilege. What it comes down to is what may have happened is that this administration violated one of the basic principles of American democracy: don't mix justice with politics.

And you are very right, maybe people wouldn't have found out about this if we did have Democrats in the majority.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We absolutely have to make sure that we continue to exercise the system of checks and balances in our oversight role here. If we don't, I am really fearful about what else. And we have already seen the evidence of how far this administration will push and how obsessed they are with the notion of a unitary Executive and the concentration of power that they have tried to gather in the Executive, through signing statements which are notations, whole paragraphs and pages and pages of notations on legislation that we pass here.

We will say "X" must happen. And in a signing statement, the President will actually write a note that says why he doesn't have to do "X" even though Congress passed a law and he signed it. He has exercised more than any other President combined the so-called right to, essentially if he doesn't think a

provision in the law that we have passed is constitutional, he has exercised his belief that he can ignore it or not implement it. That is what the judiciary is for.

So between signing statements and the abuse of power with the PATRIOT Act and National Security Letters and essentially not being entirely straightforward, for lack of a better term, I am coming up with a lot of adjectives and synonyms for the "L" word here, there is an incredible effort being made that seems to require more energy than the straight-up truth does.

That is why the oversight role is so important. If we are not here asking questions, then the administration will run rough shod over the Constitution. They have proven that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The sense I am getting from my district now is that this is all fine probably if everything is going okay for everyone else. But the fact that things aren't going well, people are struggling to pay for their health care and college tuition. They are living paycheck to paycheck, bankruptcies are up, foreclosures, and kids are getting killed because of an administration that has been less than forthright with the facts. I think that is what is stirring among the American people.

That is what happened in the election in November; and I think quite frankly the key to moving the kind of agenda we want to move here is going to be organize and tap that energy that is back home in a lot of our districts. Unless we do that, we are going to struggle. But I think we have the wind at our back. We have the American people at our back. They like what we are doing. There are good responses from the bill we passed on Friday.

□ 2210

We have got to get out of Iraq, and this President does not have the credibility to I think withstand the kind of pressure that is coming from the American people. The American people want out. They are tired of watching what is happening. Five more soldiers got killed, more kids maimed, more kids injured, more kids at Walter Reed, more kids go into a VA system that is less than adequate, and the American people are looking for the kind of changes that you have talked about, Congressman MEEK has talked about.

The bottom line I think is this, and whether you are talking about the war or anything else. For the war, it is like, well, there is only two options here. We either go down the road the President has taken us down and keep going or we have this alternative that we presented to get us out in the next year, hopefully earlier. An alternative to not going with our proposition is to continue to give the President a blank check, continue to have kids get killed, continue to not have a plan with absolutely no explanation as to what we are doing over there. No one even knows anymore.

To go along with the President's budget means that as we look through our notes here and the research we did, 1 million children who are currently covered under the SCHIP program will get cut out of it. Our plan, invest \$50 billion to cover millions of children who are currently uninsured. Which way do you want to go? I mean, this is not brain surgery. The President wants to continue to give tax cuts to the top 1 percent. We want to cover kids with health care, without raising taxes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). All Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker, but this Congress wants to add up to \$50 billion to cover \$50 million of new children on the State Children's Health Insurance Program. We want to get the Pell grant up to at least \$4,600 and we reject the President's proposals for cuts.

Now, imagine the leadership in the United States of America in 2007, Mr. Speaker, 2007 where he is going to say we want to not fund Pell Grants, we want to not fund children's health insurance and we want to continue to spend \$2 billion a week in Iraq.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman. On Friday, what we said was no more blank checks, no more war without a strategy and a plan to get our men and women in uniform home, no more sending troops over into combat, into harm's way without the armor they need, without the preparation they need, without the rest they need. All of those items were in that Iraq War supplemental.

The alternative, what the President preferred, was just give me the money, just give me the money; do not ask me any questions. He was opposed to his own benchmarks. The benchmarks that he laid out on January 10 were in the bill, the ones that he said the Iraqi people have to meet, that the Iraqi leadership has to meet, and we added some that said, you know what, you have to make sure that you think about protecting the men and women we are sending over there.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We said that you said these are the benchmarks, and guess what, we are going to hold you accountable for what you have said, because up to this point, you have been saying whatever you want and there has not been the kind of force of law which we passed out of here on Friday.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Words are nice, but when you go, like each of us have, to Walter Reed Army Medical Center and you look those troops in the eye and you have a chance to spend some time with them, the words ring really hollow unless you know you can back those words up with some action, with some commitment, with some belief in the mission and understand how devoted these men and women are to getting the job done.

I mean, listen to some of the folks that are in that hospital, they all, to a

person, have told me when I have been there, they want to go back. They want to get better, and they want to go back to join their comrades, their buddies, and help finish the job, but we have to make sure that we have their back.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Is that not interesting that the soldiers we talked to, Mr. Speaker, at Walter Reed, back home, the kids that have gone, come back, gone, come back, and they are going back again, the reason you hear about why these kids want to go back and you think why would you want to go back, they want to go back because their buddies are still there. They feel like if they go back that they will be able to save their lives.

The last couple of funerals I have been to with kids who were stop-loss and were supposed to come home but ended up staying longer than they probably should have and ended up not making it back, the reason they wanted to go back in the first place was to protect their friends, and that is the heroism, that is the valor, that is the nobility of the cause. That is why these kids go back.

To talk about that the debate last week, and many of us did not get an opportunity to speak for a variety of different reasons, but to hear, Mr. Speaker, some people say that if we bring these kids home, somehow that is going to make us less safe here in the United States, is an appalling argument, that this administration and this Republican Congress would rubber stamp this war to go over there, and that National Intelligence Estimate has told us that this war has created more terrorists, not less. It has created more terrorists, Mr. Speaker, and then now that we have thousands and thousands and thousands of more people gunning for us here, these folks have the audacity to tell us, Mr. Speaker, that somehow us bringing our kids home is going to make us less safe.

Now, that, to me, is appalling and to continue that kind of disjointed logic is unacceptable to me because we have kids in our districts who are not back home. They are either in Iraq, and many of them have gotten killed under the guise of the war, and to tell us that by bringing our kids home and getting them out of a civil war is going to make us less safe does not make any sense because all of the intelligence in the whole world is saying this war in Iraq has completed the final piece of the fanaticism of the Middle East.

We have given anyone who kind of wanted to join but did not really want to, they are now joining. They are now a part of everything. They are now a part of the terrorist groups. They are now a part of the terrorist organizations. They now hate the United States more than they ever have, and so I find the whole operation appalling.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. What we have gotten ourselves into, this is a religious war.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Civil war.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. This is a religious war that we helped to cre-

ate in part. It did not exist until the bull sort of rushed into the China shop, but I think we all find it appalling, some of us, this simplistic terminology that gets rolled out here that we cannot leave until victory has been achieved. Explain to me what victory is because if we have to stay there until we have completely eliminated a civil/religious conflict, well, it was not raging for the decades before we got there and is one that has almost no historical bounds. That is a difficult victory to ask our brave men and women to achieve, to try to somehow mediate a dispute between Shia and Sunni that cannot be resolved through the military actions of our men and women.

Victory is much broader than that. Victory is about going after the fight that really mattered in the first place which is in Afghanistan, Mr. Speaker. Victory is about making sure that we secure our borders here at home; that every container that comes into American ports gets checked; that every airport has the proper screening technology to make sure that the ports of entry who brought in the terrorists who harmed this country have all the technology they need to make sure that it never happens again.

□ 2220

That's victory in the end. So it's frustrating as a new Member to come down here and to listen to this new terminology get thrown out there that doesn't have any basis in reality. That is part of what we did on Friday as well, to start to broaden that definition of what victory means and try to challenge the people to rise to that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. On behalf of the American people, I think they are trying to see what we are trying to do. We are trying to end this war, stop the killing of our own kids, stop the maiming of our own soldiers, get them out of a civil war, try to calm down what's happening, stop the \$8-plus billion a month that we are spending over there, and try to take some of that money and invest that into our own students, our own kids.

I was, just before I got here, having dinner with an old friend of mine, who is a Republican. He said, we have spent \$400 billion, soon to be \$500-and-some-billion dollars on this war. Can you just imagine, we could have covered all of our citizens for health care, we could have paid for everyone's college education, and, you know, gotten some stuff done in this country.

Instead, we have \$500 billion, we have well over 3,000 kids have gotten killed, adults and soldiers, some 25,000 maimed or injured and God knows how many innocent Iraqi civilians, many of them children.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. As we conclude, the President is so stubborn and so "my way or the highway," that his own definition of victory, the benchmarks that we have put in this bill, he is threatening to veto. That is

what is mind-boggling, even when we insert his milestones. Still, that is not acceptable.

If the gentleman would like to talk about our Web site.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Our e-mail is 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov if any Members would like to e-mail us or visit us at www.speaker.gov/30something, e-mail us, 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. The Web site now, Mr. RYAN, is updated.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. All of the new statistics from our budget will be on there, I am sure.

I think this is an appropriate time to make the announcement of our key staffer for years and years and years here at the 30-something Working Group, Tom Manatos has gotten engaged. He is going to be married to a beautiful young Republican.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Who works at the White House.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Who works at the White House, and the engagement, I guess, was blessed by the Greek Orthodox archbishop. How about that for off to a good start?

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. The bipartisan spirit preached by the 30-something working group put in practice.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Absorbed, even, by the 30-something leadership.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right up to the staff level.

Mr. Speaker, we yield back the balance of our time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal business.

Mr. LAMPSON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 27.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 27.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending his son's 20th birthday.

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. TANNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, 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. POE, for 5 minutes, today and March 27, 28, and 29.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, March 27.

Ms. GRANGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 27, 28, and 29.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 27, 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:

960. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and promulgation of State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Florida: Emissions Guidelines for Small Municipal Waste Combustion Units [EPA-R04-OAR-2006-0140-200605(a); FRL-8276-7] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

961. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Amendments to the Minor New Source Review Program [EPA-R03-OAR-2006-0915; FRL-8276-3] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

962. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Alaska [EPA-R10-OAR-2006-0377; FRL-8249-2] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

963. A letter from the Office of Managing Director, AMD-PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's Rules To Implement WRC-03 Regulations Applicable to Requirements for Operator Licenses in the Amateur Radio Service [WT Docket No. 05-235] Amendment of the Commission's Rules Governing the Amateur Radio Services [WT Docket No. 04-140] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

964. A letter from the Office of Managing Director, AMD-PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rechannelization of the 17.7-19.7 GHz Frequency Band for Fixed Microwave Services under Part 101 of the Commission's Rules [WT Docket No. 04-143]

received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

965. A letter from the Office of Managing Director, AMD-PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Petition of Mid-Rivers Telephone Cooperative, Inc. for Order Declaring It to be an Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier in Terry, Montana Pursuant to Section 251(h)(2) [WC Docket No. 02-78] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

966. A letter from the Office of Managing Director, AMD-PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act and Broadband Access and Services [ET Docket No. 04-295; RM-10865] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

967. A letter from the Office of Managing Director, AMD-PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Hennessey, Oklahoma) [MB Docket No. 05-85; RM-11164] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

968. A letter from the Office of Managing Director, AMD-PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Opelika and Waverly, Alabama) [MB Docket No. 05-79] Reclassification of License of Station WSTR(FM), Smyrna, Georgia) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

969. A letter from the Office of Managing Director, AMD-PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Hale Center, Texas) [MB Docket No. 05-114; RM-1190] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

970. A letter from the Office of Managing Director, AMD-PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Columbus, Indiana) [MB Docket No. 05-238; RM-11260] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

971. A letter from the Acting SSA Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Optometrists as "Acceptable Medical Sources" to Establish a Medically Determinable Impairment. [Docket No. SSA-2006-0085] (RIN: 0960-AG05) received February 27, 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. RANGEL: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 493. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of genetic information with respect to health insurance and employment; with an amendment (Rept. 110-28 Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1019. A bill to

designate the United States customhouse building located at 31 Gonzalez Clemente Avenue in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the "Rafael Martinez Nadal United States Customhouse Building" (Rept. 110-70). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1138. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse" (Rept. 110-71). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 753. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Clifford Davis/Odell Horton Federal Building"; with amendments (Rept. 110-72). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 269. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 835) to reauthorize the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for housing assistance for Native Hawaiians (Rept. 110-73). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 270. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1401) to improve the security of railroads, public transportation, and over-the-road buses in the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-74). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 493. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than March 29, 2007.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. BEAN (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. GILLMOR):

H.R. 1675. A bill to suspend the requirements of the Department of Housing and Urban Development regarding electronic filing of previous participation certificates and regarding filing of such certificates with respect to certain low-income housing investors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 1676. A bill to reauthorize the program of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for loan guarantees for Indian housing; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1677. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance taxpayer protections and outreach; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WOLF, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr.

DEFAZIO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. RENZI, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 1678. A bill to amend the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 to authorize appropriations to provide assistance for domestic and foreign programs and centers for the treatment of victims of torture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MACK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1679. A bill to protect the environmental integrity of coral reefs and other coastal marine resources from exploration, development, and production activities for petroleum resources located in a maritime exclusive economic zone of the United States that is contiguous to a foreign exclusive economic zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DENT, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 1680. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to regulate the sale of ammonium nitrate to prevent and deter the acquisition of ammonium nitrate by terrorists; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 1681. A bill to amend the Congressional Charter of The American National Red Cross to modernize its governance structure, to enhance the ability of the board of governors of The American National Red Cross to support the critical mission of The American National Red Cross in the 21st century, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H.R. 1682. A bill to restore the financial solvency of the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan):

H.R. 1683. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for community projects that will reduce the number of individuals who are uninsured with respect to health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. CLARKE, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1684. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1685. A bill to protect information relating to consumers, to require notice of security breaches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1686. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act to require that uniforms, protective gear, badges, and identification cards of personnel be manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. REGULA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WELLER, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 1687. A bill to provide competitive grants for training court reporters and closed captioners to meet requirements for realtime writers under the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1688. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide health insurance coverage for children and pregnant women throughout the United States by combining the children and pregnant woman health coverage under Medicaid and SCHIP into a new All Healthy Children Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLER:

H.R. 1689. A bill to provide support to combat illegal downloading on college and university campuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1690. A bill to improve airport screening and security; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 1691. A bill to end the use of conventional steel-jawed leghold traps on animals

in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1692. A bill to fight criminal gangs; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SIREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHN-SON of Georgia, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 1693. A bill to authorize National Mall Liberty Fund D.C. to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia at Constitution Gardens previously approved to honor free persons and slaves who fought for independence, liberty, and justice for all during the American Revolution; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1694. A bill to improve the financial assistance provided to State, local, and tribal governments by expanding the eligible use of funding under the Homeland Security Grant Program to include costs related to staff and law enforcement analysts engaged in information and intelligence sharing activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1695. A bill to establish a National Commission on the Prevention of Radicalization, to enhance information sharing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 1696. A bill to amend the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act to allow the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo tribe to determine blood quantum requirement for membership in that Tribe; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. JINDAL):

H.R. 1697. A bill to establish a Rural Policing Institute within the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center of the Department of Homeland Security to develop and provide for training programs for rural law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1698. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety standard for each durable infant or toddler product, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1699. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to require certain manufacturers to provide consumer product registration forms to facilitate recalls of durable infant and toddler products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 1700. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to

enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida (for himself, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1701. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from the harbor maintenance tax for certain shipping between United States mainland ports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SOLIS, and Ms. WATSON):

H.R. 1702. A bill to reallocate funds toward sensible priorities such as improved children's education, increased children's access to health care, expanded job training, and increased energy efficiency and conservation through a reduction of wasteful defense spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, Homeland Security, Foreign Affairs, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1703. A bill to establish a coordinated avalanche protection program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. Engel, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. BLAUMENAUER):

H. Con. Res. 100. A concurrent resolution condemning the recent violent actions of the Government of Zimbabwe against peaceful opposition party activists and members of civil society; to the Committee on foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H. Res. 266. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SIREN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MACK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr.

SHIMKUS, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BARROW, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. RENZI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. JORDAN):

H. Res. 267. A resolution calling for the immediate and unconditional release of British marines and sailors held captive by Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCINTYRE (for himself and Mr. PITTS):

H. Res. 268. A resolution supporting responsible fatherhood, promoting marriage, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H. Res. 271. A resolution recognizing the heroism and sacrifice of Medal of Honor recipients, commending the efforts of the Medal of Honor Host City Program in Gainesville, Texas, to celebrate and honor the contributions of Medal of Honor recipients, and encouraging the expansion of the program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. KILPATRICK):

H. Res. 272. A resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. STUPAK introduced a bill (H.R. 1704) for the relief of Robert and Verda Shatusky; 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. 20: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 23: Mr. SPACE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STARK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 39: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 45: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BURGESS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 66: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

- H.R. 74: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 89: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 146: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H.R. 191: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 192: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 193: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 234: Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 303: Mr. WOLF, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 315: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 359: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 368: Mr. GOODE, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. RENZI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 410: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 418: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 462: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 463: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 473: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 477: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. JINDAL, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 493: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 550: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 552: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 620: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 649: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 657: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 661: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 670: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 684: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 695: Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 699: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 704: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 718: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SHULER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 727: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 748: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 758: Mrs. CAPPES.
H.R. 760: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 808: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 816: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 819: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mrs. GILLIBRAND.
H.R. 869: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 881: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 901: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 913: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 943: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 971: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. JINDAL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 997: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1038: Mr. THORBERRY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1042: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 1051: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1056: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 1058: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 1061: Mr. BAIRD and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1063: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 1073: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1074: Mr. HILL and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1078: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1093: Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MICA, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1094: Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 1103: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1108: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1117: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HODES, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1120: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1121: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1122: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1139: Mr. DREIER and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1146: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1157: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1187: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 1216: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1222: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1223: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1225: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1228: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1246: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1250: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1280: Mr. FILNER and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1281: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1289: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1314: Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1324: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1330: Ms. GIFFORDS and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 1346: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1347: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1353: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1363: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1380: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1391: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1392: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 1413: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1422: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1434: Mr. KAGEN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1441: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1448: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1469: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WU, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1474: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1479: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1493: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1498: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1506: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. HINCHAY, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1524: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1543: Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1551: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1554: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1560: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1565: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1566: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1576: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1586: Ms. FOXX, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. WAMP, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 1588: Mr. McNULTY.
H.R. 1595: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1633: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1640: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 1645: Mr. HONDA and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1660: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. JINDAL.
H.J. Res. 14: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.J. Res. 37: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.J. Res. 39: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FARR, and Mr. COHEN.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. LAMPSON.
H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WATT, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. BOREN.
H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. BOYD of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 68: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. WYNN.
H. Con. Res. 92: Mr. WEXLER.
H. Res. 20: Mr. DOGGETT.
H. Res. 37: Mr. BECERRA.
H. Res. 55: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 100: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H. Res. 119: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H. Res. 121: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. DOYLE.
H. Res. 154: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 158: Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H. Res. 169: Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H. Res. 179: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. STARK, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. SHULER.
H. Res. 196: Mr. BAIRD.
H. Res. 197: Mr. STARK.
H. Res. 221: Mr. WATT.
H. Res. 231: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 233: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Res. 235: Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. BOYD of Florida.
H. Res. 243: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H. Res. 250: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
H. Res. 259: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KÜHL of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. MATHESON.
H. Res. 264: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

THE HONORABLE JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XI

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the

Committee is required to include a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. It is not clear if the definition of "congressional earmark" under clause 9(d) of rule XXI applies to technical corrections to SAFETEA-LU projects because these technical corrections do not provide new budget authority for such projects.

However, in the interests of full disclosure and transparency, the Committee has re-

quired Members of Congress to comply with all requirements of clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI. The table included in House Report 110-62 provides a list of such provisions included in the bill. The following table provides a list of such additional provisions included in the bill, as amended, that the House of Representatives considers today:

H.R. 1195 Section	SAFETEA-LU Section	Legislative provision	Requested by
§ 105(a)(232)	§ 1702(2193)	In item number 2193 by striking the project description and by inserting "710 Freeway Study to comprehensively evaluate the technical feasibility of a tunnel alternative to close the 710 Freeway gap, considering all practicable routes, in addition to any potential route previously considered, and with no funds to be used for preliminary engineering or environmental review except to the extent necessary to determine feasibility".	Adam Schiff.
§ 105(a)(233)	§ 1702(2445)	In item number 2445 by striking the project description and by inserting "\$600,000 for road and pedestrian safety improvements on Main Street in the Village of Patchogue; \$900,000 for road and pedestrian safety improvements on Montauk Highway, between NYS Route 112 and Suffolk County Road 101 in Suffolk County".	Timothy H. Bishop.
§ 105(a)(234)	§ 1702(346)	In item number 346 by striking the project description and by inserting "Hansen Dam Recreation Area access improvements including hillside stabilization and parking lot rehabilitation along Osborne Street between Glenoaks Boulevard and Dronfield Avenue".	Howard L. Berman.
§ 105(a)(235)	§ 1702(449)	In item number 449 by striking the project description and inserting "Route 30 and Mount Pleasant Road Interchange Safety Improvements, Westmoreland County, install light installations at intersection and consolidate entrances and exits to Route 30".	Tim Murphy.
§ 110(3)	§ 1934(c)(451)	By striking item number 451	Luis G. Fortuño.
§ 110(4)	§ 1934(c)(452)	In item number 452 by striking "\$2,000,000" and inserting "\$3,000,000".	Luis G. Fortuño.
§ 201(o)(4)(A)(xii)	§ 3044(a)(57)	In item number 57 by striking the project description and inserting "Wilmington, NC, maintenance/operations and administration/transfer facilities".	Mike McIntyre.
§ 201(o)(6)	§ 3043(b)(33)	San Gabriel Valley—Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase II.—In evaluating the local share of the San Gabriel Valley—Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase II project authorized by section 3043(b)(33) of such Act (119 Stat. 1642) in the new starts rating process, the Secretary of Transportation shall give consideration to project elements of the San Gabriel Valley—Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase I project advanced with 100 percent non-Federal funds.	Adam Schiff and David Dreier.