United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 2007 No. 89

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 5, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LINCOLN DAVIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Lord, You know us. Lord, You know us through and through. You know each of us personally. You know how we are with one another. You know us, as Your people know us, the 110th Congress of the United States of America.

Lord, help us to know You. Allow us to come to know You even as we are known by You. As Ultimate Truth, enter in and make us suitable of Your dwelling within us, so Your people will place trust in us as leaders, as well as their representatives.

We choose to serve another day, another week, for we were chosen by You and Your people to serve.

Bless us and our service to this great Nation, 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 Illinois (Mr. KIRK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KIRK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 25, 2007, at 9:00 am:

That the Senate concurs in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2206.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1676.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1675.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 158.

That the Senate passed S. 231.

That the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 32.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 5, 2007.

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

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: In the light of recent developments in a legal matter involving me in the Eastern District of Virginia, I hereby request a leave from my duties as a Member of the House Small Business Committee pending my successful conclusion of that matter.

In doing so, I, of course, express no admission of guilt or culpability in that or any other matter that may be pending in any court or before the House of Representatives. I have supported every ethics and lobbying reform measure that you and our Democratic Majority have authored, and I make this request for leave to support the letter and the spirit of your leadership in this area.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TO BE AVAILABLE TO SERVE ON INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of rule X, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker named the following Members of the House to be available to serve on investigative subcommittees of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the 110th Congress:

Ms. BALDWIN, Wisconsin
Mr. CROWLEY, New York
Mr. ELLISON, Minnesota
Mr. HONDA, California
Mr. INSLEE, Washington
Ms. LEE, California
Mr. MEEKS, New York
Mrs. NAPOLITANO, California
Mr. ROTHMAN, New Jersey
Mr. SNYDER, Arkansas

Printed on recycled paper.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 25, 2007, at 3:45 pm:

That the Senate passed S. 398.

That the Senate passed S. 1537.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bills were signed by the Speaker on Friday, May 25, 2007:

H.R. 414, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 60 Calle McKinley, West in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the ''Miguel Angel Garcia Mendez Post Office Building''

H.R. 437, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 West Eisenhower Street in Rio Grande City, Texas, as the ''Lino Perez, Jr. Post Office''

H.R. 625, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4230 Maine Avenue in Baldwin Park, California, as the ''Atanacio Haro-Marin Post Office''

H.R. 1402, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 South Lecanto Highway in Lecanto, Florida, as the ''Sergeant Dennis J. Flanagan Lecanto Post Office Building''

H.R. 2080, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to conform the District charter to revisions made by the Council of the District of Columbia relating to public education

H.R. 2206, making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes

S. 214, to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys

S. 1104, to increase the number of Iraqi and Afghani translators and interpreters who may be admitted to the United States as special immigrants, and for other purposes

COMMUNICATION FROM CONSTITUENT SERVICES REPRESENTATIVE OF HON. MICHAEL R. PENCE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from John Shettle, Constituent Services Representative of the Honorable MICHAEL R. PENCE, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of Madison County, Indiana.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JOHN SHETTLE,
Constituent Services Representative.

MEMORIAL DAY IN BAGHDAD

(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, Memorial Day last week in Baghdad will always be special to me. On that day, I met with General David Petraeus, Iraq's Defense Minister Jasim, and U.S. and Iraqi troops in a Joint Security Station deep in the City of Baghdad.

Then CODEL Spratt spent 2 days in Kabul briefed by ISAF Commander Dan McNeil, Major General Robert Durbin, Afghan Defense Minister Wardak, President Hamid Karzai, and Brigadier General Robert Livingston. General Livingston commands the 218th Brigade of the South Carolina Army National Guard, which leads Task Force Phoenix to train the Afghan army and police.

I saw firsthand our coalition forces stopping terrorists overseas to protect American families at home. This meets the threat of al Qaeda's Zawahiri that Iraq and Afghanistan are the central front in the global war on terrorism. Our capable military leaders should not have their initiatives handcuffed by Congress.

As we heard a bombing in Baghdad, we read simultaneously of attacks in Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Yemen, Lebanon and Gaza. We must not ignore the worldwide threats.

Congratulations to law enforcement for stopping the bombing of JFK Airport.

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

CONGRESSIONAL PENSIONS

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, last month, several former Members of Congress cashed in their taxpayer-funded retirement checks from jail. After indictment and conviction beyond a shadow of a doubt, they are still paid each month by the taxpayers they betrayed.

After supporting a limited reform bill on this issue, this Congress has stopped all action on the needed reforms. We took no action in February. We took no action in March, no action in April and no action in May.

The House leadership has conveniently stalled all reforms that would kill the pension for a Member of Congress convicted of a felony for over 4 months now. Since senior Members have the largest pensions, you have to wonder if they are delaying this reform hoping that this Congress will fail, like all of its predecessors.

Congressman JEFFERSON was indicted this weekend, and one group estimated that he is entitled to a $47,000 annual taxpayer pension.

Mr. Speaker, if we delay this reform, future Members of Congress who are convicted will cash their taxpayer-funded retirement checks from the jailhouse ATM.

□ 1410

ENERGY POLICY

(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, I rise today to speak on a subject that is first on the minds and the wallets of the American public, and that is the cost of rising energy prices.

We are in the middle of the summer, and prices at the pump are above $3 a gallon in much of America. The liberal leadership was going to fix the high gas prices, and they have responded by offering no solutions. They offered so-called ''price gouging'' legislation, but it did nothing to address the root problem of high gas prices.

The American public wants innovation, not procrastination. They want energy exploration, not bureaucratic red tape. They want this Congress to do their jobs and put forth a plan that will power this country, self sufficiently, into this century and beyond. The liberal leadership, meanwhile, is missing in action on the issue.

America needs to change the way we look at how we produce energy, and in the next couple of weeks the Republican Conference will take the lead in unfurling a long-term energy plan for the future. It will not only address our immediate power concerns but those for decades to come.

ONE MORE PEACE OFFICER SHOT BY ONE MORE ILLEGAL

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day, while Americans were celebrating the holiday, Deputy Gerald Barnes of the Harris County Sheriff's Department in Houston was celebrating just being alive.

Responding to a call from a nightclub, the 15-year veteran from the Sheriff's Department came upon two men arguing. Oscar Perez had pulled a gun on Miguel Soto and began randomly firing his pistol.

When Deputy Barnes arrived, he told Perez to drop the gun. Perez refused and shot at Deputy Barnes numerous times. One bullet struck him in the chest above his bulletproof vest. Then after kidnapping Soto, whom Perez later shot, Perez sped off into the night. He was later captured. Oscar Perez had been illegally in the United States for years.

According to reports, the last three police officers shot in Harris County, Texas, were all shot by people illegally in the United States.

Deputy Barnes will recover, but Perez shouldn't have been in this country. The Federal Government's refusal to secure the border is allowing criminals like Perez to invade this country and commit crimes. Instead of promoting amnesty, the government should protect the border.

And that's just the way it is.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN LEWIS, ''MR. FAYETTEVILLE''

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my heartfelt condolences to the family and friends of one of the Third District's greatest leaders and greatest servants, John Lewis of Fayetteville.

He was known as ''Mr. Fayetteville'' by those who knew him. The list of what he didn't do would be easier to read. John Lewis was a Marine, a banker and a member of numerous boards, including the Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation. He was a visionary who helped develop Interstate 540 and the Northwest Arkansas Regional Airport, both of which serve literally thousands of people on a daily basis.

Many feel the downtown of Fayetteville, the home of his alma mater, the University of Arkansas, exists in its present form today because of the tireless work of John Lewis.

The condolences of many in northwest Arkansas, including myself and my family, are with the Lewis family.

Thank you, John, for our service to our community, our State, and to our country.

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 later today.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL TRAILS DAY

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 401) supporting the goals and ideals of National Trails Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 401

Whereas June 2, 2007, is observed as National Trails Day;

Whereas there are over 200,000 miles of trails in the United States, providing access to public lands for recreational and educational opportunities;

Whereas trails enrich communities throughout the United States by helping to protect habitats, watersheds, and cultural and historic artifacts;

Whereas 72.1 percent of all Americans age 16 and older participate in at least one of twenty-two designated outdoor activities, including hiking, backpacking, and trail running;

Whereas National Trails Day events take place in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the United States Virgin Islands to celebrate trails, recognize volunteers, and maintain local trails;

Whereas thousands of volunteers and event coordinators throughout the United States make National Trails Day events possible; and

Whereas 2007 is the 15th Anniversary Celebration of National Trails Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Trails Day; and

(2) honors the contributions National Trails Day has made to inspire the public and trail enthusiasts to discover, learn about, maintain, and celebrate trails.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

House Resolution 401 was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON). It expresses the support of the House of Representatives of the goals and ideals of National Trails Day.

I want to commend Representative THOMPSON for his efforts to bring congressional recognition to this important annual event. This resolution is timely, given that the 15th anniversary celebration of National Trails Day was this past Saturday.

National Trails Day is a long-standing event that is dedicated to celebrating, promoting, and protecting America's magnificent trail system. It was started by the American Hiking Society in 1993. Its goals are to raise awareness of trail, to celebrate our incredible national network of trails, and to honor and thank trail volunteers and partners.

National Trails Day events take place in local, State, and Federal public lands from coast to coast. Activities include hiking, biking, horseback riding, trail dedications, workshops, park clean-ups, trail work projects, and much, much more.

Last year, more than 100,000 trail enthusiasts across the country participated in over 1,000 National Trails Day events. At those events, volunteers contributed nearly 150,000 hours of labor to establishing, maintaining, and cleaning up trails across the country. Trail events take place in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam and my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands. Many Federal agencies, nonprofits, local groups, and corporate sponsors are all proud partners in supporting this annual event.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 401 honors the contributions that National Trails Day has made to inspire the public to discover, learn about, maintain and celebrate trails. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in support of House Resolution 401.

House Resolution 401 has been adequately explained by the majority. I thank the gentlelady, and urge adoption of this resolution.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 401.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT NATIONAL MUSEUM OF WILDLIFE ART BE DESIGNATED AS ''NATIONAL MUSEUM OF WILDLIFE ART OF THE UNITED STATES''

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to

the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 116) expressing the sense of Congress that the National Museum of Wildlife Art, located in Jackson, Wyoming, shall be designated as the ''National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States''.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 116

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art in Jackson, Wyoming, is devoted to inspiring global recognition of fine art related to nature and wildlife;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art is an excellent example of a thematic museum that strives to unify the humanities and sciences into a coherent body of knowledge through art;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art, which was founded in 1987 with a private gift of a collection of art, has grown in stature and importance and is recognized today as the world's premier museum of wildlife art;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art is the only public museum in the United States with the mission of enriching and inspiring public appreciation and knowledge of fine art, while exploring the relationship between humanity and nature by collecting fine art focused on wildlife;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art is housed in an architecturally significant and award-winning 51,000-square foot facility that overlooks the 28,000-acre National Elk Refuge and is adjacent to the Grand Teton National Park;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art is accredited with the American Association of Museums, continues to grow in national recognition and importance with members from every State, and has a Board of Trustees and a National Advisory Board composed of major benefactors and leaders in the arts and sciences from throughout the United States;

Whereas the permanent collection of the National Museum of Wildlife Art has grown to more than 3,000 works by important historic American artists including Edward Hicks, Anna Hyatt Huntington, Charles M. Russell, William Merritt Chase, and Alexander Calder, and contemporary American artists, including Steve Kestrel, Bart Walter, Nancy Howe, John Nieto, and Jamie Wyeth;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art is a destination attraction in the Western United States with annual attendance of 92,000 visitors from all over the world and an award-winning website that receives more than 10,000 visits per week;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art seeks to educate a diverse audience through collecting fine art focused on wildlife, presenting exceptional exhibitions, providing community, regional, national, and international outreach, and presenting extensive educational programming for adults and children; and

Whereas a great opportunity exists to use the invaluable resources of the National Museum of Wildlife Art to teach the schoolchildren of the United States, through onsite visits, traveling exhibits, classroom curriculum, online distance learning, and other educational initiatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the National Museum of Wildlife Art, located at 2820 Rungius Road, Jackson, Wyoming, shall be designated as the ''National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 116, introduced by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), expresses the sense of Congress that the National Museum of Wildlife Art located in Jackson, Wyoming, shall be designated as the National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States.

The National Museum of Wildlife Art is a private museum located on non-Federal land. The museum is housed at a facility that overlooks the 25,000 acre National Elk Refuge and is adjacent to Grand Teton National Park.

The National Museum of Wildlife Art was founded in 1987 with a private gift of a collection of art. Today, the museum features a collection of over 2,000 pieces of art portraying wildlife dating back to 2000 B.C.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 116 will help the National Museum of Wildlife Art receive greater public awareness. I commend Representative CUBIN for her work on this matter. We support the concurrent resolution and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

□ 1420

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 116, and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 116 has been adequately explained by the majority. The only thing I would add is I would like to commend Congresswoman CUBIN for her work on this resolution to designate the National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States in Jackson, Wyoming. This designation places the National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States in a prestigious class of less than 20 museums to earn such a designation.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 116.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENCOURAGING ELIMINATION OF HARMFUL FISHING SUBSIDIES

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 94) encouraging the elimination of harmful fishing subsidies that contribute to overcapacity in commercial fishing fleets worldwide and that lead to the overfishing of global fish stocks, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 94

Whereas nearly 1,000,000,000 people around the world depend on fish as their primary source of dietary protein;

Whereas the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization has found that 75 percent of the world's fish populations are currently fully exploited, over exploited, significantly depleted, or recovering from overexploitation;

Whereas scientists have estimated that a significant percentage of big predator fish such as tuna, marlin, and swordfish are gone from the world's oceans as a result of overfishing by foreign fishing fleets;

Whereas the global fishing fleet capacity is estimated to be up to 250 percent greater than is needed to catch what the ocean can sustainably produce;

Whereas the Congress recognized the threat of overfishing to our oceans and economy and therefore included the requirement to end overfishing in the United States by 2011 in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–479);

Whereas the United States Commission on Ocean Policy and the Pew Oceans Commission identified overcapitalization of the global fishing fleets as a major contributor to the decline of economically important fish populations;

Whereas harmful fishing subsidies encourage overcapitalization and overfishing; support destructive fishing practices such as high seas trawling that would not otherwise be economically viable; and amount to billions of dollars annually;

Whereas such subsidies have also been documented to support illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing, which impacts commercial fisheries in the United States and around the world both economically and ecologically;

Whereas harmful fishing subsidies are concentrated in relatively few countries, putting other fishing countries, including the United States, at an economic disadvantage;

Whereas the United States is a world leader in advancing policies to eliminate harmful fishing subsidies that support overcapacity and promote overfishing; and

Whereas a wide range of countries are currently engaged in historic negotiations to end harmful fishing subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and overfishing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States

should continue to promote the elimination of harmful fishing subsidies that lead to—

(1) overcapitalization;

(2) overfishing; and

(3) illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 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 the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

I commend the chairwoman of the Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, Congresswoman MADELEINE BORDALLO, for introducing House Concurrent Resolution 94. This resolution will encourage the United States to support the elimination of foreign fishing subsidies that lead to overcapacity and overfishing in global fisheries.

House Concurrent Resolution 94, as amended, resolves that the United States will continue to support efforts to eliminate harmful subsidies issued by foreign governments to their fishing fleets. These subsidies reduce the cost of fishing to foreign fishermen, making fishing a profitable enterprise where it otherwise would not be, and leading to overcapitalization, overfishing and illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing. The end result is that foreign fishing subsidies hurt American fishermen who have to compete against subsidized foreign fishing.

We support this noncontroversial resolution, as amended, and commend Ms. BORDALLO for her leadership on this issue.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 94, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 94 has been adequately explained by the majority, and I urge adoption of the resolution.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 94 expresses our support for ending the fishing subsidies given to foreign fishermen. I appreciate the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, NICK RAHALL, and the Ranking Republican, DON YOUNG, for their assistance in moving this legislation.

Foreign governments' subsidies to fishermen are common in many countries around the world. Too little of these subsidies go toward beneficial purposes, such as improving fisheries management and science. Instead, they typically are used to offset fishing costs, for example, by providing support for fuel consumption and vessel construction.

The subsidies artificially decrease the cost of fishing for foreign fishermen, making fishing a profitable trade when it would not be otherwise. The subsidies increase the rate of overfishing worldwide. Current estimates reveal that the sheer number of vessels actively fishing around the world today is up to 250 percent greater than is sustainable, according to the World Wildlife Fund.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has found that 75 percent of the world's fisheries are fully exploited, over exploited, depleted, or recovering from depletion. There is clearly no need to expand the world's fishing fleets beyond their current capacity. Quite the contrary. By eliminating the subsidies that lead to fleet expansion, we can reduce some of this pressure.

The United States—like other countries—reserves to American fishermen and women the exclusive right to fish within 200 nautical mile of the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). Hundreds of foreign vessels each year, however, are intercepted while fishing illegally in U.S. waters. This rise in illegal fishing, most certainly contributed to by the overcapacity in the world's fleets, is placing additional pressure on our already exploited resources, damaging our marine ecosystems, and taking away potential revenue from our domestic fishing industry. In 2006 alone, the United States Coast Guard intercepted 164 vessels fishing in our EEZ.

In my home district of Guam the problem of illegal fishing is significant. The Western Central Pacific area is considered one of the Coast Guard's three highest threat areas for illegal foreign fishing. In 2006, the Coast Guard recorded 11 incidents of illegal foreign fishing in the Western Central Pacific area. Since 2000, the Coast Guard has intercepted an average of 34 vessels per year. And this only represents the vessels that are being caught.

The countries whose vessels are the most likely to be found illegally fishing in the U.S. EEZ are also countries that provide large capacity-increasing subsidies to their fishing fleets. Because enforcement is so difficult, it is even more important that we attack the issue at its root by encouraging worldwide capacity reduction and by discouraging other countries from making it economically feasible for their vessels to travel into our waters to fish.

While we have no direct control over the actions of foreign governments, the Doha Round of the current World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations have placed the United States in a unique position to influence the future use of harmful fisheries subsidies by other countries. Through these negotiations the United States has an opportunity to exercise its leadership internationally in encouraging the elimination of subsidies that increase fishing capacity and that promote overfishing. By passing this concurrent resolution, Congress can demonstrate to the world its support for our government as they move forward with these negotiations.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take a strong stance against harmful foreign fishing subsidies by supporting this House Concurrent Resolution 94.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 94, encouraging the elimination of harmful fishing subsidies that contribute to overcapacity in commercial fishing fleets worldwide and that lead to the over-fishing of global fish stocks.

I commend my esteemed colleague from Guam, the Chairwoman of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans for submitting this concurrent resolution. She understands the severe impact that over-fishing has on our world's oceans and this resolution is an important step in gaining the cooperation of other nations in managing our shared ocean resources responsibly.

According to a 2006 scientific study, there may be no more commercial fish stocks left in the sea by 2050. As the report states, since 1950 29% of the world's commercial fish species have already collapsed. If we do not change our course and stop over-fishing, our children could be the first generation to face entirely empty oceans.

One major contributor to this precipitous decline in global fish stocks is the huge overcapacity of our global fishing fleets. By some accounts, the current fishing fleet capacity is 250% of what is needed to catch the maximum sustainable yield from the oceans. In many instances, this overcapacity is fueled by harmful subsidies provided by a limited number of foreign governments to their fishing fleets, leading to over-fishing, and ecologically unsound bottom-trawling in international waters.

Through our nation's laws, such as the Magnuson-Stevens Act, we have established a strong federal policy supporting sustainable fishing practices here in the United States. In order to successfully manage the world's limited ocean resources, however, we need to promote the elimination of these fishing subsidies with the cooperation of our neighbors in the world community. This Resolution is an important first step in developing a global plan to manage our oceans responsibly. Again, I thank my friend from Guam and I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 94, encouraging the elimination of these harmful fishing subsidies.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 94. I want to thank Chairwoman BORDALLO and Chairman RAHALL for their efforts on this resolution.

I know the issue of harmful foreign fishing subsidies is one of the key concerns of the West Virginia fishing fleet and I congratulate Mr. RAHALL on his interest in this resolution.

All kidding aside, this issue is a global concern. Harmful foreign fishing subsidies that threaten the sustainability of legitimate fisheries and threaten the economic viability and international competitiveness of the U.S. fishing industry must be identified and eliminated.

Some foreign fishing fleets have been heavily subsidized by their governments and this has led to over exploitation of some important fish species.

Harmful subsidies not only put legitimately prosecuted fisheries in jeopardy of overfishing, but also put U.S. fishermen at an economic disadvantage in the global fish market.

However, we need to be careful when discussing subsidies because some subsidies are actually beneficial. Government programs which help fishermen reduce unnecessary bycatch, which aid efforts to develop ''clean'' fishing gear, which aid governments in monitoring or enforcing the fisheries, or which

make the fishery safer for fishermen are all legitimate and beneficial governmental programs.

Harmful subsidies that increase the size and harvesting capabilities of fishing fleets beyond the capacity needed to sustainably harvest the quotas in a fishery can be harmful environmentally and economically.

While I support the main concept of this resolution—to place the House of Representatives on the record opposing harmful fishing subsidies by foreign governments—one statistic used in this resolution is misleading even though it is often quoted. The resolution uses the statistic that "75 percent of the world's fish populations are currently fully exploited, over exploited, significantly depleted or recovering from overexploitation." Full exploitation of fisheries is not necessarily a bad thing. In fact, the full utilization of our Nation's fisheries is a key purpose of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Admitedly, fully exploited fisheries need to be carefully managed, monitored, and enforced to keep them from becoming over exploited.

If you remove "fully exploited" from this statistic, the figure drops to approximately 25 percent. This figure, while much less dramatic, is still a concern that we need to address. Foreign subsidies that contribute to this figure need to be addressed.

The United States has already taken a leading role in addressing IUU fisheries and in addressing harmful foreign subsidies. I support these efforts and urge support of efforts to continue to reduce harmful foreign fishing subsidies.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 94, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 341) supporting the goals and ideals of ''American Eagle Day'', and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the American bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 341

Whereas the bald eagle was designated as the national emblem of the United States on June 20, 1782, by our country's Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image used in the Great Seal of the United States and the seals of the President and Vice President;

Whereas the image of the bald eagle is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

(1) Congress;

(2) the Supreme Court;

(3) the Department of Defense;

(4) the Department of the Treasury;

(5) the Department of Justice;

(6) the Department of State;

(7) the Department of Commerce;

(8) the Department of Homeland Security;

(9) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(10) the Department of Labor;

(11) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(12) the Department of Energy;

(13) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(14) the Central Intelligence Agency; and

(15) the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the American spirit of freedom and democracy;

Whereas the image, meaning, and symbolism of the bald eagle have played a significant role in American art, music, history, literature, architecture, and culture since the founding of our Nation;

Whereas the bald eagle is featured prominently on United States stamps, currency, and coinage;

Whereas the habitat of bald eagles exists only in North America;

Whereas by 1963, the number of nesting pairs of bald eagles in the lower 48 States had dropped to about 417;

Whereas the bald eagle was first listed as an endangered species in 1967 under the Endangered Species Preservation Act, the Federal law that preceded the Endangered Species Act of 1973;

Whereas caring and concerned citizens of the United States in the private and public sectors banded together to save, and help ensure the protection of, bald eagles;

Whereas in 1995, as a result of the efforts of those caring and concerned citizens, bald eagles were removed from the endangered species list and upgraded to the less imperiled threatened species status under the Endangered Species Act of 1973;

Whereas by 2006, the number of bald eagles in the lower 48 States had increased to approximately 7,000 to 8,000 nesting pairs;

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior is likely to officially delist the bald eagle from both the endangered species and threatened species lists under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, with a final decision expected no later than June 29, 2007;

Whereas if delisted under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, bald eagles should be provided strong protection under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act;

Whereas bald eagles would have been permanently extinct if not for vigilant conservation efforts of concerned citizens and strict protection laws;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the bald eagle population is an endangered species success story and an inspirational example for other wildlife and natural resource conservation efforts around the world;

Whereas the initial recovery of the bald eagle population was accomplished by the concerted efforts of numerous government agencies, corporations, organizations, and individuals; and

Whereas the sustained recovery of the bald eagle populations will require the continuation of recovery, management, education, and public awareness programs, to ensure that the populations and habitat of bald eagles will remain healthy and secure for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of ''American Eagle Day''; and

(2) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate on education information for use in schools; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 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 the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 341 celebrates the recovery of the American bald eagle, the symbol of our country displayed on American currency and government agency seals, including that of the United States Congress. The bald eagle's recovery is a huge success story for the Endangered Species Act and the conservation laws which preceded it. In 1963, there were 417 pairs of bald eagles in the lower 48 States. Today, there are an estimated 9,789 breeding pairs.

Later this month, the Secretary of the Interior is expected to remove the bald eagle from the list of threatened species. Several Indian tribes, who consider the eagle extremely important to their culture and even sacred, have raised concerns that the eagle will lose all protections upon delisting. However, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act will continue to protect the bald eagle.

I commend Representative DAVID DAVIS for introducing this resolution which encourages organizations and government agencies working on the conservation of endangered species to collaborate on education information for use in our schools. The resolution also asks the American people to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies.

This resolution merits our support.

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

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

I rise in support of House Resolution 341 which endorses the goals and ideals of American Eagle Day.

Two hundred and twenty-five years ago, the Second Continental Congress decided to use the image of the American bald eagle on the Great Seal of the United States. Since that time, the image of this majestic bird has graced American art, our culture, currency and stamps. It has been the subject of more than 2,500 books, making the bald eagle the most extensively studied bird in North America.

While there were nearly 500,000 on this continent prior to European settlement, this species was particularly devastated by various chemical compounds that caused widespread reproductive failure. In response, the Congress enacted the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and the bird was listed on our Endangered Species Act.

From its all-time low of 417 nesting pairs in the continental United States in 1963, extraordinary conservation efforts have saved the bald eagle, and we have witnessed a significant population increase. Today, there are 9,789 breeding pairs, not including the more than 30,000 bald eagles living in Alaska.

By any objective standard, recovery of the bald eagle has been remarkable, but sadly, it is one of only a handful of species that have been recovered under the Endangered Species Act. While it is likely that the Secretary of the Interior will soon make a decision to remove the bald eagle from the Federal list of threatened and endangered species, there is no question that the bald eagle will continue to inspire millions of Americans because it symbolizes the fundamental values of this country of courage, freedom and patriotic spirit.

Under the terms of House Resolution 341, the people of the United States are encouraged to observe American Eagle Day on June 20 and to provide educational information on the value of conserving our Nation's wildlife resources.

I urge an ''aye'' vote and want to compliment the author of this resolution, freshman Congressman DAVID DAVIS OF TENNESSEE, for his effective leadership in proposing this celebration of American Eagle Day.

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

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield so such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS), who is the author of the bill.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues on the House Resources Committee for bringing this legislation that I've introduced, along with my fellow Tennessee Members, JIMMY DUNCAN and JOHN TANNER, to the floor of the House today supporting the goals and ideals of American Eagle Day.

Almost 225 years ago, on June 20, 1782, the Second Continental Congress designated the bald eagle as the national symbol of the United States. Since that time, the bald eagle has become a fixture on the seals and marks of the Federal Government and on our stamps, currency and coinage.

And while the bald eagle has always been such a popular fixture in the hearts and minds of so many Americans, it is difficult to believe that we were very close to forever losing the symbol of our great country.

In 1963, the number of nesting pairs of eagles in the 48 contiguous States had dwindled to a figure of just over 400. As the habitat for the bald eagle solely exists in North America, these figures were extremely alarming and led to the bald eagle being listed as an endangered species for the first time in 1967.

Today, I'm pleased to note that, as a result of the Federal protection laws and through the diligent efforts of so many private conservationists, the bald eagle has made an incredible recovery.

□ 1430

In 1995, the bald eagle was removed from the endangered list to the threatened list, and it could very soon be moved permanently off of these lists as soon as Federal guidelines can be finalized that will forever protect the birds and their habitats.

I have been extremely interested in this issue, not only because of the importance of this as a matter of national concern but also because of my first-hand experience in dealing with a group located in the heart of the First Congressional District of Tennessee that has been working for the last 22 years to save the bald eagle.

The American Eagle Foundation is located in Pigeon Ford, Tennessee, at the base of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. This nonprofit group has worked to establish recovery programs to protect the eagle and actively cares for many nonreleasable birds to ensure they live healthy lives.

In addition, they operate the largest bald eagle breeding facility in the world, and they have released hundreds of eaglets into the wild with the support of local, State and Federal officials.

Through the efforts of the American Eagle Foundation and the grassroots efforts of children nationwide, I am pleased to offer this legislation for this consideration. Spaced conveniently between Flag Day on June 14 and Independence Day on July 4, July 20 will give Americans another day in which they can celebrate their patriotism by honoring the unique symbol of our heritage and folklore.

I again thank my colleagues for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House and encourage all of my colleagues on the House to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in recognizing American Eagle Day to honor the birds that have symbolized our country's freedom and democracy for centuries. H. Res. 341 encourages all Americans to acknowledge American Eagle Day on June 20, 2007, which marks the 225th anniversary of the bald eagle's designation as our national symbol.

The bald eagle habitats in Tennessee have been important in the recovery and restoration of this majestic species. I want to particularly thank the American Eagle Foundation and its president Al Cecere for their hard work to protect our American bald eagles. I have had the honor of visiting in my office with Al and Challenger, the world-famous American bald eagle that appears at high-profile events like the Super Bowl to represent the freedoms we enjoy in this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and our colleagues will join me in supporting H. Res. 341 to celebrate June 20 as American Eagle Day.

Mr. CANNON. 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 the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 341.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SUPPORT OF CONGRESS FOR THE CREATION OF A NATIONAL HURRICANE MUSEUM AND SCIENCE CENTER IN SOUTHWEST LOUISIANA

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) expressing the support of Congress for the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in Southwest Louisiana.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 54

Whereas the Creole Nature Trail All-American Road District Board of Commissioners has begun to create and develop a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in the southwest Louisiana area;

Whereas protecting, preserving, and showcasing the intrinsic qualities that make Louisiana a one-of-a-kind experience is the mission of the Creole Nature Trail All-American Road;

Whereas the horrific experience and the devastation long-term effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita will play a major role in the history of the United States;

Whereas a science center of this caliber will educate and motivate young and old in the fields of meteorology, environmental science, sociology, conservation, economics, history, communications, and engineering;

Whereas it is only appropriate that the effects of hurricanes and the rebuilding efforts be captured in a comprehensive center such as a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center to interpret the effects of hurricanes in and outside of Louisiana; and

Whereas it is critical that the history of past hurricanes be preserved so that all people in the United States can learn from this history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress supports and encourages the creation of a National

Hurricane Museum and Science Center in southwest Louisiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days with which 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 the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

I want to begin by commending Representative BOUSTANY of Louisiana for introducing H. Con. Res. 54, supporting and encouraging the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in southwest Louisiana.

House Concurrent Resolution 54 expresses Congress' support of the Creole Nature Trail All-American Road District Board of Commissioners in creating and developing a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in the southwest Louisiana area. Such a center will educate visitors about the devastating effects and rebuilding efforts surrounding the region's recent hurricanes and will preserve history so that future generations may learn from it. We support this bill.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 54 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 54 has been adequately explained by the majority. I would like to commend Congressman BOUSTANY for his work on this resolution to create the National Hurricane Museum and Science Center.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my colleague from Utah and the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands for their comments on this, and I appreciate the committee in allowing this to come to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. Hurricanes Rita and Katrina forever changed the lives of gulf coast residents. It was not until the 2005 storms that most Americans really began to fully comprehend the potential size, strength and impact of these devastating natural disasters.

We are nowhere near where we need to be as far as educating the public and raising awareness about hurricane preparedness.

Last week marked the beginning of the 2007 hurricane season. Yet despite intense media coverage surrounding Katrina and Rita, a recent poll of coastal residents conducted by the Associated Press revealed that an astounding 88 percent had not taken any steps to protect their homes against future storms. Sixty-one percent had no hurricane survival kits on hand.

We need to do more to remind the public about the devastation caused by major storms on the level of Katrina, Rita, Andrew and Ivan, as well as teach them about the science behind these phenomena and what we can do to better protect lives and property leading up to a potential storm.

This resolution expresses the support of Congress for the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in southwest Louisiana. The goal of this comprehensive center is to interpret the effects of hurricanes on our land, people, culture and government to preserve artifacts and personal histories of those who have suffered and died because of these events, to conduct research and showcase improvements in meteorology, technology, communications and building systems, and also to offer a creative learning experience in the disciplines of math, science, history, geography and social sciences as they relate to catastrophic natural disasters.

The Center will partner with the National Weather Service, the media and other public and private organizations to provide timely and reliable information as it relates to severe weather events and their aftermath.

The Creole Nature Trail All-American Road began working on this project before the 2005 storms. In September, the project was awarded a $1.3 million Department of Transportation Scenic Byways grant, the largest ever awarded under the Louisiana Scenic Byways program.

Just last week, the board conducted two public meetings in southwest Louisiana to seek community input on the top four sites being considered for the museum and science center. A final site selection is expected to be announced later this month, honoring the 50th anniversary of Hurricane Audrey, a storm that was devastating in my congressional district and took many lives years ago.

The National Hurricane Museum and Science Center will not only serve as a historical center to study the effects that hurricanes have on our coast, it will be a living memorial to attract scholars, students and tourists to the region, a region that's still struggling to recover after the 2005 storms.

Southwest Louisiana is constantly learning how to protect itself from future disasters, and this project will help assist our efforts and our neighbors along the gulf coast and throughout the country in that important effort.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. I want to thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Across the Sabine River from southwest Louisiana is southeast Texas, and the citizens of southeast Texas are still reeling from the beating that they got from Hurricane Rita in 2005. The hurricane devastated rice farmers who were struggling even before the wind and rain destroyed most of their crops.

It hit the oil refineries in my congressional district and across the gulf coast, which account for one-third of the Nation's domestic oil production, and it brought our fuel supply to a screeching halt. Gasoline prices soared, and citizens can no longer afford to heat and even cool their homes.

Amidst the chaos of Hurricane Rita and its aftermath, lawlessness preyed upon the real victims. Some of those who weathered the storm took advantage of FEMA's incompetence in its attempt to distribute money to those in need. The cheaters took FEMA debit cards and spent them on gentlemen's clubs and brand-new cars. The real victims languished homeless and helpless, waiting for the Federal Government to do something.

The folks in my congressional district can still feel the impact of the hurricane 2 years later. People are still trying to just survive; and, as Mr. BOUSTANY has said, another hurricane season is now upon us. We cannot forget how a few short hours in southwest Louisiana and southeast Texas caused so much destruction. We cannot forget in historical terms Hurricane Katrina or Rita, and we must remember they are not rare events for the gulf coast.

In 1900, an unnamed hurricane was the deadliest natural disaster in our Nation's history. It killed between 10- and 12,000 people in Galveston, Texas. It destroyed most of the buildings on the island, some 3,600. With remarkable determination, the survivors of the great storm of 1900 raised the whole City of Galveston, Texas, 12 feet to protect it from future disasters.

□ 1440

We cannot forget the victims of the past, and we must remember how the victims of Katrina and Rita are still fighting to recover their homes, their towns and their livelihoods, and we must be better prepared in the future.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to rise in support of this resolution offered by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana.

The National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in Southwest Louisiana will honor these victims and those of previous hurricanes, preserve their history. It will tell the stories of all the hurricanes of the past, but also encourage new solutions for natural disasters of the future. So I'd like to commend Dr. BOUSTANY for offering this important resolution. It's a long time in coming.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 54, which supports the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in Southwest Louisiana. The creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in southwest Louisiana will serve as a historical reminder for all Americans as well as the rest of the world of the importance of disaster preparedness.

We must not forget the depths of the devastation and despair of Hurricane Katrina that resulted from the lack of proactive disaster planning and preparedness. Hurricane Katrina was the costliest and one of the deadliest hurricanes in the history of the United States. It was the sixth-strongest Atlantic hurricane ever recorded and the third-strongest hurricane on record that made landfall in the United States. Katrina formed on August 23 during the 2005 Atlantic hurricane season and caused devastation along much of the north-central Gulf Coast of the United States. Most notable in media coverage were the catastrophic effects on the city of New Orleans, Louisiana, and in coastal Mississippi. Due to its sheer size, Katrina devastated the Gulf Coast as far as 100 miles from the storm's epicenter.

Mr. Speaker, the images of the detriment and devastation remain deeply etched in my mind and much of the remnants of the tragedy still remain in those communities today. The storm surge caused severe and catastrophic damage along the Gulf coast, devastating the cities of Bay St. Louis, Waveland, Biloxi/Gulfport in Mississippi, Mobile, Alabama, and Slidell, Louisiana and other towns in Louisiana. Levees separating Lake Pontchartrain and several canals from New Orleans were breached a few days after Hurricane Katrina had subsided, subsequently flooding 80% of the city and many areas of neighboring parishes for weeks. In addition, severe wind damage was reported well inland.

Although we continue to mourn the loss of the thousands of victims who perished in Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath, we must still push forward to gain knowledge and insight about these disastrous hurricanes and their effects on the public. The Hurricane Center has the potential to provide a great source of educational service to the American public as concerns about the rapidly changing climate in hurricane-prone regions rise.

The Hurricane Center will not only educate but also motivate the young and the old in the fields of meteorology, environmental science, sociology, conservation, economics, history, communications, and engineering. In addition, the Hurricane Center can benefit everyone by providing resources that inform the public on preparing, surviving and recovering from natural disasters such as Hurricane Katrina. Hopefully, this will enable us to avoid such needless and devastating results as those from Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath.

Examining technology, engineering, and preservation of natural barriers all can help to reduce the impact of hurricanes. It is only appropriate that the effects of hurricanes and the rebuilding efforts be captured in a comprehensive center such as a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center to interpret the effects of hurricanes in and outside of Louisiana. For these reasons, I strongly support H. Con. Res. 54 and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the creation of a Museum and Science Center that will serve to remind and educate Americans about the importance of hurricane disaster preparedness.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 54.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE OUACHITA NATIONAL FOREST ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 390) recognizing the importance of the Ouachita National Forest on its 100th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 390

Whereas on December 18, 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt created by proclamation the Arkansas National Forest on reserved public domain lands south of the Arkansas River;

Whereas on April 29, 1926, President Calvin Coolidge issued an Executive Order to change the name of the Arkansas National Forest to the Ouachita National Forest to reflect both the name of the mountains embraced by the national forest and the name of the principal river which drains the national forest;

Whereas Ouachita is the French spelling of a Native American word meaning ''good hunting ground'';

Whereas the Ouachita National Forest today encompasses approximately 1.8 million acres in Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma and offers a variety of recreation areas, scenic areas, wilderness areas, historic resources, and timber and other forest products to the Nation; and

Whereas the Ouachita National Forest is the largest and oldest national forest in the southern region of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Ouachita National Forest, the House of Representatives recognizes the important contributions of the Ouachita National Forest to the success of the United States in conserving the environment and ensuring that our natural resources remain sources of pride for our citizens, our communities, and our Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 390 was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative Mike Ross.

The bill would express recognition by the House of Representatives of the importance of the Ouachita National Forest on its centennial.

The Ouachita is the largest and the oldest national forest in the southern region of the United States.

On December 18, 1907 President Theodore Roosevelt proclaimed the establishment of what he called Arkansas National Forest. Nineteen years later, by Executive order, President Calvin Coolidge changed the name of the forest to the Ouachita National Forest, reflecting the name of both the local mountains and the main river running through the forest.

The forest encompasses six wilderness areas, seven scenic areas and 11 shooting ranges, as well as 35 recreational areas, including the 26,445-acre Winding Stair National Recreation Area.

Mr. Speaker, Ouachita is a noteworthy unit of our National Forest System, and it is appropriate that we take this action today to celebrate the forest's centennial.

I want to commend and congratulate my colleague, Representative ROSS, for his commitment and leadership on this matter. We support the passage of House Resolution 390 and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 390, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 390 has been adequately explained by the majority, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Arkansas, MIKE ROSS.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 390, a resolution honoring and recognizing the importance of Ouachita National Forest on its 100th anniversary. I am very fortunate to represent a good part of the Ouachita National Forest within the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas.

I'm also pleased that the entire Arkansas Congressional Delegation, Congressmen JOHN BOOZMAN, VIC SNYDER and MARION BERRY have joined me in supporting and cosponsoring this bipartisan bill honoring one of our Nation's true national treasures.

This marks the 100th birthday or anniversary, if you will, of one the largest and oldest national forests in the

southern region of the United States, the Ouachita National Forest.

As Chairwoman CHRISTENSEN indicated, in 1907 President Theodore Roosevelt created the Arkansas National Forest on reserved public lands south of the Arkansas River. And by 1926 President Calvin Coolidge issued an Executive order to change the name of the forest to the Ouachita National Forest, named after the Ouachita Mountains, which stretch from near the center of Arkansas to southeast Oklahoma, and after the principal river which drains the national forest, the Ouachita River.

For the past 100 years, the Ouachita National Forest has remained a vast, magnificent region that offers spectacular recreation, scenic and wilderness areas for numerous visitors from throughout the world. The forest provides an array of activities, ranging from ATV recreational activities and opportunities, to hiking and to mountain biking to horseback riding trails and swimming. The forest also contains five lakes, often referred to as ''Diamond Lakes,'' which are known for their crystal clear quality and beautiful scenery.

In addition to the scenic views and outdoor activities the forest has to offer, the Ouachita National Forest is also one of the only places in the United States that contains an incredible crater area which allows visitors and rock collectors to dig for real diamonds and quartz crystals.

Today the Ouachita National Forest also includes more than 1.8 million acres in Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma, and provides timber and forestry products throughout the United States.

And while the word ''Ouachita'' is the French spelling of the Native American word for ''good hunting ground,'' the forest also contains six locations that have been designated as wilderness areas covering 65,000 acres. These areas provide environmentally safe habitats for wildlife and fish, including many threatened and endangered species, as well as watershed protection and improvement and wilderness area management.

This resolution honors and recognizes all the important services and contributions that the Ouachita National Forest continues to make available to visitors all across our country and throughout the world who come here to visit and to the spirit and practice of ensuring that our natural resources remain sources of pride for our citizens, our communities and, yes, our Nation.

I'm proud to sponsor a resolution commemorating its 100th anniversary, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Resolution 390 today and honor Ouachita National Forest's centennial celebration.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this matter, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 390.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIVERSIDE-CORONA FEEDER WATER SUPPLY ACT

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1139) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, design and construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, and other uses from the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin, Santa Ana River, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1139

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 ''Riverside-Corona Feeder Water Supply Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term ''District'' means the Western Municipal Water District, Riverside County, California.

(2) PROJECT.—The term ''Project'' means the Riverside-Corona Feeder Project and associated facilities.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. PLANNING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE RIVERSIDE-CORONA FEEDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Western Municipal Water District, is authorized to participate in the planning, design, and construction of a water supply project, the Riverside-Corona Feeder, which includes 20 groundwater wells, groundwater treatment facilities, water storage and pumping facilities, and 28 miles of pipeline in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California.

(b) AGREEMENTS AND REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may enter into such agreements and promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(c) FEDERAL COST SHARE.—

(1) PLANNING, DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION.—The Federal share of the cost to plan, design, and construct the project described in subsection (a) shall be not more than 25 percent of the total cost of the project, not to exceed $50,000,000.

(2) STUDIES.—The Federal share of the cost to complete the necessary planning studies associated with the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 50 percent of the total study cost and shall be included as part of the limitation on funds provided in paragraph (1).

(d) IN-KIND SERVICES.—In-kind services performed by the Western Municipal Water District shall be part of the local cost share to complete the project described in subsection (a).

(e) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary under this section shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act $50,000,000 or 25 percent of the total cost of the Project, whichever is less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

The purpose of H.R. 1139, as amended, is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, design and construct water facilities for municipal, domestic irrigation and other uses in the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin, Santa Ana River in California.

H.R. 1139, as amended, would authorize limited Federal financial assistance for the design and construction of 20 groundwater wells, groundwater treatment facilities, water storage and pumping facilities and 28 miles of pipeline in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties of California.

□ 1450

The West, now more than ever, must explore and identify new ways of providing a reliable water supply to meet the current and future water demands of a rapidly growing population. H.R. 1139, as amended, seeks to accomplish this by building new pipelines and infrastructure that would allow for the storage of conserved water in groundwater basins.

This project would also serve to provide a critical emergency supply, aid in groundwater cleanup, and reduce dependence on the Colorado River and the very sensitive Bay-Delta.

I thank Mr. CALVERT for his efforts on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1139, as amended.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1139. H.R. 1139, sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to assist the Western Municipal Water District in the planning, design, and construction of the Riverside-Corona Feeder. This project includes water storage, pumping facilities, and 28 miles of pipeline in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California.

This legislation, as amended, is another step toward ''drought proofing'' Southern California and also reduces the region's dependence on imported water supplies, while providing limited Federal assistance. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the Riverside-Corona Feeder Water Supply Act represents an important investment in the water infrastructure in western Riverside County, California, one of the fastest-growing regions in this country.

At a time when water demand continues to grow due to the West's increasing population, traditional water sources have been confronted by a prolonged drought and other environmental challenges. In fact, just last week California water officials turned off the huge pumps that send water to Southern California from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to protect a tiny imperiled fish. While the shutdown is only scheduled to last a week or two, it is a stark reminder that Southern California must continue to reduce its dependence on imported water from the Delta and the Colorado River.

The Western Municipal Water District provides water service to western Riverside County and serves a population of more than 600,000 people. The purpose of the Riverside-Corona Feeder water supply project is to capture and store water in wet years in order to increase Western's firm water supplies, provide a cost-effective water supply, and improve water quality.

New wet year water will come from local runoff, including regulated releases from Seven Oaks Dam and the State Water Project and stored in San Bernardino groundwater basins. To deliver the stored water to consumers in Western's service area, the project will provide for new groundwater pumping and pipeline capability. As an additional benefit, the Riverside-Corona Feeder will provide the means to control water tables, thereby reducing liquefaction dangers in the Colton and San Bernardino communities. Additionally, the project improves local water quality as perchlorate and other contaminants would be removed from the basin when water is extracted from the well heads via the Riverside-Corona Feeder.

I applaud Western and our local elected officials in Western Riverside County for taking bold, proactive steps in meeting our region's current and future water demand. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the leadership of Western's General Manager, John Rossi, as well as the Western board members, Charles Field, Tom Evans, Brenda Dennstedt, Don Galleano, and Al Lopez. I also want to thank my good friend GRACE NAPOLITANO, the chairwoman of the Water and Power Subcommittee, for her leadership and support of my legislation.

I think it is crucial that we recognize and assist communities that are working to reduce their reliance on imported water, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the Riverside-Corona Feeder Water Supply Act.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1139, 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.

CONJUNCTIVE USE OF SURFACE AND GROUNDWATER IN JUAB COUNTY, UTAH

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1736) to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to provide for conjunctive use of surface and groundwater in Juab County, Utah.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1736

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

SECTION 1. CONJUNCTIVE USE OF SURFACE AND GROUNDWATER IN JUAB COUNTY, UTAH.

Section 202(a)(2) of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–575) is amended by inserting ''Juab,'' after ''Davis,''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 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 the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

The purpose of H.R. 1736, as introduced by our distinguished colleague from Utah (Mr. CANNON), is to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to provide for conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater in Juab County, Utah.

H.R. 1736, when enacted, would authorize a water resources feasibility study for the city of Juab, Utah. This study includes groundwater recharge and management, as well as a review of the joint use of surface water and groundwater.

The assessment and evaluation of current water resources is essential to understanding the needs of the community and the environment. H.R. 1736 seeks to provide the technical information needed by the city of Juab.

I thank Mr. CANNON for his hard work on this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1736.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1736. I would like to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands for her kind comments and background on this bill.

H.R. 1736 passed the House of Representatives last Congress, and I reintroduced this legislation earlier this year. This bill will benefit many of my constituents by allowing Juab County to become eligible for funding for conjunctive use under the Central Utah Project. Precious water resources in Utah are highly valued and maximizing existing water resources efficiently is imperative.

The Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project was planned to develop and export water from the high Uinta Mountains in the eastern part of the State and bring it to the populated Wasatch Front.

As originally planned, Juab County would have received a large amount of water. However, due to alterations in the original plan, much of that water is planned for use in the Wasatch, Utah, and Salt Lake Counties. While efforts will continue to identify and secure substantial additional water supplies for Juab, there are near-term steps that can be taken to help the county meet its current needs and growing demands. This legislation will facilitate one of those near-term steps.

H.R. 1736 will allow Juab County to become eligible for funding for studies and construction of conjunctive use projects by amending the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992. Allowing Juab County to be eligible to receive funds under the Central Utah Project Completion Act will allow the county to maximize surface water flows and groundwater sources by storing flows in existing aquifers.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1736.

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.

CEILING INCREASE ON FEDERAL SHARE OF WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1175) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the ceiling on the Federal share of the costs of phase I of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1175

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

SECTION 1. CEILING INCREASE ON FEDERAL SHARE OF WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT.

Section 1631(d) of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h–13(d)) is amended—

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

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

''(3) The Federal share of the costs of the project authorized by section 1624 shall not exceed the following:

''(A) $22,000,000 for fiscal year 2007.
''(B) $24,200,000 for fiscal year 2008.
''(C) $26,620,000 for fiscal year 2009.
''(D) $29,282,000 for fiscal year 2010.
''(E) $32,210,200 for fiscal year 2011.
''(F) $35,431,220 for fiscal year 2012.
''(G) $38,974,342 for fiscal year 2013.
''(H) $42,871,776 for fiscal year 2014.
''(I) $47,158,953 for fiscal year 2015.
''(J) $51,874,849 for fiscal year 2016.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 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 the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my friend and our colleague from California, Representative LORETTA SANCHEZ, for her dedicated and hard work on this legislation over several Congresses.

The purpose of H.R. 1175, as introduced by Ms. SANCHEZ, is to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the Federal cost share of phase one of the Orange County, California Regional Water Reclamation Project.

The project authorized by H.R. 1175 will supplement existing water supplies by providing a new, reliable, high quality source of water to recharge the Orange County Groundwater Basin and protect it from further degradation due to seawater intrusion.

I thank Ms. SANCHEZ for her efforts on this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1175.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1175 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Democratic bill manager has adequately explained the bill. This legislation has been cosponsored by five of my Republican colleagues, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1175, a bill that I have introduced for two consecutive Congresses. I am pleased to see that the bill is on the Suspension Calendar today. I would like to thank the House leadership for making that happen.

H.R. 1175 would increase the ceiling on the federal share of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project—from $20 million to $51,874,849. This project will ultimately allow Orange County to complete its innovative groundwater replenishment system, which is designed to reuse advanced treated wastewater to recharge the aquifer in northern Orange County.

This aquifer is the primary source of drinking water for over 144,000 families in Orange County each year, serving about 2.3 million residents from north and central Orange County. This reclamation effort has the potential of creating a new water supply of 72,000 acre-feet per year.

The OC Groundwater Replenishment Project is an innovative program which has drawn national and international attention. Many U.S. states and foreign nations—including Japan, Korea, Taiwan—have come to Orange County to look at our tertiary cleaning system. They have observed that reusing recycled water—especially important in the arid west—will help preserve and recharge overdrawn river and groundwater supplies, and will help protect our environment from unexpected scarcity of water.

What this bill does is to increase the federal share of the project, bringing it closer to the 25 percent level, the level at which almost every other reclamation project is funded in the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act of 1992 and the Reclamation Cycling and Water Conservation Act.

The project is not just important to Orange County, California, but also to the entire western United States. By recycling our own water, we will not rely so heavily on the Colorado River Aqueduct or water from the San Francisco Bay Delta.

Members from both sides of the aisle recognize the need for this project and have been consistently supportive of this effort. I would like to thank, in particular, my colleagues from Orange County who are all original cosponsors of this bill. I appreciate their continued support for this legislation, and this important project.

Let me thank, again, the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, for his support, as well as Ranking Member YOUNG, Subcommittee Chairwoman NAPOLITANO and Ranking Member MCMORRIS for their overwhelming support of H.R. 1175.

Finally, let me thank Denis Bilodeau, Irv Pickler, Virginia Grebbien, Philip Anthony, Craig Miller, and everyone affiliated with the Orange County Water District and Orange County Sanitation District for their hard work and leadership in groundwater treatment and recycling. Their innovation has put Orange County at the forefront of water recycling and groundwater replenishment technology. I thank them for all they continue to do for Orange County.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1175.

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.

LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 361) to amend the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize additional projects and activities under that Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 361

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 ''Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES UNDER THE LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ADDITIONAL PROJECTS.—Section 4(a) of the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–576; 114 Stat. 3067) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) In Cameron County, Texas, Bayview Irrigation District No. 11, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March 3, 2004, engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $1,425,219.

''(21) In the Cameron County, Texas, Brownsville Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the February 11, 2004 engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $722,100.

''(22) In the Cameron County, Texas Harlingen Irrigation District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $4,173,950.

''(23) In the Cameron County, Texas, Cameron County Irrigation District No. 2, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the February 11, 2004 engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $8,269,576.

''(24) In the Cameron County, Texas, Cameron County Irrigation District No. 6, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report by Turner Collie Braden, Inc., at a cost of $5,607,300.

''(25) In the Cameron County, Texas, Adams Gardens Irrigation District No. 19, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004 engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $2,500,000.

''(26) In the Hidalgo and Cameron Counties, Texas, Hidalgo and Cameron Counties Irrigation District No. 9, water conservation and improvement projects as identified by the February 11 engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $8,929,152.

''(27) In the Hidalgo and Willacy Counties, Texas, Delta Lake Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004 engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $8,000,000.

''(28) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 2, a water conservation and improvement project identified in the engineering reports attached to a letter dated February 11, 2004, from the district's general manager, at a cost of $5,312,475.

''(29) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects identified in an engineering report dated March 5, 2004 by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $5,595,018.

''(30) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 6, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $3,450,000.

''(31) In the Hidalgo County, Texas Santa Cruz Irrigation District No. 15, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report dated March 5, 2004 by Melden and Hunt at a cost of $4,609,000.

''(32) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Engelman Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report dated March 5, 2004 by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $2,251,480.

''(33) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Valley Acres Water District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report dated March, 2004 by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $500,000.

''(34) In the Hudspeth County, Texas, Hudspeth County Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $1,500,000.

''(35) In the El Paso County, Texas, El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $10,500,000.

''(36) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Donna Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects identified in an engineering report dated March 22, 2004 by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $2,500,000.

''(37) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 16, water conservation and improvement projects identified in an engineering report dated March 22, 2004 by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $2,800,000.

''(38) The United Irrigation District of Hidalgo County water conservation and improvement projects as identified in a March 2004 engineering report by Sigler Winston, Greenwood and Associates at a cost of $6,067,021.''.

(b) INCLUSION OF ACTIVITIES TO CONSERVE WATER OR IMPROVE SUPPLY; TRANSFERS AMONG PROJECTS.—Section 4 of such Act (Public Law 106–576; 114 Stat. 3067) is further amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) INCLUSION OF ACTIVITIES TO CONSERVE WATER OR IMPROVE SUPPLY.—In addition to the activities identified in the engineering reports referred to in subsection (a), each project that the Secretary conducts or participates in under subsection (a) may include any of the following:

''(1) The replacement of irrigation canals and lateral canals with buried pipelines.

''(2) The impervious lining of irrigation canals and lateral canals.

''(3) Installation of water level, flow measurement, pump control, and telemetry systems.

''(4) The renovation and replacement of pumping plants.

''(5) Other activities that will result in the conservation of water or an improved supply of water.

''(d) TRANSFERS AMONG PROJECTS.—Of amounts made available for a project referred to in any of paragraphs (20) through (38) of subsection (a), the Secretary may transfer and use for another such project up to 10 percent.''.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR LOWER RIO GRANDE CONSTRUCTION.

Section 4(e) of the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–576; 114 Stat. 3067), as redesignated by section 2(b) of this Act, is further amended by inserting before the period the following: ''for projects referred to in paragraphs (1) through (19) of subsection (a), and $42,356,145 (2004 dollars) for projects referred to in paragraphs (20) through (38) of subsection (a)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 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 the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first commend our colleague from Texas, and my classmate, Representative HINOJOSA, for his dedication to and hard work on this legislation.

The purpose of H.R. 361 is to amend the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize additional projects and related activities.

H.R. 361, when enacted, would authorize limited Federal assistance for 19 projects aimed at conserving water or improving water supply. This would include the replacement of irrigation canals and lateral canals, the lining of channels and the installation of water level, flow measurement, pump control, and remote control systems.

This legislation would help to accomplish a more sustainable water supply by enhancing existing water distribution systems and monitoring water resources.

I thank Mr. HINOJOSA for his efforts on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have his remarks inserted into the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 361.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 361 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands has appropriately explained the bill, which has passed the bill in the last two Congresses in one form or another. I support the bill.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 361, a bill that will authorize a number of projects which will improve irrigation and water conservation throuhgout the Rio Grande Valley. I want to thank Chairman RAHALL and Chairwoman NAPOLITANO as well as my colleagues from the Texas Border Region, Congressmen ORTIZ, REYES, RODRIGUEZ, and CUELLAR for their support in bringing this vitally important legislation onto the House floor.

I represent a region of the country that is experiencing phenomenal population growth yet is subject to severe periodic droughts. The 2000 Census showed that the population of Hidalgo County, in my district, increased by 48 percent. On the Mexican side of the border, millions have come to work in the maquiladoras and to take advantage of the economic boom that has come from NAFTA.

This growth has placed an enormous strain on water delivery systems throughout the Texas-Mexico border region. Water intended for irrigating crops flows through open dirt ditches where much of the precious water supply is lost to seepage and evaporation. Municipalities also rely on the water from these inefficient and outdated irrigation delivery systems to meet the water needs of growing communities.

H.R. 361 will authorize 19 projects that will allow border water districts to continue upgrading and modernizing our antiquated water delivery systems through the installation of water pipes and canal linings. Similar projects were authorized in the 106th and 107th Congresses.

The Rio Grande Valley has already made a great deal of progress because this has been a collaborative effort. The irrigation district have provided matching funds. The Texas Water Development Board and Texas A&M University have paid for many of the engineering studies. Federal appropriators have provided more than $10 million. As a result, we are seeing water savings of almost 80 percent in the projects that have been completed.

Most importantly, Federal authorization has allowed us to tap into the resources of the North American Development Bank. To date, NADBank has approved almost $24 million for these projects and passage of H.R. 361 will make these new projects eligible for NADBank assistance.

These funds are being put to good use. Numerous projects are already underway and some are almost completed.

When the metering system is fully installed, irrigation districts will have a much clearer picture of water usage and water savings. This data will be vital to improving water management throughout the region.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 361.

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.

SENATOR PAUL SIMON STUDY ABROAD FOUNDATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1469) to establish the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation under the authorities of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1469

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 ''Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to President George W. Bush, ''America's leadership and national security rest on our commitment to educate and prepare our youth for active engagement in the international community.''.

(2) According to former President William J. Clinton, ''Today, the defense of United States interests, the effective management of global issues, and even an understanding of our Nation's diversity require ever-greater contact with, and understanding of, people and cultures beyond our borders.''.

(3) Congress authorized the establishment of the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program pursuant to section 104 of the Miscellaneous Appropriations and Offsets Act, 2004 (division H of Public Law 108–199). Pursuant to its mandate, the Lincoln Commission has submitted to Congress and the President a report of its recommendations for greatly expanding the opportunity for students at institutions of higher education in the United States to study abroad, with special emphasis on studying in developing nations.

(4) According to the Lincoln Commission, ''[s]tudy abroad is one of the major means of producing foreign language speakers and enhancing foreign language learning'' and, for that reason, ''is simply essential to the [N]ation's security''.

(5) Studies consistently show that United States students score below their counterparts in other advanced countries on indicators of international knowledge. This lack of global literacy is a national liability in an age of global trade and business, global interdependence, and global terror.

(6) Americans believe that it is important for their children to learn other languages, study abroad, attend a college where they can interact with international students, learn about other countries and cultures, and generally be prepared for the global age.

(7) In today's world, it is more important than ever for the United States to be a responsible, constructive leader that other countries are willing to follow. Such leadership cannot be sustained without an informed citizenry with significant knowledge and awareness of the world.

(8) Study abroad has proven to be a very effective means of imparting international and foreign-language competency to students.

(9) In any given year, only approximately one percent of all students enrolled in United States institutions of higher education study abroad.

(10) Less than 10 percent of the students who graduate from United States institutions of higher education with bachelors degrees have studied abroad.

(11) Far more study abroad must take place in developing countries. Ninety-five percent of the world's population growth over the next 50 years will occur outside of Europe. Yet in the academic year 2004–2005, 60 percent of United States students studying abroad studied in Europe, and 45 percent studied in four countries—the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, and France—according to the Institute of International Education.

(12) The Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (The 9/11 Commission Report) recommended that the United States increase support for ''scholarship, exchange, and library programs''. The 9/11 Public Discourse Project, successor to the 9/11 Commission, noted in its November 14, 2005, status report that this recommendation was ''unfulfilled,'' and stated that ''The U.S. should increase support for scholarship and exchange programs, our most powerful tool to shape attitudes over the course of a generation.''. In its December 5, 2005, Final Report on the 9/11 Commission Recommendations, the 9/11 Public Discourse Project gave the government a grade of ''D'' for its implementation of this recommendation.

(13) Investing in a national study abroad program would help turn a grade of ''D'' into an ''A'' by equipping United States students to communicate United States values and way of life through the unique dialogue that takes place among citizens from around the world when individuals study abroad.

(14) An enhanced national study abroad program could help further the goals of other United States Government initiatives to promote educational, social, and political reform and the status of women in developing and reforming societies around the world, such as the Middle East Partnership Initiative.

(15) To complement such worthwhile Federal programs and initiatives as the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, the National Security Education Program, and the National Security Language Initiative, a broad-based undergraduate study abroad program is needed that will make many more study abroad opportunities accessible to all undergraduate students, regardless of their field of study, ethnicity, socio-economic status, or gender.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to significantly enhance the global competitiveness and international knowledge base of the United States by ensuring that more United States students have the opportunity to acquire foreign language skills and international knowledge through significantly expanded study abroad;

(2) to enhance the foreign policy capacity of the United States by significantly expanding and diversifying the talent pool of individuals with non-traditional foreign language skills and cultural knowledge in the United States who are available for recruitment by United States foreign affairs agencies, legislative branch agencies, and nongovernmental organizations involved in foreign affairs activities;

(3) to ensure that an increasing portion of study abroad by United States students will take place in nontraditional study abroad destinations such as the People's Republic of China, countries of the Middle East region, and developing countries; and

(4) to create greater cultural understanding of the United States by exposing foreign students and their families to United States students in countries that have not traditionally hosted large numbers of United States students.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) BOARD.—The term ''Board'' means the Board of Directors of the Foundation established pursuant to section 5(d).

(3) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—The term ''Chief Executive Officer'' means the chief executive officer of the Foundation appointed pursuant to section 5(c).

(4) FOUNDATION.—The term ''Foundation'' means the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation established by section 5(a).

(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(6) NONTRADITIONAL STUDY ABROAD DESTINATION.—The term ''nontraditional study abroad destination'' means a location that is determined by the Foundation to be a less common destination for United States students who study abroad.

(7) STUDY ABROAD.—The term ''study abroad'' means an educational program of study, work, research, internship, or combination thereof that is conducted outside the United States and that carries academic credit toward fulfilling the participating student's degree requirements.

(8) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'' means any of the several States, the

District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(9) UNITED STATES STUDENT.—The term ''United States student'' means a national of the United States who is enrolled at an institution of higher education located within the United States.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF THE SENATOR PAUL SIMON STUDY ABROAD FOUNDATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the executive branch a corporation to be known as the ''Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation'' that shall be responsible for carrying out this Act under the authorities of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.). The Foundation shall be a government corporation, as defined in section 103 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—The Foundation shall be governed by a Board of Directors chaired by the Secretary of State (or the Secretary's designee) in accordance with subsection (d).

(3) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is the intent of Congress in establishing the structure of the Foundation set forth in this subsection to create an entity that will administer a study abroad program that—

(A) serves the long-term foreign policy and national security needs of the United States; but

(B) operates independently of short-term political and foreign policy considerations.

(b) MANDATE OF FOUNDATION.—In administering the program referred to in subsection (a)(3), the Foundation shall—

(1) promote the objectives and purposes of this Act;

(2) through responsive, flexible grant-making, promote access to study abroad opportunities by United States students at diverse institutions of higher education, including two-year institutions, minority-serving institutions, and institutions that serve nontraditional students;

(3) through creative grant-making, promote access to study abroad opportunities by diverse United States students, including minority students, students of limited financial means, and nontraditional students;

(4) raise funds from the private sector to supplement funds made available under this Act; and

(5) be committed to minimizing administrative costs and to maximizing the availability of funds for grants under this Act.

(c) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be in the Foundation a Chief Executive Officer who shall be responsible for the management of the Foundation.

(2) APPOINTMENT.—The Chief Executive Officer shall be appointed by the Board and shall be a recognized leader in higher education, business, or foreign policy, chosen on the basis of a rigorous search.

(3) RELATIONSHIP TO BOARD.—The Chief Executive Officer shall report to and be under the direct authority of the Board.

(4) COMPENSATION AND RANK.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Executive Officer shall be compensated at the rate provided for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) AMENDMENT.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Chief Executive Officer, Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation.''.

(5) AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES.—The Chief Executive Officer shall be responsible for the management of the Foundation and shall exercise the powers and discharge the duties of the Foundation.

(6) AUTHORITY TO APPOINT OFFICERS.—In consultation and with approval of the Board, the Chief Executive Officer shall appoint all officers of the Foundation.

(d) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be in the Foundation a Board of Directors.

(2) DUTIES.—The Board shall perform the functions specified to be carried out by the Board in this Act and may prescribe, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, regulations, and procedures governing the manner in which the business of the Foundation may be conducted and in which the powers granted to it by law may be exercised.

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall consist of—

(A) the Secretary of State (or the Secretary's designee), the Secretary of Education (or the Secretary's designee), the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary's designee), and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (or the Administrator's designee); and

(B) five other individuals with relevant experience in matters relating to study abroad (such as individuals who represent institutions of higher education, business organizations, foreign policy organizations, or other relevant organizations) who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of which—

(i) one individual shall be appointed from among a list of individuals submitted by the majority leader of the House of Representatives;

(ii) one individual shall be appointed from among a list of individuals submitted by the minority leader of the House of Representatives;

(iii) one individual shall be appointed from among a list of individuals submitted by the majority leader of the Senate; and

(iv) one individual shall be appointed from among a list of individuals submitted by the minority leader of the Senate.

(4) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—The Chief Executive Officer of the Foundation shall serve as a nonvoting, ex officio member of the Board.

(5) TERMS.—

(A) OFFICERS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Each member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(A) shall serve for a term that is concurrent with the term of service of the individual's position as an officer within the other Federal department or agency.

(B) OTHER MEMBERS.—Each member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(B) shall be appointed for a term of 3 years and may be reappointed for a term of an additional 3 years.

(C) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(6) CHAIRPERSON.—There shall be a Chairperson of the Board. The Secretary of State (or the Secretary's designee) shall serve as the Chairperson.

(7) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Board described in paragraph (3) shall constitute a quorum, which, except with respect to a meeting of the Board during the 135-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall include at least one member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(B).

(8) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

(9) COMPENSATION.—

(A) OFFICERS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(A) may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of the member's service on the Board.

(ii) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each such member of the Board shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) OTHER MEMBERS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(B) while away from the member's home or regular place of business on necessary travel in the actual performance of duties as a member of the Board, shall be paid per diem, travel, and transportation expenses in the same manner as is provided under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(ii) LIMITATION.—A member of the Board may not be paid compensation under clause (i) for more than 90 days in any calendar year.

SEC. 6. ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PROGRAM.—There is hereby established a program, which shall—

(1) be administered by the Foundation; and

(2) award grants to—

(A) United States students for study abroad;

(B) nongovernmental institutions that provide and promote study abroad opportunities for United States students, in consortium with institutions described in subparagraph (C); and

(C) institutions of higher education, individually or in consortium,

in order to accomplish the objectives set forth in subsection (b).

(b) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the program established under subsection (a) are that, within 10 years of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) not less than one million undergraduate United States students will study abroad annually for credit;

(2) the demographics of study-abroad participation will reflect the demographics of the United States undergraduate population, including students enrolled in community colleges, minority-serving institutions, and institutions serving large numbers of low-income and first-generation students; and

(3) an increasing portion of study abroad will take place in nontraditional study abroad destinations, with a substantial portion of such increases taking place in developing countries.

(c) MANDATE OF THE PROGRAM.—In order to accomplish the objectives set forth in subsection (b), the Foundation shall, in administering the program established under subsection (a), take fully into account the recommendations of the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (established pursuant to section 104 of the Miscellaneous Appropriations and Offsets Act, 2004 (division H of Public Law 108–199)).

(d) STRUCTURE OF GRANTS.—In accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, grants awarded under the program established under subsection (a) shall be structured to the maximum extent practicable to promote appropriate reforms in institutions of higher education in order to remove barriers to participation by students in study abroad.

(e) BALANCE OF LONG-TERM AND SHORT-TERM STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS.—In administering the program established under subsection (a), the Foundation shall seek an appropriate balance between—

(1) longer-term study abroad programs, which maximize foreign-language learning and intercultural understanding; and

(2) shorter-term study abroad programs, which maximize the accessibility of study abroad to nontraditional students.

(f) QUALITY AND SAFETY IN STUDY ABROAD.—In administering the program established under subsection (a), the Foundation shall require that institutions receiving grants demonstrate that—

(1) the study abroad programs for which students receive grant funds are for academic credit; and

(2) the programs have established health and safety guidelines and procedures.

SEC. 7. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 31, 2008, and each March 31 thereafter, the Foundation shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this Act during the prior fiscal year.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the total financial resources available to the Foundation during the year, including appropriated funds, the value and source of any gifts or donations accepted pursuant to section 8(a)(6), and any other resources;

(2) a description of the Board's policy priorities for the year and the bases upon which competitive grant proposals were solicited and awarded to institutions of higher education, nongovernmental institutions, and consortiums pursuant to section 6(a)(2)(B) and 6(a)(2)(C);

(3) a list of grants made to institutions of higher education, nongovernmental institutions, and consortiums pursuant to section 6(a)(2)(B) and 6(a)(2)(C) that includes the identity of the institutional recipient, the dollar amount, and the estimated number of study abroad opportunities provided to United States students by each grant;

(4) a description of the bases upon which the Foundation made grants directly to United States students pursuant to section 6(a)(2)(A);

(5) the number and total dollar amount of grants made directly to United States students by the Foundation pursuant to section 6(a)(2)(A); and

(6) the total administrative and operating expenses of the Foundation for the year, as well as specific information on—

(A) the number of Foundation employees and the cost of compensation for Board members, Foundation employees, and personal service contractors;

(B) costs associated with securing the use of real property for carrying out the functions of the Foundation;

(C) total travel expenses incurred by Board members and Foundation employees in connection with Foundation activities; and

(D) total representational expenses.

SEC. 8. POWERS OF THE FOUNDATION; RELATED PROVISIONS.

(a) POWERS.—The Foundation—

(1) shall have perpetual succession unless dissolved by a law enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) may adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) may make and perform such contracts, grants, and other agreements with any person or government however designated and wherever situated, as may be necessary for carrying out the functions of the Foundation;

(4) may determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid, including expenses for representation;

(5) may lease, purchase, or otherwise acquire, improve, and use such real property wherever situated, as may be necessary for carrying out the functions of the Foundation;

(6) may accept cash gifts or donations of services or of property (real, personal, or mixed), tangible or intangible, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act;

(7) may use the United States mails in the same manner and on the same conditions as the executive departments;

(8) may contract with individuals for personal services, who shall not be considered Federal employees for any provision of law administered by the Office of Personnel Management;

(9) may hire or obtain passenger motor vehicles; and

(10) shall have such other powers as may be necessary and incident to carrying out this Act.

(b) PRINCIPAL OFFICE.—The Foundation shall maintain its principal office in the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foundation shall be subject to chapter 91 of subtitle VI of title 31, United States Code, except that the Foundation shall not be authorized to issue obligations or offer obligations to the public.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9101(3) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(R) the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation.''.

(d) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of State shall serve as Inspector General of the Foundation, and, in acting in such capacity, may conduct reviews, investigations, and inspections of all aspects of the operations and activities of the Foundation.

(2) AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD.—In carrying out the responsibilities under this subsection, the Inspector General shall report to and be under the general supervision of the Board.

(3) REIMBURSEMENT AND AUTHORIZATION OF SERVICES.—

(A) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Foundation shall reimburse the Department of State for all expenses incurred by the Inspector General in connection with the Inspector General's responsibilities under this subsection.

(B) AUTHORIZATION FOR SERVICES.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 10(a) for a fiscal year, up to $2,000,000 is authorized to be made available to the Inspector General of the Department of State to conduct reviews, investigations, and inspections of operations and activities of the Foundation.

SEC. 9. GENERAL PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.

(a) DETAIL OF PERSONNEL.—Upon request of the Chief Executive Officer, the head of an agency may detail any employee of such agency to the Foundation on a reimbursable basis. Any employee so detailed remains, for the purpose of preserving such employee's allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits, an employee of the agency from which detailed.

(b) REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employee of an agency who is serving under a career or career conditional appointment (or the equivalent), and who, with the consent of the head of such agency, transfers to the Foundation, is entitled to be reemployed in such employee's former position or a position of like seniority, status, and pay in such agency, if such employee—

(A) is separated from the Foundation for any reason, other than misconduct, neglect of duty, or malfeasance; and

(B) applies for reemployment not later than 90 days after the date of separation from the Foundation.

(2) SPECIFIC RIGHTS.—An employee who satisfies paragraph (1) is entitled to be reemployed (in accordance with such paragraph) within 30 days after applying for reemployment and, on reemployment, is entitled to at least the rate of basic pay to which such employee would have been entitled had such employee never transferred.

(c) HIRING AUTHORITY.—Of persons employed by the Foundation, not to exceed 30 persons may be appointed, compensated, or removed without regard to the civil service laws and regulations.

(d) BASIC PAY.—The Chief Executive Officer may fix the rate of basic pay of employees of the Foundation without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code (relating to the classification of positions), subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title (relating to General Schedule pay rates), except that no employee of the Foundation may receive a rate of basic pay that exceeds the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''agency'' means an executive agency, as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term ''detail'' means the assignment or loan of an employee, without a change of position, from the agency by which such employee is employed to the Foundation.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $80,000,000 for fiscal year 2008 and each subsequent fiscal year.

(2) AMOUNTS IN ADDITION TO OTHER AVAILABLE AMOUNTS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1) are in addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for educational exchange programs, including the J. William Fulbright Educational Exchange Program and the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, administered by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State.

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foundation may allocate or transfer to any agency of the United States Government any of the funds available for carrying out this Act. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes for which the funds were authorized, in accordance with authority granted in this Act or under authority governing the activities of the United States Government agency to which such funds are allocated or transferred.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The Foundation shall notify the appropriate congressional committees not less than 15 days prior to an allocation or transfer of funds pursuant to paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. 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 gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a singularly important piece of legislation which I bring to my colleagues with great personal enthusiasm and some fond memories.

Let me first pay tribute to our late colleague, Senator Paul Simon, after whom this legislation is named. Paul was a firm champion not only of education, higher education, but also education abroad, this incredibly important aspect in a growingly interdependent world. It is appropriate that this piece of legislation be named after our great late colleague, Paul Simon.

Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, first I established and then I had the privilege of directing the Study Abroad Program of the California State University and College System. When I established that program, it was a path-breaking enterprise because historically study abroad was the privilege of only the wealthy and those who attended uniquely elite institutions.

Our legislation expands the opportunity for study abroad that hopefully will involve annually about a million of our college and university students.

Not too many years ago, study abroad was the opportunity for some wealthy college students to spend some time in France or Italy or maybe in Germany. But in an increasingly globalized world, our need to have young men and women who are conversant in the languages of many countries and who are familiar with the cultures of many countries is an absolute necessity for our national security and our national well-being.

This historic piece of legislation will democratize the program of Study Abroad, which used to be the privilege of a very thin layer of our society. It opens up for every American college student, irrespective of his or her socioeconomic status, the opportunity of spending a year or more involved in serious language and area study all over the world.

□ 1510

At a time when new languages are required by vast numbers of our young people, Chinese, Indian, Arabic and others, this will provide a dramatic upgrading of our ability to interact with the rest of the globe. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation which will usher in a new era for American higher education for college students all over the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that an exchange of letters between the Committee of Foreign Affairs and the Committee of Oversight and Government Reform be included in the RECORD at this time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2007.

Hon. TOM LANTOS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LANTOS: I am writing about H.R. 1469, a bill to establish the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation. The Committee on Foreign Affairs reported this legislation to the House on May 9, 2007.

I appreciate your effort to consult with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform regarding those provisions of H.R. 1469 that fall within the Oversight Committee's jurisdiction. These provisions address issues related to the Federal civil service, Federal property management, and the duties of inspectors general.

In the interest of expediting consideration of H.R. 1469, the Oversight Committee will not request a sequential referral of this bill. I would, however, request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Oversight Committee should H.R. 1469 or a similar Senate bill be considered in conference with the Senate. Moreover, this letter should not be construed as a waiver of the Oversight Committee's legislative jurisdiction over subjects addressed in H.R. 1469 that fall within the jurisdiction of the Oversight Committee.

Please include our exchange of letters on this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Again, I appreciate your willingness to consult the Committee on these matters.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2007.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Chairman, Committee Oversight and Government Reform,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1469, the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act of 2007.

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. I acknowledge that the Committee will not seek a sequential referral of the bill and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not in any way serve as a jurisdictional precedent as to our two committees.

Further, as to any House-Senate conference on the bill, I understand that your Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees for consideration of portions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction, and I agree to support a request by the Committee with respect to serving as conferees on the bill, consistent with the Speaker's practice in this regard.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters are included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I look forward to working with you on this important legislation. If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me or have your staff contact my staff.

Cordially,

TOM LANTOS,
Chairman.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very proud to join Chairman LANTOS in introducing his bill, H.R. 1469, the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act of 2007. The Act gives effect to key recommendations of the bipartisan, congressionally mandated report of the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Commission as well as the 9/11 Commission report.

The United States has an increasing need for foreign language expertise, cultural knowledge and better people-to-people diplomacy. We saw a dramatic example of this need, lamentably, after the events of 9/11 when we faced a sudden shortage of qualified speakers of Arabic, Farsi and other strategic languages. A study released last August by the Government Accountability Office indicated that serious language gaps remain within the State Department that can adversely impact State's ability to communicate with foreign audiences and execute critical duties. Study abroad by more American students in places other than traditional destinations in western Europe is essential to our Nation's security and future leadership in the world.

For these reasons, the gentleman from California's bill, H.R. 1469, aims to increase the number and diversity of American students studying abroad with an eventual goal of 1 million per year. It ensures that most of the increase occurs in nontraditional and strategically important destinations, such as China, the Middle East and the developing world.

This Act will establish the Simon Study Abroad Foundation, an independent U.S. Government corporation that can raise private sector funds to promote its work, freed from the large bureaucracies and short-term agendas of other U.S. agencies. By offering competitive grants to universities and educational consortiums based on its priorities, the Foundation will generate broader interest among American schools in study abroad programs, leveraging an impact far greater than a mere direct grant program for students.

To ensure maximum transparency and efficiency, the Foundation will be subject to oversight by an Inspector General and annual congressional reporting requirements.

I appreciate Chairman LANTOS incorporating my proposals for those oversight mechanisms in the introduced text of the bill.

I also was pleased to consult with him regarding the small changes made to the bill after committee consideration. Three minor changes make explicit what was already implicit in the bill: Two of them confirm that the Foundation is a new and different approach not intended to supplant other exchange and direct-grant programs currently run by the State Department. The third makes clear that the Foundation should take care to fund only safe, high-quality study abroad programs. A fourth, substantive change aims to make the Foundation more

cost-effective by eliminating the compensation for board members that was part of the originally introduced text.

In sum, this Act, Mr. Speaker, represents a creative, forward-thinking initiative to protect American leadership and security in a fast-changing world. H.R. 1469 deserves our enthusiastic support.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 1469, the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Act of 2007. This important piece of legislation seeks to enhance the enrollment, diversity, and range of countries relating to U.S. college study abroad programs.

The United States is failing to take full advantage of a valuable tool that should be used to enhance our standing in the world and to improve our national security. Opportunities for students to study abroad is integral to creating intercultural awareness, a globally competent workforce, ensuring America's economic competitiveness, and protecting national security. Students can be powerfully effective diplomats for American culture, democratic values, and foreign policy.

H.R. 1469 aims to improve the diversity, the range of countries, and number of students that study abroad while in college. Only about 1 percent of all U.S. college students study abroad, and the vast majority study in Europe. Just 9 percent of those students are minority students, even though African American, Native American, and Hispanic students make up 30 percent of the total U.S. college enrollment.

Inspired by the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission and the congressionally chartered Lincoln Commission, the Senator Paul Simon Act will create a new government corporation charged with democratizing study abroad for American students the way that the GI Bill democratized higher education.

The Simon Foundation Act is visionary legislation sponsored by Senators RICHARD DURBIN and NORM COLEMAN, and the chairman and ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. LANTOS and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. The legislation authorizes $80 million annually for 10 years in order to assist 1 million American students study abroad each year by 2018. This funding from the Department of State budget will directly support student scholarships and organizations like Bardoli Global around the Nation.

Bardoli Global is an organization that originated in my congressional district. It exists to provide greater access to study abroad opportunities for outstanding African American, Native American, and Hispanic American student leaders and to make those students globally competent change agents for their communities. The organization's Houston pilot program will soon expand to five other cities across the Nation in 2008.

Mr. Speaker, we must act now to enact the vision of the late Senator Paul Simon from Illinois who worked tirelessly to promote a public-private partnership to democratize study abroad. We must act quickly to achieve equity and diversity in study abroad, especially targeting traditionally underrepresented students. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as always, it's a pleasure to work with Chairman LANTOS.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1469, 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.

RELATING TO THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 152) relating to the 40th anniversary of the reunification of the City of Jerusalem, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 152

Whereas June 2007 marks the 40th anniversary of the Six Day War and the reunification of the city of Jerusalem;

Whereas Israel has, since its founding, sought peace with its Arab neighbors;

Whereas in the weeks leading up to the Six Day War, Israel's neighbors, without provocation, called for and implemented a blockade of Israel's critical outlet to the Red Sea, ordered United Nations peace-keeping forces out of the Sinai desert, massed their forces with apparent hostile intent in the Sinai and in the Golan Heights, and publicly threatened to destroy Israel;

Whereas in six days of war, Israel defeated those forces seeking its destruction and reunited the city of Jerusalem which had been artificially divided for 19 years;

Whereas Jerusalem has been the focal point of Jewish religious devotion and the site of a continuous Jewish presence for over three millennia, with a Jewish majority since at least 1896;

Whereas Jerusalem is a holy city for the Christian and Muslim faiths;

Whereas the vibrant Jewish population of the historic Old City of Jerusalem was driven out by force during the 1948 Arab-Israeli War;

Whereas from 1948 to 1967 Jerusalem was a divided city, and Israeli citizens of all faiths as well as Jews of all nationalities were denied access to holy sites in eastern Jerusalem, including the Old City, in which the Western Wall and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre are located;

Whereas this year marks the 40th year that Jerusalem has been administered as a unified city in which the rights of all faiths have been respected;

Whereas the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–45), which became law on November 8, 1995, states as a matter of United States policy that Jerusalem should remain the undivided capital of Israel in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to support a peaceful, two-state solution to end the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) congratulates the citizens of Israel on the 40th anniversary of the Six Day War in which Israel defeated enemies aiming to destroy the Jewish State;

(2) congratulates the residents of Jerusalem and the people of Israel on the 40th anniversary of the reunification of that historic city;

(3) commends those former combatant states of the Six Day War, Egypt and Jordan, who in subsequent years had the wisdom and courage to embrace a vision of peace and coexistence with Israel;

(4) commends Israel for its administration of the undivided city of Jerusalem for the past 40 years, during which Israel has respected the rights of all religious groups;

(5) reiterates its commitment to the provisions of the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 and calls upon the President and all United States officials to abide by its provisions; and

(6) urges the Palestinians and Arab countries to join with Israel in peace negotiations to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict, including realization of the vision of two democratic states, Israeli and Palestinian, living side-by-side in peace and security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my good friend from Florida, the distinguished ranking member of our committee, in recognizing the 40th anniversary of one of the great military triumphs of the 20th century, the so-called Six Day War. Some of us remember and everybody has read about the attempt of the neighboring Arab countries to annihilate the State of Israel 40 years ago. In a brilliant preemptive move, the Israeli military moved ahead and destroyed the air forces and much of the military of the neighboring countries which were ready to destroy it.

The Six Day War transformed the shape of the Middle East and brought about the unification of the city of Jerusalem. Prior to the Six Day War, Jerusalem was closed to Israelis. Following the Six Day War, members of all faiths have had full and free access to the city of Jerusalem, and places of worship, Muslim, Christian, Jewish, are available to all individuals who seek an opportunity for peaceful prayer.

This body and the other body some years back called for the proper placement of the United States embassy in Israel's capital in Jerusalem. My good friend, the late Senator Patrick Moynihan, and I introduced this legislation which was strongly supported with significant majorities in both the House and the Senate. But administrations since that time have seen fit to postpone the move of our embassy to Jerusalem.

I earnestly hope that with this commemorative resolution we again call the attention of this administration to its promise, clear and unequivocal, to move the embassy to Israel's capital, Jerusalem. Our embassy is in the capital of every single country with which we maintain diplomatic relations and the capital is designated by the country concerned. It is long overdue that this administration honor the President's personal commitment to move the United States embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

□ 1520

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 152, which congratulates the citizens of Israel on the 40th anniversary of that nation's victory over those who sought to destroy it in the Six Day War and commemorates the 40th anniversary of Jerusalem's reunification.

Jerusalem has historically been a united city, one holy for Jews, Christians and Muslims alike. Last week I had the privilege to go on a congressional delegation to Israel with my distinguished colleague and friend from Florida, Mr. WEXLER. There we visited the old city of Jerusalem and prayed at the ancient Temple's legendary Western Wall. At that site, and throughout the City of Jerusalem, people have freely beseeched God for centuries. But had Jerusalem still been divided, as it was from 1948 to 1967, the old city's holy places would have been off limits to us and to millions of others.

Therefore, I stand here today with particular appreciation for the religious freedom that Jerusalem's unity entails. It is unfortunate, however, that much of the world continues to refuse to recognize Jerusalem's unity and specifically its status as Israel's capital, a status which is both appropriate and a fact of reality.

The Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 states that it is a matter of U.S. policy that Jerusalem should remain the undivided capital of Israel and that the United States should move its embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The resolution before us, H. Con. Res. 152, reaffirms U.S. policy in this regard, and I hope that the administration and our allies worldwide will move swiftly to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital and to move their embassies to that city.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important resolution, to clearly articulate that Jerusalem must remain the undivided capital of Israel.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 152, and I take pride in joining my colleagues to congratulate the citizens of Israel on this important anniversary, as well as commending Jordan and Egypt for making peace with their neighbor.

The anniversary marks the 40th year that the ancient and historic city has been administered as a unified city in which the rights of all faiths have been respected. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that having worked in Jerusalem in 1965, I experienced that time when in fact people could not travel to all of Jerusalem, and in fact we know that that is very different today.

It is also important that we use this anniversary to highlight the work that still needs to be done. The historic victory by the Israeli military greatly expanded Israel's territory, but with territorial gains came new problems. These unresolved issues have led to ever-increasing tensions that today manifest themselves in the form of Qassam rocket attacks and military insurgents. As we debate this resolution today, the region, as we know, finds itself in dire conflict.

Earlier this year, I introduced a resolution calling on President Bush to dispatch a new special envoy to the Middle East to capitalize on every opportunity for progress.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must be the leader in promoting peace. The current situation is simply unsustainable. So as we look back 40 years today, let us also look 40 years ahead. Let us look 40 years ahead and work toward a future, not fraught with conflict and strife, but coexistence, moderation and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and continue to push for peace.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and colleagues for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, my father is from Israel, and every summer I spent a good portion of my childhood in Israel, 2 days after the 1967 war, every summer for 5 years, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1973, every summer going to Israel. I remember that moment, since the bulk of my childhood was spent there.

The Six Day War was obviously not only an amazing military accomplishment, a lot of people think today in retrospect that it is a pyrrhic victory, that things would have been so much easier for Israel had that victory not occurred; that David became Goliath.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of myths that I would like to address to the chairman, and also to the leader on the Republican side.

One is it was not such a peaceful time pre the 1967 war. There were a lot of attacks on Israel because of indefensible boundaries. In fact, the peace with Jordan and Egypt could not have happened if it weren't for the 1967 war. There was no possibility, given the pan-Arabism that existed under Nasser, for any peace to have happened.

In fact, one has to look at the 1967 war, that it created possibilities, as did the 1973 war, for peace to occur, and every nation that has decided to make peace with Israel, Egypt and Jordan, has had peace.

The war in 1967, because of the changes to the boundaries to the south, to the immediate east and to the north, redefined Israel's security. Once those nations came to terms with Israel's status, which is what the 1967 war accomplished, they accomplished and received peace, and land-for-peace has been at the premise of America's foreign policy, Israel's foreign policy, and was possible because of the outcome and the results strategically on the ground and in the environment because of 1967.

People remember the military accomplishment which was unique and stands out in the 20th century, but it also created an environment that allowed peace to happen, at least with the two countries that have chosen the road of peace with Israel.

I would like to pick up on my colleague from California and her comments about the next 40 years. The next 40 years needs to be a period of time where America, and this may be a little bit of a criticism here, we were always and always will be the indispensable leader in that region. The moment we walk away from that role the parties lose interest in discussing among themselves.

I would hope that immediately the President would again, and I echo what my colleague from California said, nominate somebody to be a Middle East envoy, to again create a dialogue between the Israelis and Palestinians, to find what the Jordanians and Egyptians have found with the Israelis, peace, based on the premise of land for peace.

But everybody should not only look at the military peace of the 1967 war, but it created an opportunity that today two countries that prior to that had fought in the 1967 war against Israel now recognize Israel and have economic, cultural and other types of trade, and that is only due to what happened in 1967.

To those who think 1967 was a pyrrhic victory, wasted, we wouldn't have in fact the Israeli-Jordanian agreement

or the Israeli-Egyptian agreement if it weren't for the victories that happened there. There were also other things that happened to Israel.

One does hope though that as we look forward to trying to find resolution and look at the region as a whole, everybody has always described that Israel and the Arab conflict was at the heart of the Mideast. That is not at the heart. It is a problem. It needs to be resolved.

But the larger problem of the greater Gulf area is not one of the Israeli-Palestinian problem, although it is a significant problem; it is the radical philosophy that is dominating the young in the Arab world that we need to help resolve, because it is leading and feeding part of the terrorism, and that is the larger conflict. The Palestinian-Israeli problem is a problem, but it is not at the heart of the conflict in that region.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment our two leaders today, the chairman and the leader on the Republican side, for this resolution, for recognizing an historic moment that in fact without which we would not see the peace between Israel and Jordan and Israel and Egypt.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, before yielding back my time, I would like to make a couple of observations. As my colleagues pointed out, two of Israel's neighbors, Jordan and Egypt, have signed historic peace agreements with the State of Israel. And while this peace is not a full-fledged, blossoming, all-encompassing peace agreement, it certainly has meant the end of hostilities and the beginning of commercial, cultural, educational, touristic and diplomatic relations.

□ 1530

The time is long overdue for Israel to be able to reach an agreement with both Lebanon and Syria, as well as the Palestinian people, so this long-suffering area, where all of the people have suffered for far too long and far too severely, at long last can be a region of peace and reconciliation.

For this to come about, terrorism must end. You cannot make peace with people who are plotting daily to destroy your very existence. When Israel evacuated Gaza, it expected peace from that area. But, under Hamas, daily rocket attacks are unleashed on peaceful civilian Israeli border communities. Two women were killed just in recent weeks as a result of these monstrousattacks. Hezbollah in the north similarly is sworn to terrorism.

This must be put to an end if this important region is to join much of the rest of the world in moving ahead with economic progress, social progress, and the reconciliation of people.

I honestly hope that our resolution paying tribute to the victory 40 years ago and reminding ourselves of our formal commitment to move the U.S. Embassy to its proper location in Jerusalem will serve as a reminder that the time is long overdue for normalizing the situation in this region.

The end of terrorism, the move of our Embassy, will bring about a long prayed for and hoped for period of peace.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 152, which recognizes the 40th anniversary of the reunification of the City of Jerusalem.

This week Israel is recognizing the 40th anniversary of the Six-Day War. On June 7, 1967, Israel reunified the city of Jerusalem, opening it to worshippers of all nationalities and religions.

On that day Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan declared: "This morning, the Israel Defense Forces liberated Jerusalem. We have united Jerusalem, the divided capital of Israel. We have returned to the holiest of our holy places, never to part from it again. To our Arab neighbors we extend, also at this hour—and with added emphasis at this hour—our hand in peace. And to our Christian and Muslim fellow citizens, we solemnly promise full religious freedom and rights. We did not come to Jerusalem for the sake of other peoples' holy places, and not to interfere with the adherents of other faiths, but in order to safeguard its entirety, and to live there together with others, in unity."

Mr. Speaker, even 40 years after Israel's overwhelming victory in the June 1967 War—a war fought to preserve Israel's very existence in the face of enemies determined to destroy it—Israel's stability is still threatened. At this critical time in Israel's history we must focus on what is of the utmost importance—furthering the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

Congress must fully analyze and consider the Arab League Peace Initiative which offers Israel full normalization of relations with the Arab world and is widely viewed in Israel and around the world as an important opportunity and a real basis for negotiations that could end the Israeli-Arab conflict. While not perfect, this plan sets the table for fruitful negotiations and a final resolution of the conflict.

We must also consider negotiations with Syria. If successful, such negotiations could have significant positive impact with respect to limiting Iran's sphere of influence, calming the situation in Lebanon, weakening the support network for Hamas and Hezbollah, and delivering real security to Israel on its northern border.

We must call on President Bush to invest in serious, sustained, and effective efforts to improve the security situation on the ground today and re-establish a viable peace process that can deliver peace and security to Israel, and international acceptance of Jerusalem as Israel's capital.

Mr. Speaker, today I call on all of my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 152, and I pledge to continue to work to maintain Jerusalem as Israel's indivisible capitol and to promote the policy of the United States to support a peaceful, two-state solution to end the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, forty years ago this week, America's Israeli allies triumphed over the greatest threat to their nation's survival since it was founded in 1948. By emerging from the Six-Day War victorious, Israel demonstrated that a country devoted to liberty, equality and democracy could not only exist, but flourish, in one of the most volatile regions in the world.

In the weeks leading up to June of 1967, Israel's Arab neighbors amassed an immense force along their shared borders with the Jewish state. Their goal—as Egyptian President Gamel Abdel Nasser then put it—was "the destruction of Israel," and they assembled 465,000 troops, 2,800 tanks, and 800 aircraft on Israel's doorstep to achieve this malicious goal.

In the armed conflict that followed, Israel defended itself honorably, courageously, and effectively—winning the war in just six days and taking control of lands previously held by the invading nations. And in an unprecedented act of compromise, Israel offered to give back the captured lands in return for nothing more than a promise that Israel's neighbors would join them in pursuit of peaceful co-existence.

Furthermore, Israel stated that the City of Jerusalem, which was placed under Israel's control as a result of the war, would once again be open to peoples of all faiths and nationalities—a provision that allowed Jews, Christians and Muslims alike to freely worship in the holy city.

These actions in defense of peace and equality—undertaken by Israel just weeks after being attacked—help to demonstrate why the U.S.-Israeli relationship remains so strong to this day. The Israeli people have always worked hard to find common ground with their neighbors, even while facing profound threats to their safety and sovereignty. And just as Israel has never turned its back on the principles and values that all free nations share, America will never turn its back on her.

It gives me great pride to support H. Con. Res. 152, commemorating the 40th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem and recognizing the preceding struggle—and I look forward to many more years of fruitful partnership between the United States and Israel.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 152.

When the 1947 U.N. Partition Plan created two separate states in Palestine—one Jewish, and one Arab—it was a milestone in world history. Jerusalem was from this point on to be an international city—neither Jewish nor Arab, but shared by the two cultures.

However, the excitement over this groundbreaking compromise was short-lived. Although Israel accepted the plan, the Arab world refused to sign on, and soon after attacked Israel, plunging the region into Arab-Israeli War of 1948. The result of this war was a division of Jerusalem in two, with one half being controlled by Israel and one half controlled by Jordan.

In 1967, during the Six Day War, Israel retook control of the Jordanian half of Jerusalem. On June 7, 1967, a cease fire occurred, and Israel took full control over the entire city of Jerusalem. One year later, Israel declared a new holiday—Jerusalem Day—to commemorate the reunification of the city.

This year, to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the reunification, Israel held its Jerusalem Day with the slogan ''Something Special for Everyone.'' I commend Israel and all of the inhabitants of Jerusalem for embodying the inclusiveness of the phrase ''Something Special for Everyone.''

I encourage my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, if there's been any good news on the Middle East peace process over the last 7 years, it's that barriers to ending the conflict are less about final-status issues and more about the challenge of reaching the outcome that majorities on both sides know will be necessary: an independent Palestinian state, based on the 1967 borders, living side by side with Israel in peace, with a shared Jerusalem and a negotiated solution to the Palestinian refugee problem. Against that backdrop, it is unclear to me what good comes from passing a resolution which would place Congress out of step with large parts of the Israeli political spectrum.

This resolution is disconnected from the reality on the ground. At a time of rocket attacks in Sderot, retaliations in Gaza, and renewed fears of war between Israel and Syria, it is, at a minimum, inappropriate for either the United States Congress or the Bush administration to stand in the way of whatever moves for peace Israel may choose to make, yet that is exactly what this resolution does. We should be more engaged at promoting a return to a peace process, not less, and we should be encouraging compromise, not intransigence on the difficult issues.

Jerusalem is Israel's capital and a city of unmatched significance for the Jewish people. I will never forget my first morning in Israel and what it was like to go on a run around the Old City. However, I must oppose a resolution that reaffirms the need to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem prior to a peace agreement because, as both Presidents Clinton and Bush have recognized, this harms our efforts at diplomacy and, therefore, the security of Israel and the United States. Instead, we should keep faith with the Biblical injunction to ''pray for the peace of Jerusalem,'' reject this senseless resolution, and recommit our support for serious efforts at peace in the Middle East and security for Israel.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 152, celebrating the 40th anniversary of the reunification of the city of Jerusalem.

The city of Jerusalem is a unique place in the world, steeped in history and faith, the eternal heart of three major world religions. Jerusalem has suffered war and conquest repeatedly throughout the ages, but I have faith that Jerusalem will never be fractured again.

Jews, Muslims, and Christians all find a spiritual home in Jerusalem, and it is essential that Jerusalem remain open to worshippers of all faiths. Unfortunately, for too many years of its history, access to the holy sites in Jerusalem was denied to some. But for the last 40 years, Israel has guaranteed access to all faiths, and the world community has been able to visit Jerusalem freely. I applaud Israel for this principled and fair policy, which has surely not always been easy to maintain. It is an important affirmation of Israel's humane and democratic values that a country which finds itself under frequent attack would maintain a commitment to the openness of a site of such international importance as Jerusalem.

Unfortunately, the great emotion people feel about the holy city of Jerusalem has frequently found a false outlet in violence against others. It is a great sadness to me, and a great injustice against the history and sanctity of Jerusalem, that the city has been a flashpoint for so much violence in my lifetime.

I am deeply disappointed and frustrated that in the past several years the Middle East peace process has been derailed from the promising moments during the Clinton presidency. President Clinton was as deeply involved, at a personal as well as a political level, with the quest to find a permanent solution to the problems of the region as any world leader has ever been. While he was not quite able to attain the overarching peace agreement that he had worked so hard to achieve, President Clinton recognized that finding a lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian issue needed to be a foreign policy priority of the United States.

Since President Clinton left office, the involvement of the United States in the Middle East peace process has been scattered, sporadic, and ineffectual. Instead of redoubling our efforts to find peace, the United States launched a disastrous war in Iraq. We have sparked a bloody civil war in that country, inflamed Islamic fundamentalism throughout the Middle East, empowered the dangerous regime in Iran, ignored the frustrations and economic despair of the Palestinians, and damaged the immediate security of our great ally in the region—Israel.

On the 40th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem, I view that city as a symbol of hope in the bleak landscape of the Middle East. Through Israel's commitment to the openness of Jerusalem, worshippers of all faiths can visit the holy Old City and see the beauty of its timeless stone buildings and ancient walls.

The United States has always stood steadfast with its close ally Israel, and we must never cease doing so. We must recommit ourselves to the peace process in the Middle East, and lead the international community in forging a path to reconciliation and coexistence. We must dedicate ourselves to bringing about a new peaceful history in this divisive region, so that future generations may continue to find spiritual renewal in Jerusalem.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a strong supporter of Israel, of the Palestinian people, and of achieving a two-state solution where Israel and Palestine exist peacefully side by side. I have had the pleasure of visiting Jerusalem on more than one occasion, and am keenly aware of its importance to people of different faiths.

I rise today, however, to voice my disappointment that H. Con. Res. 152 conveys rather empty rhetoric instead of constructive observations and commitments. The United States has always served as the historical broker of peace agreements between Israel and its Arab neighbors and this is a role that we should continue to fulfill and I believe we should return to taking a much more active role in negotiations than we have under the Bush Administration's tenure. However, passage of a resolution by the United States Congress which fails to recognize the progress of past peace negotiations runs contrary to achieving our ultimate goal of a lasting peace in the region.

Jerusalem is the rightful capital of Israel and will forever remain the capital of Israel. However, it has long been understood that a permanent agreement about the Palestinian areas of Jerusalem will be left to final-status negotiations. The sooner the United States returns to a more active participant in the peace negotiations, the sooner we can arrive to a solution for Jerusalem. But in the meantime, I think we tread on dangerous territory when Congress adopts positions that run counter to issues that have yet to be negotiated.

Israel's victory in 1967 was necessary to shatter the idea that the State of Israel could ever be destroyed. Make no mistake that I am firmly committed to the viability and security of a Jewish state in Israel. However, it would be naive to ignore the unresolved consequences of the war and foolish to believe that continued occupation does not pose a real threat to Israel's well-being. I hope that we can use the anniversary of the Six-Day War to look forward and reaffirm a real commitment by the United States to achieve at last a workable two-state solution and a lasting peace.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, while I applaud the fact that H. Con. Res. 152 recognizes and reinforces a two-state solution to end the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians, I urge Congress and the Administration to move away from rhetoric and actively engage in steps that will foster lasting peace in the Middle East. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict not only grossly disrupts the lives of Israelis and Palestinians, it destabilizes the entire Middle East and enflames extremism, threatening U.S. national security.

U.S. involvement in Iraq has consumed the Administration's attention, but resolving the Israel-Palestinian conflict is an integral component for long-term peace in the region. Efforts to bring resolution to this conflict should not be put on the back burner because of the Administration's political fumbling in Iraq. I urge the Administration to reinvigorate its role as a fair and balanced broker and call on the U.S. Congress to recognize that securing peace in the volatile Middle East will require a sustained financial commitment. And, I urge our friends and allies in the region to recognize that peace in the Middle East is in their own countries' best national security interests and to become more actively engaged in the peace process.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address H. Con. Res. 152, recognizing the 40th anniversary of Israel's victory in the Six-Day War. This resolution will pass by a large majority, but I fear that it will become the latest in a series of missed opportunities for this body to support a viable peace process in the Middle East.

This resolution has several positive features. It is appropriate to commemorate Israel's victory in the Six-Day War. Its overwhelming military victory helped to secure Israel's continuing existence as a sovereign nation, something that was very much in doubt on the eve of the conflict.

I particularly support the third clause of the resolution, which commends Egypt and Jordan for their bold and brave decisions to reach peace with Israel. Their leadership has been a critical, if often underappreciated, guarantor of Israel's security and survival, and I continue to hope that other nations in the region will follow their lead.

It is also important to affirm that Jerusalem is the rightful capital of Israel, while acknowledging that the Palestinian people also have a

claim to Jerusalem as a capital and as a sacred city.

Nevertheless, I am concerned that this resolution, while calling for peace negotiations, actually undermines U.S. efforts to secure the trust of all sides in the search for peace. The resolution pursues an obsolete notion, put forth as if the last decade of peace negotiations simply had not occurred.

The idea of an undivided Jerusalem under sole Israeli sovereignty has not been part of any serious peace proposal—proffered by Israelis, Palestinians, or the international community—in the last several years. Israel's 2000 Camp David proposal and the Clinton compromise proposal, the 2002 Road Map for Middle East Peace, the 2003 Geneva Initiative, the 2003 ''People's Voice'' Initiative offered by Ami Ayalon and Sari Nuseibeh: none of these plans envision an undivided Jerusalem under sole Israeli sovereignty.

And this idea is not just outdated in theory; it fails to reflect the present reality in Jerusalem. Israel's security barrier is rapidly creating a physical barrier between already segregated neighborhoods of East and West Jerusalem.

Recognizing Jerusalem as the undivided capital of Israel under sole Israeli sovereignty does not help to bring peace to Jerusalem or Israel, nor does it help achieve the vision the resolution espouses. In fact, the only thing likely to fully guarantee Jerusalem as the permanent capital of Israel is the official, international recognition of Israel's neighbors and the entire international community—and this recognition is unlikely so long as Palestinian claims to their own capital and sacred city are denied.

As Christians, Jews, and Muslims, we can best honor our holy city by helping it become a model of peace, unity, and reconciliation. Doing so requires sustained, courageous, and open-minded efforts to promote negotiations, stand against violence, and find solutions. Congress and our Administration must play a much more effective role, returning our nation to active and sustained engagement in seeking peace.

I just returned from a brief visit to Jerusalem, now divided, threatened, strained by the anxiety of constant conflict. It is my great hope to one day visit a revitalized Jerusalem, undivided and shared as the capital of Israel and an independent Palestinian state, where Jews, Muslims, and Christians live together in peace and mutually honor the sites sacred to all of us. I can only wish that the resolution before us more adequately expressed this aspiration.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, today the House recognizes the 40th anniversary of the Six Day War and congratulates Israel on administering a unified Jerusalem as a city open to people of all faiths.

I want to join in congratulating the people of Jerusalem on the 40th anniversary of the unification of this ancient city. Further, I wish to commend the State of Israel for opening this holy city to followers of all faiths. Jerusalem is the holiest city of the Jewish faith, the third holiest Islamic city, and is the site of many significant Christian sites. Because of its important status to all these religions, Jerusalem must remain an undivided city that protects the rights of all ethnic and religious groups. Israel has recognized this important reality and allows members of all faiths to visit and worship at their holy sites.

It is my hope that all parties in the Middle East will use Jerusalem's example of religious coexistence to work towards a final negotiated peace in the region. A lasting peace between Israel and its neighbors is in the interests of all countries in the region and overall international stability.

Finally, it is my belief that the United States should help to reaffirm its commitment to a strong relationship with Israel by placing its embassy and staff in its capital city of Jerusalem. Accordingly, I hope that the President will consider the relevant language in the legislation before the House today and abide by the provisions of the Jerusalem Embassy Act passed by Congress in 1995. This would be an important step in cementing the bond between the United States and Israel at this critical time in history.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 152, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE IN ESTONIA AND ATTACKS ON ESTONIA'S EMBASSIES IN 2007

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 397) condemning violence in Estonia and attacks on Estonia's embassies in 2007, and expressing solidarity with the Government and the people of Estonia, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 397

Whereas on April 27, 2007, a crowd of more than 1,000 pro-Russian demonstrators gathered in Tallinn and riots broke out across the city;

Whereas more than 153 people were injured as a result of the pro-Russian riots, and one died as a result of stabbing by another rioter;

Whereas several stores in Tallinn and surrounding villages were looted as a result of the riots, and a statue of an Estonian general was set on fire;

Whereas since April 27, 2007, the Government of Estonia has reported several cyber-attacks on its official lines of communication, including those of the Office of the President;

Whereas on April 28, 2007, and in days following, the Embassy of Estonia in Moscow was surrounded by angry protesters who demanded the resignation of the Government of Estonia, tore down the flag of Estonia from the Embassy building, and subjected Embassy officials inside the building to violence and vandalism;

Whereas on April 30, 2007, a delegation of the State Duma of the Russian Federation visited Estonia and issued an official statement at the Embassy of the Russian Federation in Estonia that ''the government of Estonia must step down'';

Whereas on May 2, 2007, the Ambassador of Estonia to the Russian Federation was physically attacked by protesters and members of youth groups during an official press conference;

Whereas on May 2, 2007, the Swedish Ambassador to the Russian Federation was attacked as he left the Embassy of Estonia in Moscow, and his car was damaged by a crowd, resulting in a formal protest to the Russian Federation by the Swedish Foreign Ministry;

Whereas the Government of Estonia has reported other coordinated attacks against Estonian embassies in Helsinki, Oslo, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Riga, Prague, Kiev, and Minsk, and the Estonian Consulate in St. Petersburg;

Whereas on May 2, 2007, Prime Minister of Estonia Andrus Ansip stated that a ''sovereign state is under a heavy attack'' and that the events constitute ''a well-coordinated and flagrant intervention with the internal affairs of Estonia'';

Whereas on May 2, 2007, the public prosecutor's office of Estonia initiated an investigation into the cyber-attacks against Internet servers in Estonia and requested cooperation from the Russian Federation to identify the source of the attacks;

Whereas on May 2, 2007, the European Commission expressed its solidarity with Estonia and urged Russia to respect its obligations to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961, and end the blockade of the Embassy of Estonia in Moscow; and

Whereas the Embassy of Estonia in Russia has been closed since April 27, 2007, and Estonia has suspended consular services to Moscow because conditions remain unsafe for Embassy officials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its strong support for Estonia as a sovereign state and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) as it deals with matters internal to its country;

(2) condemns recent acts of violence, vandalism, and looting that have taken place in Estonia;

(3) condemns the attacks and threats against Estonia's embassies and officials in Russia and other countries;

(4) urges all activists involved to express their views peacefully and reject violence;

(5) honors the sacrifice of all those, including soldiers of the Red Army, that gave their lives in the fight to defeat Nazism;

(6) condemns any and all efforts to callously exploit the memory of the victims of the Second World War for political gain;

(7) supports the efforts of the Government of Estonia to initiate a dialogue with appropriate levels of the Government of the Russian Federation to resolve the crisis peacefully and to sustain cooperation between their two sovereign, independent states; and

(8) urges the governments of all countries—

(A) to condemn the violence that has occurred in Estonia, Moscow, and elsewhere in 2007 and to urge all parties to express their views peacefully;

(B) to assist the Government of Estonia in its investigation into the source of cyber-attacks; and

(C) to fulfill their obligations under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the only Member in the history of Congress who survived the Holocaust and was liberated by the Russian Army. I was therefore opposed to the decision and continue to remain opposed to the decision by the government of Estonia to move a memorial honoring Russian soldiers for their historic sacrifice during World War II in liberating Estonia and many other parts of Europe from Hitler's domination. What came afterward, however, is an entirely different issue.

On April 27, over 1,000 pro-Russian demonstrators gathered in Tallinn, the beautiful small capital of Estonia. That group soon got out of control. Riots broke out across the city. Finally, over 150 people were injured. One person died.

The next day, the Embassy of Estonia in Moscow was surrounded by angry, pro-Russian demonstrators who demanded the resignation of the government of Estonia. The Estonian ambassador was physically attacked by demonstrators during an official press conference. Even the Swedish ambassador to Russia was assaulted when he left the Estonian Embassy in Moscow.

Since the initial riots in Tallinn, the Estonian government has reported other coordinated attacks against its Embassies in Helsinki, Finland; Oslo, Norway; Copenhagen, Denmark; Stockholm, Sweden; Riga; Prague and Kiev.

The Estonian government, with the assistance of NATO, has also been investigating cyber attacks against the government's Web site, as well as against the computer systems of political parties, banks, and media organizations in Estonia. Cyber attacks in this day and age, Mr. Speaker, can be devastating. The Estonian government estimates that these attacks cost the targets tens of millions of Euros, a significant sum for a small country like Estonia.

These incidents of violence have been condemned by a host of European institutions. The European Commission has expressed its solidarity with Estonia and urged Russia to respect its obligations under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. NATO has issued a similar statement condemning the violence.

So, today, we in Congress join our friends in Europe in expressing our strong disapproval of the unjustified and unacceptable Russian attacks against Estonia, and we express our strong solidarity with the people and government of the great democratic nation of Estonia.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this all-important measure.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong support of this resolution authored by our good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), which condemns the violence within Estonia, condemns the attacks on Estonia's Embassy in Russia that have taken place recently, and which expresses our solidarity with the government and the people of Estonia in the face of such violence and intimidation.

As the chairman has pointed out, the April 27 relocation by the Estonian government of a Soviet-era statue and memorial, located in the capital, led some ethnic Russians within Estonia and some Russians in Russia itself to undertake violent demonstrations and threatening intimidation. These events presented the rest of the world with the worrisome prospect that Estonia and other countries once held captive by the former Soviet regime would continue to be subjected to organized, threatening behavior by their neighbor, Russia.

Additionally troublesome is the possibility that such behavior might be supported by officials at high levels within the Russian government.

It is the view of the most impartial observers that in the days that followed the memorial's relocation, the Russian government quite obviously failed to adequately protect the Estonian Embassy in Moscow, which was threatened for some time by a mob.

In Estonia itself, government, commercial and media Web sites observed a series of suspicious and devastating cyber attacks, reportedly originating from within Russia in what appeared to be a very organized manner.

□ 1540

All of that followed very violent demonstrations mounted by some ethnic Russians within Estonia, demonstrations that required significant engagement by the police to halt.

Mr. Speaker, since regaining their independence with the fall of the Soviet regime, Estonia, as well as the other Baltic States, have worked hard to overcome the serious impact of that decades-long occupation, a period in which the native population in Estonia came close to becoming a minority, a minority in their own land, due to the actions of the Soviet government.

Many Baltic citizens were deemed to be threats to that occupation and they were shipped off to Siberia, some never to be seen again, while ethnic Russians were assigned by the regime to settle in the Baltic States.

But with renewed independence, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania have had the opportunity to again take control of their future.

To their credit, they have worked with the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the European Union to find ways to address the presence of those who had been settled on their territories during the Soviet era, finding procedures to grant proper citizenship that, while tough in some cases, nevertheless provided a means for the large ethnic Russian minorities to participate in the civic life of those states whose independence was no longer questioned.

The European Union and the NATO alliance recognized the efforts by these Baltic States to constructively address the challenges and to implement general democratic and free market reforms.

That is why Estonia and other Baltic States are today members of both the European Union and NATO, and why those organizations have stood by Estonia in the face of the disproportionate reaction to the recent relocation of the memorial, that reaction appearing to have had its roots in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltic States have more than earned their independence through decades of repression and suffering under a Communist regime.

It is important that through the adoption of this resolution before us today, authored by Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois, we make it clear that we stand in support of Estonia and its independence in the face of threats and intimidation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join us in support of Mr. SHIMKUS' resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the author of the resolution.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman LANTOS and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for your time and the speedy movement of this resolution, and it's timely with the President's trip to Europe.

A few things of note. I continue to follow, as the chairman knows, the occurrences in the former captive nations, the European Union countries, and mostly the Baltic countries, and it seems like we can never get to forgiveness. It seems like countries always go back to another point in time to address their grievances.

I've been on the floor numerous times to talk about Molotov-Ribbentrop, and we've debated that and we've voted on that resolution. We forget about Roosevelt's land lease deal that was very helpful to the Soviet Union at that time, and as the chairman's correct, we also forget about the sacrifices made by the Soviet Union in winning World War II, especially on the Eastern

front. So his concerns are well-founded and very much appreciated by this Member.

There was great hope after the fall of the Wall, as I served on the German border during the Cold War era, that this would bring a new time for Europe, a time of prosperity and peace, the rule of law, democratic institutions. And that's why we continue to be frustrated by the current involvement, because when there is peace and stability and the rule of law, the people prosper, people on both sides of the boundary lines. In this case the Estonians and across the border, the Russians, they would both benefit from peaceful relations and coexistence.

But we just can't get there yet, and so that's why I'm very appreciative of bringing this resolution because the decision by the Estonian government to move the memorial, as the chairman said, probably not proper in his estimation, I know that it can be said that it was done with dignity, with consultation and moved to a place in a military cemetery and given all the respects offered.

But having said that, what a free and independent country, a decision it can make, doesn't justify the result. Again, that's why going back to the comments of, can't we just forgive and can't we just move forward, the great nations do not have to bully small neighbors. Great nations can stand side by side with their smaller allies and their neighbors to help them develop and grow.

And what we see from the Russian Federation is just the opposite. We see them continually harass and bully their neighbors. Their neighbors have made choices that we expect free and democratic countries to be able to make, and just because the Russian Federation are unhappy with that it does not give them the right to bypass the rule of international law.

So this issue, as has been discussed earlier, the result of the movement of the statue led to riots within Estonia by ethnic Russians and also problems in the capital of Moscow, and as Ranking Member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN said, any impartial observer would say that there was a move by the government to specifically not stop them, and there is great evidence that they helped encourage this ability to be thugs and bullies to ambassadors and government representatives of free and democratic countries.

That's why I'm very thankful that the committee seemed right to bring this resolution speedily to the floor. As cochair of the House Baltic Caucus, I've been heavily involved for 10 years with NATO expansion, the EU expansion and the energy disputes.

Estonia is one of our closest allies and friends in Europe. They have been an integral part in our war on terror in having troops in Afghanistan.

That is why House Resolution 397 is so important. The U.S. House of Representatives must stand with our Estonian friends and refuse to let them be bullied by the Russian government. The intimidation that President Putin is using against our allies in Eastern Europe is simply unacceptable.

Again, I'd like to thank the chairman for bringing this to the floor.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. LANTOS. Before yielding back our time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all of my colleagues to an upcoming open joint hearing of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Russian Duma on June 21. This will be the first time in history that the Foreign Affairs Committees of these two parliaments will have met in joint session.

□ 1550

I very much hope, and I know my distinguished ranking member, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, joins me in hoping, that we will have a meaningful and helpful dialogue with our Russian colleagues so that the current state of tension between Russia and the United States could somehow be diminished.

We had high hopes when the Soviet Union collapsed over 15 years ago, but many recent statements by Mr. Putin and many actions by Russia, including the action that we have just heard described against the free and democratic Republic of Estonia, fill us with a great deal of concern and anxiety.

I urge all of my colleagues to attend this joint session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Duma's Foreign Affairs Committee in a few weeks in our hope that before the President and Mr. Putin meet in Kennebunkport we might have a legislative opportunity of exploring candidly all of the issues that, at the moment, seem to divide us.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 397, which condemns violence in Estonia and attacks on that country's embassies in 2007. It also expresses solidarity with the government and the people of Estonia.

This past April 27, a crowd of more than 1,000 pro-Russian demonstrators gathered in Tallin, the capital city of Estonia. The gathering became unruly and riots broke out across the city. In the end, over 150 people were injured and one person died from stab wounds.

On May 2, the Estonian Ambassador was physically attacked by protesters during an official press conference. That same day, the Swedish Ambassador to Russia was assaulted when he left the Estonian Embassy in Moscow.

Since the initial riots in Tallin, this wave of violence continued, and the Estonian Government has reported other coordinated attacks against its embassies in Helsinki, Oslo, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Riga, Prague, and Kiev, among other cities. The Estonian Government, with the assistance of NATO, has been investigating cyber attacks against the government's website, as well as against the computer systems of political parties, banks, and media organizations. The Estonian Government estimates that these attacks have cost the targets tens of millions of euros.

Estonia is a well respected member of NATO and the European Union. These incidents of violence have been condemned by a host of European institutions. The European Commission and NATO have expressed their solidarity with Estonia and urged Russia to respect its obligations under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that this House also express its disapproval of the unjustified attacks against Estonia. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution, which denounces violence in Estonia and attacks against its embassies, while also expressing solidarity with the government and people of the great nation of Estonia.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 397, 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. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II AND HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS, PRINCE PHILIP, DUKE OF EDINBURGH, FOR THEIR STATE VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 412) expressing gratitude to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, for their State Visit to the United States and reaffirming the friendship that exists between the United States and the United Kingdom, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 412

Whereas Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, traveled to the United States for a State Visit from May 3 to May 8, 2007, celebrating the special relationship that exists between the United States and the United Kingdom;

Whereas the United States and the United Kingdom enjoy a trans-Atlantic friendship sustained by a commitment to democratic traditions, liberty, and the spread of freedom, as well as common economic and cultural foundations;

Whereas in a rapidly changing world, Queen Elizabeth II has been a force of stability and constancy and has provided inspiration to the world in times both peaceful and tumultuous; and

Whereas Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip serve as ambassadors for the British people and the goodwill engendered by their visit serves as a reminder, for the people of the United States and the United Kingdom alike, of our joint values and priorities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives is deeply appreciative of the State Visit recently conducted by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and celebrates the State Visit as having been an occasion to reaffirm the value and depth of the friendship that exists between the United States and the United Kingdom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANNER. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Two hundred and thirty years ago, Americans threw off the yoke of the British monarch with much fanfare, as everyone knows. But, since then, the American people have celebrated the royals, and they have watched and observed the demeanor of the royal family of Great Britain throughout the years. As a matter of fact, we gave a coveted film award to a woman portraying the Queen just not long ago.

But, anyway, a few short weeks ago, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, were greeted by enormous crowds visiting the United States. This was the Queen's fourth State visit following previous visits in 1991, 1976 and first in 1957.

Her most recent trip was highlighted by her commemoration of the 400th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown, the first permanent English settlement in the New World. When 108 London entrepreneurs set sail on orders from King James I to settle Virginia, that would set the stage for one of the most, if not the most, successful and lasting alliance in modern history.

The Queen praised such historic links and bonds of friendship between our two countries when she was here and referred to the fact that our relationship has been built on a shared commitment to democratic traditions and liberty.

During her visit, she also noted, as well, our shared future. Just as the settlers of 1607 set out to discover a new world, researchers on both sides of the Atlantic are now seeking to explore new frontiers in medicine and space. This collaboration between British and American scientists is invaluable.

The Queen has served tirelessly as an ambassador for the British people, and she has led her country through times of prosperity as well as times of turmoil. It is for these reasons and others that I am delighted to support this resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) for authoring the resolution before us; and I rise in support of his resolution, 412, which expresses gratitude to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, for their recent state visit to the United States and reaffirms the friendship that exists between the United States and the United Kingdom. Queen Elizabeth's visit reminded us of the shared values that underpin the unique friendship and partnership of the United States and the United Kingdom.

The extent to which the United States and the United Kingdom today share common goals in their foreign and defense policies as well is also quite remarkable. There is no other bilateral relationship that the United States has with another country that is routinely referred to as ''the special relationship.''

In the time that Queen Elizabeth has reigned, more than half a century, America and Britain have continually strengthened their partnership and collaborated on threats to world peace and security, both large and small. That important collaboration continues today, as President Bush noted in his remarks in the dinner he held at the White House in the Queen's honor, when he stated the following: ''together we are supporting young democracies in Iraq and Afghanistan . . . confronting global challenges such as poverty and disease and terrorism, and together we're working to build a world in which more people can enjoy prosperity and security and peace.''

Mr. Speaker, I should note as well the significance of how closely the economies of the United States and the United Kingdom are linked. The United Kingdom is the fourth largest market for exports, such exports totaling more than $36 billion in the year 2004 alone. Just as significant, the United States and the United Kingdom are each other's biggest foreign investors.

This resolution gives us an opportunity to reflect upon the strength and the value of a trans-Atlantic relationship that has proven critical to safeguarding the community of democracies in Europe and, indeed, throughout the world.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution, expressing appreciation to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip for their recent visit and the bonds that tie our two nations together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of the resolution, Mr. BOOZMAN of Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this bill that expresses our appreciation to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, for visiting the United States over the last month.

Over the course of her lifetime and during her 55 years on the throne, Queen Elizabeth has played a vital role in the United Kingdom's successes through her strong leadership in diplomacy. She has been a great source of stability for her nation.

During times of peace and times of unrest, Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip have displayed amazing courage and have inspired the world community. The relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom is a special one. The Americans and British have been working together for generations, furthering the deep-rooted commitment each country has for peace and security.

I would like to thank Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip for reaffirming the trans-Atlantic friendship between our two countries with their visit last month to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1600

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 412, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO STOP GENOCIDE AND VIOLENCE IN DARFUR, SUDAN

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 422) calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop genocide and violence in Darfur, Sudan.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 422

Whereas since the conflict in Darfur, Sudan began in 2003, hundreds of thousands

of people have been killed and more than 2,500,000 displaced as a result of the ongoing and escalating violence;

Whereas on July 23, 2004, Congress declared, ''the atrocities unfolding in Darfur, Sudan, are genocide'' and on September 23, 2004, then Secretary of State Colin Powell stated before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that, ''genocide has occurred and may still be occurring in Darfur,'' and ''the Government of Sudan and the Janjaweed bear responsibility'';

Whereas on October 13, 2006, the President signed the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act (Public Law 109–344), which identifies the Government of Sudan as complicit with the forces committing genocide in the Darfur region and urges the President to, ''take all necessary and appropriate steps to deny the Government of Sudan access to oil revenues'';

Whereas President George W. Bush declared in a speech delivered on April 18, 2007, at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum that no one ''can doubt that genocide is the only word for what is happening in Darfur—and that we have a moral obligation to stop it'';

Whereas the presence of approximately 7,000 African Union peacekeepers has not deterred the violence and the increasing attacks by the Government of Sudan and Government-sponsored Janjaweed militia and rebel groups;

Whereas worsening violence has forced humanitarian organizations to suspend operations, leaving a substantial portion of the population of Darfur inaccessible to aid workers;

Whereas violence has spread to the neighboring states of Chad and the Central African Republic, threatening regional peace and security;

Whereas the Government of Sudan continues to refuse to allow implementation of the full-scale peacekeeping mission authorized under United Nations Security Council Resolution 1706;

Whereas former United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan subsequently negotiated a compromise agreement with the Government of Sudan for a hybrid United Nations-African Union peacekeeping mission to be implemented in three phases;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has long-standing economic and military ties with Sudan and continues to strengthen these ties in spite of the on-going genocide in Darfur, as evidenced by the following actions:

(1) China reportedly purchases as much as 70 percent of Sudan's oil;

(2) China currently has at least $3,000,000,000 invested in the Sudanese energy sector, for a total of $10,000,000,000 since the 1990s;

(3) Sudan's Joint Chief of Staff, Haj Ahmed El Gaili, recently visited Beijing for discussions with Chinese Defense Minister Cao Gang Chuan and other military officials as part of an eight-day tour of China; Cao pledged closer military relations with Sudan, saying that China was ''willing to further develop cooperation between the two militaries in every sphere'';

(4) China has reportedly cancelled approximately $100 million in debt owed by the Sudanese Government;

(5) China is building infrastructure in Sudan and provided funds for a presidential palace in Sudan at a reported cost of approximately $20,000,000; and

(6) Data provided by the Government of Sudan to the United Nations for 2005 states that Sudan imported at least $24,000,000 in arms and ammunition from the People's Republic of China, as well as nearly $57,000,000 in parts and aircraft equipment, and $2,000,000 in helicopter and airplane parts from China, making China the largest provider of military arms and equipment to Sudan, even as Sudan has defended its right to transfer and use such military arms and equipment in Darfur for military operations;

Whereas given its economic interests throughout the region, China has a unique ability to positively influence the Government of Sudan to abandon its genocidal policies and to accept United Nations peacekeepers to join a hybrid United Nations-African Union peacekeeping mission;

Whereas the President's Special Envoy to Sudan, Andrew S. Natsios, further said in testimony on April 11, 2007, that ''China's substantial economic investment in Sudan gives it considerable potential leverage, and we have made clear to Beijing that the international community will expect China to be part of the solution'';

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China's recent appointment of a senior diplomat as China's special representative on African affairs who shall focus specific attention on the Darfur issue and its pledge to provide military engineers to support African Union peacekeeping forces in Darfur are welcome developments, but do not demonstrate that Beijing is truly committed to using all the considerable diplomatic and political means at its disposal to stop the genocide in Darfur;

Whereas due to its large population, its rapidly growing global economy, its large research and development investments and military spending, its seat as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and on the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, China is an emerging power that is increasingly perceived as a leader with significant international reach and responsibility;

Whereas in November 2006, China hosted its third Forum on China-Africa Cooperation with more than 40 heads of state in attendance and which focused heavily on trade relations and investment on the African continent as it is expected to double by 2010;

Whereas China is preparing to host the Olympic Summer Games of 2008, the most honorable, venerated, and prestigious international sporting event and has selected ''One World, One Dream'' as a slogan for those games;

Whereas China should act consistently with the Olympic standard of preserving human dignity in Darfur, Sudan and around the world; and

Whereas China has been reluctant to use its full influence to improve the human rights situation in Darfur: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to—

(A) acknowledge publicly and condemn the atrocities taking place in Darfur;

(B) cease all military arms, ammunition, and related military equipment sales to the Government of Sudan; and

(C) take steps to immediately suspend economic cooperation with the Government of Sudan and investment in Sudan until and unless the Government of Sudan—

(i) stops its attacks on civilians;

(ii) complies with all United Nations Security Council resolutions related to Darfur; and

(iii) engages in good faith negotiations with Darfur rebel groups to achieve a sustainable negotiated peace agreement;

(2) recognizes the close relationship between China and Sudan and strongly urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its full influence to—

(A) urge the regime in Khartoum to comply with the deployment of the peacekeeping force authorized by United Nations Security Council Resolution 1706;

(B) call for Sudanese compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1556 and 1564, and the Darfur Peace Agreement, all of which demand that the Government of Sudan disarm militias operating in Darfur;

(C) call on all parties to the conflict to adhere to the 2004 N'Djamena ceasefire agreement and the recently-agreed United Nations communiqué which commits the Sudanese Government to improve conditions for humanitarian organizations and ensure they have unfettered access to the populations they serve;

(D) emphasize that there can be no military solution to the conflict in Darfur and that the formation and implementation of a legitimate peace agreement between all parties will contribute toward the welfare and stability of the entire nation and broader region;

(E) urge all rebel groups to unify and assist all parties to come to the negotiating table in good faith;

(F) urge the Government of southern Sudan to play a more active role in pressing for legitimate peace talks and take immediate steps to support and assist in the revitalization of such talks along one single coordinated track;

(G) engage collaboratively in high-level diplomacy and multilateral efforts toward a renewed peace process; and

(H) join the international community in imposing economic and other consequences on the Government of Sudan if that Government continues to carry out or support attacks on civilians and frustrate diplomatic efforts; and

(3) recognizes that the spirit of the Olympics, which is to bring together nations and people from all over the world in peace, is incompatible with any actions directly or indirectly supporting acts of genocide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANNER. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Six days ago, the President imposed a new series of sanctions on the Sudanese government and its murderous leaders. The administration may have sent a stronger message a month ago, but did not. But new American sanctions, however belatedly imposed, are in place. Now the rest of the civilized world must respond. Strong sanctions represent a crucial bridge in efforts to force the regime in Khartoum to give

up its reprehensible program of genocide in Darfur. But it is now readily apparent that we can only cross that bridge with the help of China.

Time and again, we have witnessed national interests taking precedence over the destruction of people's lives, their society and their culture. China, purely for economic interests, in our opinion, has stood firmly in the way of a robust international response to the Darfur genocide.

It has been 3 years since this Congress declared that the unfolding atrocities in Darfur constitute genocide. Yet, since it began, China has acted as a shield for Sudan against international criticism and tough sanctions at the United Nations.

In spite of unimpeachable evidence of genocide and other atrocities, China has continued as Sudan's largest trading partner and the main foreign investor in its oil sector.

China's sales of arms and military equipment to Khartoum is even more disturbing. But China has taken it one step further by actually blocking efforts to send international forces into Darfur.

Several countries have been resistant. But among the states unwilling to support a robust civilian protection operation to stop the genocide, China assumes a unique culpability because of its influence, its permanent seat on the U.N. Security Council, and its role in Sudan.

In 2004, China forced the Security Council to water down an oil sanctions resolution and threatened it would veto any future resolutions sanctioning Sudan.

China shielded Khartoum against international sanctions while the Sudanese military drove tens of thousands out of their communities and oil regions just to speed exploration.

In 2006, China explicitly argued to the Security Council against a peacekeeping deployment to Darfur, arguing that it could not support the resolution because Sudan's government was not yet ready to accept U.N. peacekeepers on its soil.

Not only did China oppose the deployment on behalf of Sudan, its Ambassador lobbied hard for the Russians to take the same position. Only under relentless international pressure, with the actress Mia Farrow and others raising the specter that the upcoming Beijing Olympics will become the ''Genocide Olympics,'' has China finally begun to take a few small, constructive steps in the right direction on Sudan.

If we are going to save lives in Darfur, it is imperative that we keep the pressure on China to force Sudan to end the atrocities, resume peace talks and bring resolution to the horror known as Darfur.

This very important resolution calls on China to condemn explicitly the atrocities in Darfur, to cease military arms sales, to suspend economic cooperation with Sudan and use its influence to urge President Bashir to comply with full and immediate deployment of the African Union peacekeeping force.

It also calls on all parties to the conflict to adhere to the ceasefire agreement and allow unfettered access by humanitarian workers to those in need. It's a clear signal to China and Sudan that their relationship cannot and will not withstand the glare of international scrutiny.

Unless it wants to permanently scar its reputation, China must act as a responsible world power and use its influence to stop this now.

I therefore urge passage and commend the author, my friend and colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for her tireless leadership on the Darfur issue.

Let me also thank our majority leader, STENY HOYER, for his consistent and effective efforts to do the same.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 422, which calls on the government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and leverage to stop genocide and violence in Darfur.

I wish to thank my colleague from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE, for introducing this important measure, and for all of the cosponsors who she has gathered and their strong and steadfast support of efforts to halt the humanitarian disaster which continues to unfold daily in Sudan.

I had the honor of traveling to the camps of the internally displaced persons in Darfur with Ms. LEE, and I thank her for her courageous leadership in this effort.

In July 2004, as my good friend from Tennessee stated, the House boldly declared that genocide was occurring in the Darfur region of western Sudan. Nearly 3 years later, the bombing, rape and murder continue.

Hundreds of thousands of people have been killed, and more than two million people have been forced from their homes by marauding militias and a callous government bent on total destruction.

And while I'm encouraged by the leadership of our United States Government and attempts to end this carnage, I cannot help but feel a profound sense of frustration. Where is the rest of the international community?

The U.S. Government has provided vital support for the African Union, the United Nations peacekeeping forces. We've led diplomatic efforts to find a political solution to the crisis. We've donated over $2.6 billion in humanitarian assistance for Darfur and Chad since 2005.

And just last week the President announced that he would impose tough additional sanctions against key individuals and businesses linked to human rights abuses in the region. Included among those businesses were five major petrochemical companies owned or controlled by the Sudanese regime, and an air transport company transferring arms to fighters in Darfur.

President Bush also announced that he had directed the U.S. Permanent Representative to the U.N. to seek passage of a Security Council resolution which would sanction the regime in Khartoum, expand and extend the arms embargo and impose a no-fly zone over Darfur.

These measures have been characterized as unhelpful by some, including the Sudanese regime's representatives here in Washington, as well as by Chinese officials.

And it's no wonder, Mr. Speaker. As the resolution before us indicates, China purchases up to 70 percent of Sudan's oil. It has $3 billion invested in the energy sector in Sudan, and it has exported at least $24 million in arms and ammunition and another $59 million in aircraft equipment to Sudan.

This continues, despite the Sudanese regime's insistence that it can use these funds and equipment for military operations in Darfur; that is, to continue the carnage against Sudanese civilians there.

Regrettably, the Chinese leadership appears unwilling to sacrifice its economic interests in Sudan for the sake of humanity. This is unacceptable, and it is also no surprise.

Beijing must take immediate steps to prevent further death, misery and destruction by compelling the regime in Khartoum to end these atrocities.

□ 1610

This means suspending economic cooperation with and stopping all military equipment sales to Sudan until the Sudanese regime stops its assaults on civilians in Darfur, allows the deployment of U.N. peacekeepers, disarms militias, and brings all rebel groups and high-level diplomats together to negotiate a political solution.

Through this resolution we are challenging China as well as other countries who have influence in Sudan to stand with the United States at the United Nations and press for immediate deployment of a robust peacekeeping mission in Darfur as authorized by Security Council Resolution No. 1706. We call on them to support and enforce a rigorous, multilateral sanctions regime against those individuals and businesses which are complicit in genocide. If China and other nations with influence in Sudan choose to look the other way, then we should reevaluate our relationship with those governments. It should be made clear that governments allied with Khartoum are complicit in a war on civilians and the immeasurable human suffering occurring in Darfur.

I strongly support Ms. LEE's timely resolution, and I take heart in the moral strength that has been demonstrated by this administration, this body, and the American people.

The people of Darfur have known too much suffering with the leaders of the world showing too much procrastination and China showing far too much negligence. The time for action is now. It is long overdue, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentlewoman from California for introducing this resolution.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the author of the resolution, Ms. BARBARA LEE of California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding, for his leadership and support to end the genocide in Darfur, and also let me just thank our chairman, Congressman LANTOS; our ranking member, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN of the Foreign Affairs Committee; and Chairman PAYNE and the ranking member of the Africa subcommittee, Mr. SMITH, for their leadership on the issue of Darfur and for working together to make sure that all of our efforts here continue to be bipartisan. We have over 128 cosponsors of this resolution today.

Again, thank you to Congressman JERRY MORAN of Kansas and also Congressman JIM MCGOVERN of Massachusetts and to all of our staff.

This is a mission that we are all on. Many of us have visited on several occasions, and each time we visit Darfur we come back recommitted and rededicated to do what we can each and every day to end this horrific genocide.

Thirteen years ago, the world stood by as nearly 1 million people, 1 million people, were slaughtered in the genocide in Rwanda. The best our country could do then, unfortunately, was to apologize for our failure to act, and that was after the fact. Many of us swore that another Rwanda would never happen again on our watch. But today, Mr. Speaker, it is happening again.

Nearly 3 years ago, under the bold leadership of our good friend, Chairman DONALD PAYNE, on July 22, 2004, Congress formally declared that genocide was taking place in Darfur. Estimates indicate that nearly 450,000 people have been killed, and 2.5 million innocent civilians have been displaced to date.

I witnessed this ongoing tragedy for the first time in 2005 when I visited the refugee camps in Chad and Darfur with two great humanitarian leaders, Don Cheadle and Paul Rusesabagina, this delegation led, again bipartisan, by Chairman ED ROYCE. In February, 2006, under the leadership of our great Speaker, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI, I had the opportunity once again to visit the refugee camps in another region of Darfur. This again was a bipartisan delegation. And just this past April, along with my colleague Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, we visited another region in Darfur as part of this visit organized by our majority leader, STENY HOYER.

As Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN has said, what we saw in Darfur, of course, is continuing to deteriorate. More and more people are dying, and even humanitarian aid workers are at risk. The day before our delegation arrived, five soldiers from Senegal were killed in Darfur, African Union soldiers there to protect innocent civilians.

Unfortunately, for many Darfurians the situation remains grim. Last week, many of us expressed our support for the President's announcement of additional sanctions on businesses controlled by the government of Sudan and on individuals in the Sudanese government. Today, we take another step forward by calling on the Chinese to use their unique influence with Sudan to end the genocide.

Mr. Speaker, there is no way to sugarcoat this. China is the principal trading partner of a genocidal regime that has thumbed its nose at the international community. China reportedly purchases as much as 70 percent of Sudan's oil and has cancelled over $100 million in debt and has provided $20 million in funding to build a palace for General Bashir. China unquestionably has the unique ability to influence Khartoum in a positive manner, but they cannot do so by simply following a policy of appeasement. They must put real pressure on General Bashir to comply with all U.N. resolutions and fully, unconditionally accept the U.N.-AU peacekeeping mission. And they must urge Sudan to pursue a renewed peace process with all parties, and they must insist that humanitarian organizations have unfettered access to the 2.5 million people who have been displaced.

Most importantly, they should deny Bashir the tools to continue perpetrating the genocide by cutting off, and I mean cutting off, all military arms sales and suspending economic opportunities and cooperation with the government of Sudan.

The economic costs to China for taking these steps today is minimal compared to the benefit they would achieve if they would provide to the people of Darfur an end to the genocide and the international acclaim that China could win by helping to end the genocide.

I urge our Chinese friends not to view this resolution as a condemnation but to view it as an opportunity to take action to end an urgent moral and humanitarian crisis. So we are urging the Chinese government to act, and our own steps must increase to stop this horrific and unbelievable tragedy occurring on our watch.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the Members here who are speaking in support of this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Judge POE of Texas, a distinguished member of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for yielding time.

Sudan is responsible for the genocide in Darfur. ''Genocide'' is a fancy term, Mr. Speaker, that means organized murder by a government. The violence has displaced over 2 million people, and it has claimed at least 500,000 lives. President Bush has announced tougher sanctions on businesses and individuals dealing with the government of Sudan, but the perpetrators of evil are also propped up by China.

Seventy percent of Sudan's oil goes to China, and loads of Chinese arms regularly find their way to these demons of the desert. No wonder China is road-blocking change in Sudan. It is all about money and who gets it.

Though the Chinese have appointed envoys, they haven't done anything to pressure the Sudanese to stop murdering their own people. I think it is safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that as long as China continues to prop up the evil in Sudan, the Chinese government is complicit in this atrocity; and I don't think it is too much to ask Congress, in the name of basic human rights, to demand that China use its influence in Sudan to help stop the genocide. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this resolution offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Mr. Speaker, the Chinese have an opportunity to show the world that they care about innocent people and take this blemish off of their historical record. It is in their best interest, not to mention the best interest of the victims of Darfur, that they pressure Sudan to stop the killing of their own people.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 2 minutes to Ms. SHELLEY BERKLEY of Nevada.

□ 1620

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of this important legislation.

Everyone in this body knows about the atrocities being committed in Darfur. Congress has already labeled them a genocide, and the administration followed suit shortly thereafter.

Last year, we passed the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, which seeks to give teeth to our declarations and clamp down on the Sudanese government. And yet, despite all of this activity, the horrors continue. The Sudanese regime still has not gotten the message that the United States is serious about stopping the bloodshed.

Many countries continue to view the situation as ''business as usual.'' China is the largest foreign investor in Sudan and continues to provide the Sudanese blood-soaked government with interest free loans. They are even engaging in arms sales, despite the clear evidence of massacre, rape, destruction, displacement and genocide.

Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about stopping the bloodshed in Sudan, we cannot allow business to continue as usual. The Chinese government and governments throughout the world need to start getting the message: If you continue to invest in murderous, blood-thirsty regimes, if you continue to invest in Sudan, there will be consequences, there will be very serious consequences.

I urge support for this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 4 minutes to a leader in worldwide human rights efforts, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend and colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ms. LEE for introducing H. Res. 422, which calls on the government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop the atrocities being committed in Darfur.

This measure builds on numerous steps that this Congress and the United States Government, through the White House and the executive branch, have taken over the past several years to call a halt to the relentless killings, rapes and displacement of the innocent men, women and children in that region.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that Sudan's soil has been soaked in the blood of innocent people. Sudan has not suffered just one, but two genocides. Everybody will recall that in southern Sudan, some two million people were slaughtered by the Bashir government; another 4 million people were displaced.

When President Bush came into office, he announced that Senator Danforth would become our special envoy, and very vigorous and robust efforts were made to try to stop the killing in southern Sudan. We succeeded. But after a short period of time new hostilities broke out in the Darfur region in 2003, in February, and the blood-letting was beginning again. Darfur is now the second genocide that has occurred in Sudan.

I think we should note for the record that no other nation on Earth has done as much as the United States to stop the genocide. Most of the food and the medicines at the refugee camps that my colleagues and I have all visited, looked in the eyes of so many people who have suffered so much, has come from the U.S. taxpayer. I think that should give us some sense of meaning that we have played a significant role in alleviating at least some of this suffering.

Just last week, President Bush announced the expansion and tightening of economic sanctions against the Sudanese government. These sanctions include the barring of 30 more companies owned and controlled by the government of Sudan from the U.S. financial system, and it is a crime for Americans to knowingly engage in businesses with these companies.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that more can and must be done by other members of the international community to address these crimes against humanity. A primary culprit is the complicity in this genocide by the People's Republic of China. Instead of joining the international community in calling an end to the genocide, China has served as enabler-in-chief to the atrocities that continue to take place in Darfur. Not only has the Chinese government provided Bashir with funds and weapons, about over $90 million worth in 2005 alone, but it has lavished him with gifts and a false sense of legitimacy. The money and the weapons that Sudan has received from China has made the Chinese government absolutely complicit in these crimes against humanity.

And now we see China's thwarting or attempting to thwart a U.S.-led effort at the U.N. Security Council for a resolution that would impose extended international arms embargo and new sanctions against the Sudanese government. According to Reuters last week, the Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeswoman said, ''New sanctions against Sudan would only complicate the issue. China appeals to all parties to maintain restraint and patience.''

I would urge this spokeswoman and all Chinese officials to go to Darfur and again look into the eyes of those who have suffered, look in the eyes of at least some of the 2 million people who have been displaced from their homes, look into the eyes of some of the families, the survivors of the 450,000 that have been killed and say, ''let's look for patience and restraint.''

China has covered itself in shame. It has enabled two genocides, southern Sudan and now in Darfur. Still, because so many victims are going to be suffering today and tomorrow and the next day, we appeal to the Chinese government, Mr. Speaker, to join us as peacemakers in that troubled region.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Mr. STEVE ISRAEL from New York for 2 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, and I rise in support of this very important resolution.

I want to thank the sponsor of this resolution, the gentlewoman from California, not only for authoring it, but for working with me several weeks ago on an amendment that passed by a bipartisan margin in the House of Representatives to send a message to the leaders of Sudan that we will not tolerate genocide and in fact we will explore the upgrade of the Abeche airbase, which is located 100 miles from the border in Chad.

This is a very important resolution. I rise in support of this resolution today because too few people rose in support of those from my faith who were victimized by a holocaust in the 1930s and 1940s.

When I came to this body, Mr. Speaker, I made a vow that I would stand up and oppose and fight against and speak out against any genocide, and speak out against any power that was wittingly or unwittingly empowering or assisting in a genocide, which is what brings me to the floor today.

I was recently in China just 2 months ago engaging the Chinese government on a broad range of energy security issues. China has one of the world's fastest growing economies, arguably the world's fastest growing economy. By the year 2030, it will have more cars on its roads than we have on our roads. It is expanding its defense budget. China can be an important partner with the United States in leading the world, but with that role in leading the world comes a responsibility not to empower, not to assist any kind of genocide. It is time for the leadership of China to stand up with our democracy and say no to the genocide that is occurring in Darfur, and China has a critical opportunity to do that. They purchase 70 percent of Sudan's oil. They invested over $10 million in the Sudanese energy sector over the last two decades. They are the main supplier of arms to Sudan with $83 million exported there in 2005.

Mr. Speaker, we want to work with China. We want to engage China. We want to work with China to lead the world in a constructive way on stability and peace and economic development and environmental stewardship, but China needs to show the world that it is willing to engage those who are perpetrating a genocide, to draw the line and say it will not be tolerated. That is precisely what this resolution does. I am very pleased and proud to support it.

I thank the gentlewoman from California again for her leadership, and I will continue, with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis, to stand up and speak out when genocide is committed, or against those who assist in the commission of a genocide.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia, with whom I had the honor of traveling to Darfur on Ms. LEE and Mr. HOYER's trip to that area recently.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentlewoman, and I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I had the opportunity to travel with Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, Majority Leader HOYER and other members of a bipartisan congressional delegation to the war-torn nation of Sudan and see firsthand one of the worst humanitarian crises in recent times.

As a Nation dedicated to freedom and the rights of the individual, the United States has a responsibility to speak out when those rights are violated. While in Darfur, we saw directly the atrocities in this besieged nation. We toured the Alsalam Internally Displaced Persons Camp, where 47,000 people seeking food, water and safety live in crowded, deplorable and often still unsafe conditions.

□ 1630

This is one of nearly 100 such camps which collectively have more than 2 million people. They live in small, makeshift twig huts, many only the size of a pup tent. On numerous occasions, the IDP camps themselves have been attacked. And this is just one of

many examples of the deplorable situation in Darfur.

There is no doubt that the ongoing crisis in Darfur has led to a major humanitarian disaster. We along with the rest of the world must band together to bring change to this horrible situation. Next year the world will join together to celebrate the Olympic Games. The Olympic spirit brings together nations and people from all over the world in a spirit of peace. The People's Republic of China as the Olympic host country has a profound responsibility to ensure that spirit of peace will be celebrated throughout the games. However, I am deeply worried that this spirit will be deeply compromised due to China's implicit acquiescence to the atrocities being committed in Darfur.

The People's Republic of China has a deep relationship with Sudan and has substantial economic investment there. China's connection to Sudan, a country that supports the genocide of its own people, is troubling and seriously undermines the spirit of the Olympic Games.

There is no question that China is in a position to help improve the situation in Darfur. As an economic partner to Sudan, China must use all means possible to help bring an end to this genocide. As they seek to host the world, they must show the true extent of their leadership and call for an end to this genocide.

House Resolution 422 rightfully calls on the People's Republic of China to end military and economic assistance to Sudan until Sudan ceases attacking civilians and promotes the humanitarian and peacekeeping efforts going on in Darfur in its own country. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and call on China to fully support the Olympic spirit by calling on Sudan to end the genocide in Darfur.

While I have never seen anything like what I saw in Darfur, the situation is not completely hopeless. The humanitarian assistance the United States is providing is helping millions of people in desperate circumstances. But we must continue to do more and we must urge the international community to join with us to bring an end to the genocide. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in a bipartisan spirit to bring an end to this international crisis.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I now am proud to yield the floor to Mr. GEORGE MILLER from California for 2 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank all of my colleagues who have spoken on this resolution and certainly to BARBARA LEE, my colleague from California, who has been such a not only supporter and the author of this resolution but all of our efforts to change the situation in Darfur.

I had the honor to accompany Congresswoman LEE and our Speaker to Darfur a year ago February and saw the incredible devastation and the brutality and the genocide that is taking place there and vowed to do whatever I can to see if we can change it. I have been wearing this green band to save Darfur for over a year and a half. But this band will not save the people of Darfur, all of my constituents, thousands of my constituents who have marched throughout the Bay area, who have come across the country to march to save Darfur will not save Darfur. What will save Darfur is the nations of the world owing up to their responsibility to reject this genocide, to stop this genocide, to stop this holocaust against these people and get the government of Sudan to do so.

Of course today we are here to call upon the nation of China to owe up to its responsibilities, given its huge influence, its economic influence, its military influence, its resource influence in Sudan, to use that influence to get the government of Sudan to start to sit down and to negotiate with all of the parties to end the arms trade that is taking place, to stop the economic engagement until such time as these people in Darfur are once again made safe, until these people in Darfur are once again allowed to return to their villages, to their families and start to put their lives back together and to end the genocide. That's what is necessary to be done.

My colleague Mr. GOODLATTE referred to the Olympics. It's hard to believe that the world is going to look upon the host of the Olympics and see there at the same time a nation that is underwriting a genocide. That is absolutely on a daily basis by its inaction and then by its positive actions underwriting and allowing the genocide to go forward. It's not that China can stop this alone, but in concert with the rest of the nations of the world that have called out for an end to this genocide, to take actions against the economic activity and the military activity in Sudan.

Congresswoman LEE has pushed the effort of divestiture that has been followed up in many States and cities and universities and other entities. This has got to continue to stop the genocide that now so many of my colleagues have witnessed firsthand on those terrible, terrible visits to Darfur where we see the worst of humanity and the violence against these individuals and their families and their children. It has got to stop. I want to thank my colleagues for bringing this bipartisan resolution to the floor to help us try and end the genocide in Darfur.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 5 minutes.

Mr. TANNER. I am pleased to yield to the author of the resolution our remaining time.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank the gentleman once again for yielding and would like to thank so many of our young people from around the country who have been nonstop in their work to end the genocide. Also, I would like to thank and recognize and salute the faith community, because this has been a movement to save Darfur by young people in the faith community. I would just like to mention a few of the organizations that have been unbelievable and unrelenting in their commitment. The Save Darfur Coalition, and my colleague from California referred to our arm bands, Not on Our Watch, Save Darfur. The Sudan Divestment Task Force. The American Jewish World Service. STAND, which is the Student Anti-Genocide Coalition. Dream for Darfur. Genocide Intervention Network. ENOUGH: The Project to End Genocide and Mass Atrocities. These are examples of the type of organizations at the grassroots level that have been working day and night to help us here in the House of Representatives understand our focus and what we need to do as a country to join hands to end this horrible massacre that is taking place.

I just want to once again thank Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Chairman LANTOS, Mr. TANNER from Tennessee and especially once again Congressman DON PAYNE for beating the drum, oftentime being a lone voice in the wilderness, but making sure that the rest of the world knew that it is incumbent upon the United States Government to lead to end this genocide and to say again to our country, to the world, not on our watch will this take place. And today we are taking one more step closer to bringing the world together to ask China to join with us, as Congressman GEORGE MILLER said, to stop underwriting this genocide that is taking place and to come together now with people and countries of good conscience who stand together to say to General Bashir and the Sudanese government to stop this carnage, to allow the people of Darfur to return home to their villages. They want to go home. They want to go live their lives and raise their children. We want the international forces, the U.N. forces, to go in and to help protect the refugees and to help the AU forces to make sure that people are protected until they can go home. And, of course, finally to find a long-term political solution.

A month ago we called upon the League of Arab Nations to do the same thing. And so it's time that the world stand together and say, no more. It's time that we stand together and say to the people of Darfur that hope is coming and that 450,000 people should not have been tolerated, but we don't want to see another single death occur as a result. China has got to help us do this. And so today we are asking the Chinese government in the spirit of cooperation to help stop this genocide that is taking place.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, Chairman LANTOS and I protested in front of the Sudanese Embassy about the

continuing genocide in Darfur. I'm privileged to say that I've shared jail time with the distinguished gentleman from California.

I also want to thank Congresswoman LEE for her leadership on this issue, and I'm honored to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, others have already described the terrible humanitarian crisis affecting the civilian population of Darfur. Crimes against humanity are committed on a daily basis. President Bush and the Congress have determined the systematic killings and deprivations in Darfur constitute acts of genocide.

These serious matters demand a sustained, multilateral response by the United States and the international community. Together, we must pressure the Government of Sudan to stop the killing, stop the arming and support of proxy militias, and negotiate and implement a just and lasting peace.

Key to the success of such a strategy is the active support of Sudan's major economic and political partners: China, Russia, Malaysia, Egypt and India.

China is Sudan's largest economic partner and its largest provider of military arms and equipment.

China can play a significant, perhaps even decisive, role in ending the genocide in Darfur and convincing Khartoum to negotiate a lasting peace accord.

But will it?

China has taken some steps in the right direction. It supported the deployment of a joint United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force, and recently appointed a special envoy to Darfur.

But rather than condemn the violence against defenseless civilians, China's envoy cited poverty as the reason for Darfur's suffering.

Did poverty displace over two-and-a-half million people into camps, Mr. Speaker?

Did poverty force another half a million to flee the country and live in refugee camps?

I visited some of these camps in eastern Chad, Mr. Speaker. I saw first-hand how the conflict in Darfur is destabilizing Sudan's neighbors.

Did poverty burn Darfur's villages to the ground, poison water wells, rape women, murder men, and leave children to die of hunger and thirst?

No, Mr. Speaker. The regime sitting in Khartoum has orchestrated and condoned these actions.

This resolution asks China to acknowledge this violence and use its influence to stop the death and destruction taking place in Darfur.

To stop selling military arms and equipment to Sudan.

To exercise its considerable economic leverage by suspending its economic ties until Khartoum stops the killing, complies fully with U.N. Security Council resolutions, and enters good faith negotiations to end the fighting in Darfur.

Next year, China will host the 2008 Summer Olympics. It has chosen as its theme for the Games a motto filled with hope: ''One World, One Dream.''

But life in Darfur is no dream, Mr. Speaker. It's an unspeakable nightmare.

China has the ability to change that reality.

It is, as always, Mr. Speaker, a matter of political will.

Is China's so-called dream for the world nothing more than a paper banner carried around by a cute and cuddly mascot?

Or does China genuinely want to play a responsible role in world and human events and help stop the genocide in Darfur?

We are watching, Mr. Speaker.

The world is watching, Mr. Speaker.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 422.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 422, which calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop genocide and violence in Darfur, Sudan. I traveled to Darfur in February 2006. I will never forget what I saw, nor will I relent in my work to end the ongoing genocide.

China, if it chose to, could play a critical role in ending the genocide in Darfur. The President's Special Envoy to Sudan, Andrew S. Natsios, has said that ''China's substantial economic investment in Sudan gives it considerable potential leverage, and we have made clear to Beijing that the international community will expect China to be part of the solution.'' China has a close relationship with the Government of Sudan, economically and militarily. It purchases 70 percent of Sudan's oil. China has agreed to cancel nearly $100 million if Sudan's debt to the country, and it has invested over $10 million in the Sudanese energy sector over the last two decades. China, already the main supplier of arms to Sudan with $83 million exported there in 2005, recently agreed to cooperate more closely militarily ''in every sphere.''

With this resolution we are asking China to acknowledge and condemn the violence taking place in Darfur, Sudan. Additionally, we are calling on China to cease all military arms and equipments sales to Sudan. Finally, we are strongly encouraging China to suspend economic ties to Sudan until the Government of Sudan stops attacking civilians, complies with U.N. Security Council resolutions, and enters into peace negotiations with rebel groups. China has the ability to end the genocide and horror. I hope it chooses to act immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 422, calling on the People's Republic of China to use their influence and economic leverage with the Government of Sudan to stop the genocide and violence in Darfur. I am proud to join a large number of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, in cosponsoring this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we stand in serious risk of allowing the ongoing slaughter in Darfur to become one of the blackest marks on humankind's history. This is absolutely unacceptable. It has been nearly 3 years since we in Congress declared that ''the atrocities unfolding in Darfur, Sudan, are genocide,'' a sentiment that has been repeated only recently by President Bush, who went on to say ''we have a moral obligation to stop it.'' Congress has been outspoken in expressing a bipartisan consensus of disgust at the atrocious human rights abuses committed in the western region of Sudan.

Genocide in Darfur continues to play out on our watch. Current estimates put the death toll at 450,000 people, with an additional two million driven from their homes and livelihoods into wandering uncertainty or refugee camps. More than 3.5 million people within Darfur are currently entirely reliant on the international community for the crucial aid that might enable them to survive.

Some valuable foundations have been laid. The 22,500-strong U.N. peacekeeping mission authorized by United Nations Security Council Resolution 1706 is absolutely necessary to boost the brave but struggling African Union forces already in the region. These U.N. soldiers must be deployed immediately in Sudan, and given unimpeded access to the Darfur region. We must continue to press this issue until U.N. boots are actually on the ground in Darfur.

To do this, we must step up pressure on China. As the principle export destination of Sudanese oil, China is complicit in the genocide perpetrated by the Sudanese government. However, the immense economic and diplomatic weight wielded by the Chinese government could be used to great effect in ending the killing in Darfur, if applied to that end. It remains my hope that China may be persuaded to provide the type of constructive leadership in Sudan befitting a great power.

To this end, this resolution strongly urges China to acknowledge and condemn the atrocities in Darfur, to cease all military arms and related sales, to suspend economic cooperation with the Government of Sudan, and to work to positively influence the Government of Sudan to achieve a number of specific objectives, including the full compliance with Security Council Resolutions.

As China prepares to host the 2008 Summer Olympics, I believe we should expect China to work to live up to its own Olympic slogan: ''One World. One Dream.'' The time for admirable speeches and impassioned rhetoric, valuable though these are, has passed. The people of Darfur need definitive action and decisive leadership, and they need it now. Now is the moment to seize upon bipartisan common ground, and to work together to respond actively, to fulfill our humanitarian promises, and to finally help bring an end to this shameful chapter in human history. This bill is an important, definitive, and imaginative step toward this goal, and I commend my colleague for introducing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, Darfur continues to burn on our watch. Since the genocide began, we have commemorated both the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, and the 10th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide with candles and powerful speeches of regret. We have expressed a bipartisan consensus against the genocide, and yet it continues.

Though we in Congress are currently faced with a number of important and pressing issues vying for our attention, Darfur must be made a priority, and it must remain so until the genocide has ended. I strongly support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 422.

This resolution aims at encouraging the People's Republic of China to use its influence as one of Sudan's chief purchasers of oil to place pressure on the Sudanese government to improve the conditions for the people in the Darfur region and allow humanitarian organizations to enter the region and assist the people of Darfur.

The underlying basis for the conflict in the Darfur region is difficult to define. Some scholars describe it as a conflict between Arab and African cultures, although this is a simplistic

view. Whatever the foundation of the conflict, the Nile Valley region (the area around the Darfur region in Sudan), has had cultural conflicts dating as far back as the fourteenth century.

The current conflict in the Darfur region of Sudan places the Sudanese military and the Janjaweed militia against rebel groups, including the Sudan Liberation Movement and the Justice and Equality Movement. The Sudanese government, while denying its support for the Janjaweed militia, has nonetheless provided funding and weapons to the Janjaweed.

Because of this military conflict, humanitarian aid groups have been unable to reach most parts of the Darfur region. Further, journalists have been prevented from entering the region by the Sudanese government, thus ensuring that many of the atrocities occurring in Darfur go unreported.

U.N. officials have estimated that over 400,000 Darfur residents have died since the conflict began, many due to starvation. Further estimates put the number of residents displaced from their homes at over 2 million.

It is important that the United States look to any means available to quell the atrocious acts occurring in Darfur. As a leading arms dealer to the country of Sudan, The People's Republic of China is uniquely situated to encourage the Sudanese government to accept the decisions of the United Nations with regard to helping the inhabitants of the Darfur region.

As China readies itself for the spotlight on the world stage at the 2008 Beijing Olympics, it is important that China, along with the rest of the world, step up its influence on the Sudanese government and ensure that the atrocities and human rights violations taking place in the Darfur region are put to an end.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in support of ending the genocide and violence in Darfur, Sudan.

For far too long, the international community has paid inadequate attention and devoted insufficient resources to stopping the crisis in Darfur. Although the problems of Sudan lay a long way from our homes, we have learned from the Holocaust in Europe, as well as ethnic cleansing in Yugoslavia and genocide in Rwanda, that an assault on humanity anywhere is an assault on humanity everywhere. We cannot continue to ignore this genocide without diminishing our own humanity.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am committed to bringing security and relief to the people of Darfur. I have led efforts to encourage state, local, and university divestment of funds from companies that conduct business operations in Sudan. And now I join my colleagues in urging China to do the same.

Given its economic interests throughout the region, China has a unique ability to positively influence the Government of Sudan to abandon its genocidal policies and to accept the United Nations' peacekeeping mission. To be accepted as a responsible player at the world's diplomatic table, China must end all military and economic assistance to the government of Sudan until Sudan stops overt and covert support for attacks on civilians and engages in meaningful peace negotiations.

All members of the international community share a moral obligation to end to the human suffering in Darfur. The situation is dire, but I am confident that we can all do our part to help stop this genocide and bring peace and stability to millions of innocent men, woman, and children.

Calling on the People's Republic of China to use its influence to help stop the genocide in Sudan is the right thing to do. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H. Res. 422.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 422, which calls on China to use its leverage with the government of Sudan to end the genocide in Darfur.

The ongoing genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan already is believed to have caused the deaths of almost half a million people. More than 200,000 people have been killed by Sudanese Government forces and armed militias since 2003, and another 200,000 people have died as a result of the deliberate destruction of homes, crops and water supplies and the resulting conditions of famine and disease. Over one-third of the population of Darfur has been displaced, and the United Nations estimated that almost 250,000 people have been displaced in the past 6 months alone, due primarily to government-sponsored militia attacks.

China, unlike most nations in the international community, has cultivated a close relationship with the Government of Sudan. China maintains close military ties with Sudan and purchased almost $2 billion worth of Sudanese oil last year. China also has cancelled $100 million in Sudanese debt and provided an additional $20 million to finance the construction of a presidential palace in the capital city. As a result, China is in a unique position to put pressure on the Government of Sudan to stop the violence in Darfur. So far, it has failed or refused to do so.

This resolution urges China to acknowledge and condemn the atrocities in Darfur, cease all weapons sales to Sudan, and suspend economic cooperation with Sudan. The resolution also urges China to use its leverage to influence the Government of Sudan to: comply with United Nations Security Council Resolutions providing for disarmament of militias in Darfur and deployment of a full-scale peacekeeping force; participate in peace negotiations to secure a legitimate peace agreement between all parties; and improve working conditions for humanitarian organizations operating in Sudan and ensure they have access to the 2.5 million people displaced by this genocide.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I urge China to join with the international community and take a stand against genocide in Darfur.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 422, which calls upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop the genocide in Darfur.

The violence in Darfur grows more gruesome by the day. I led the first congressional delegation to Darfur in 2004 with Senator SAM BROWNBACK, and I have personally witnessed the nightmare there with my own eyes. Every day that passes, more men are killed, more women are raped, and more children die of malnutrition. This is simply unacceptable.

The people in Darfur have lost their homes, their livelihoods, their loved ones. They have seen unspeakable horrors, carried out by the genocidal National Islamic Front in Khartoum and their cruel compatriots, the Janjaweed militia.

The U.S. and the international community have made strong efforts to halt the violence in Darfur, and have provided significant levels of humanitarian support to the victims of this genocide. However, these efforts have largely failed to stop the NIF's desire to complete their campaign in Darfur.

The Chinese Government's destructive role in the region is partly to blame for the continuing violence in Darfur. A recent Amnesty International report showed that China is making the conflict worse by providing weapons to the Sudanese Government to carry out the genocide in Darfur.

When President Hu visited Khartoum in February, instead of using his influence to persuade Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir to stop the violence in Darfur, he promised to build Bashir a brand new palace.

When President Hu appointed a new special envoy to Darfur, the envoy came back from the region claiming that the ''final solution'' for Darfur lies with removing ''mistrust'' between the Sudanese Government and the United States. He said the violence in Darfur is limited to sporadic conflicts along the border with Chad.

China has used its veto power on the U.N. Security Council to repeatedly obstruct efforts by the U.S. and the U.K. to introduce peacekeepers to curtail the slaughter. Beijing is uniquely positioned to put a stop to the slaughter, yet they have so far been unabashed in their refusal to do so.

China, which is a major business partner of Sudan, should be using its influence with the Sudanese Government to bring an end to the violence in Darfur. China's role in extracting oil from Sudan and maintaining close business relations with this genocidal regime are clearly more important to the Chinese Government than saving human lives.

This resolution calls on the Chinese Government to use its influence to stop the violence in Darfur. It urges China to push the Sudanese Government to accept a hybrid peacekeeping force, to disarm the Janjaweed militia, and to join the international community in imposing economic sanctions on Sudan if the government continues to support attacks on civilians.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution. A critical part of our efforts on Darfur is pressing the Chinese Government to stop supporting the genocide there. China must begin playing a constructive role in the region.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 422 to call on the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to halt the ongoing genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan.

As hundreds of thousands have died at the hands of government-backed militias in Darfur, China, and Sudan have cultivated a mutually beneficial relationship that provides crucial energy resources to China in return for thwarting international efforts to sanction the Khartoum government and deploy a United Nations peacekeeping force in Darfur.

China and Sudan have extensive economic, political, and military ties. China is Sudan's largest foreign investor and purchases two-thirds of Sudanese oil exports. China has sold arms to the Sudanese military and in February cancelled $80 million in Sudanese debt.

While it can do much more, China has taken some steps to alleviate the suffering in Darfur. Last November, China helped negotiate the agreement at Addis Abba which called for the deployment of a joint United Nations/African Union peacekeeping force. In May, China appointed a Special Envoy to Sudan and pledged $5.1 million in humanitarian aid to Darfur. Yet these positive steps are far outweighed by China's continuing support for the genocidal regime in Khartoum.

Unless China acts to pressure the Khartoum government into accepting a U.N. peacekeeping force, China risks having the 2008 Beijing Olympics forever known as the genocide Olympics. China must condemn the violence taking place in Darfur, halt all military arms sales to Sudan, and suspend economic ties to Sudan until the Government of Sudan stops attacking civilians, complies with U.N. Security Council resolutions, and enters into peace negotiations with rebel groups.

As China rises as a power in the 21st century, it must realize that with its increased power comes a greater responsibility to take action to stop genocide.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for H. Res. 422, which calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop the genocide and violence in Darfur.

The world must be united in its call for an end to genocide. As China seeks to enter onto the world stage as a global economic and diplomatic power, the government must assume the responsibility, as well as the benefits that accompany this distinction.

China must use its close economic and military ties and advise the Sudanese government that genocide is very bad for business. Congress and the world are watching. It is imperative that China uses its power in a responsible manner and help bring a change to this troubled region.

Mr. TANNER. 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. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 422.

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. TANNER. 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.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN TO RELEASE DR. HALEH ESFANDIARI

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 430) calling on the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to immediately release Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 430

Whereas Haleh Esfandiari, Ph.D., holds dual citizenship in the United States and Iran;

Whereas Dr. Esfandiari taught Persian language and literature for many years at Princeton University, where she inspired untold numbers of students to study the rich Persian language and culture;

Whereas Dr. Esfandiari is a resident of the State of Maryland and the Director of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, D.C. (referred to in this preamble as the ''Wilson Center'');

Whereas, for the past decade, Dr. Esfandiari has traveled to Iran twice a year to visit her ailing now-93-year-old mother;

Whereas, in December 2006, on her return to the airport during her last visit to Iran, Dr. Esfandiari was robbed by three masked, knife-wielding men, who stole her travel documents, luggage, and other effects;

Whereas, when Dr. Esfandiari attempted to obtain replacement travel documents in Iran, she was summoned to an interview by Iran's Ministry of Intelligence;

Whereas Dr. Esfandiari was interrogated by the Ministry of Intelligence for seven to eight hours per day;

Whereas the questioning by the Ministry of Intelligence focused on the Middle East Program at the Wilson Center;

Whereas Dr. Esfandiari answered all questions to the best of her ability, and the Wilson Center also provided extensive information to the Ministry in a good faith effort to aid Dr. Esfandiari;

Whereas Lee Hamilton, former United States Representative and president of the Wilson Center, has written to Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to call his attention to Dr. Esfandiari's dire situation;

Whereas Mr. Hamilton repeated that the Wilson Center's mission is to provide forums to exchange views and opinions and not to take positions on issues, nor try to influence specific outcomes;

Whereas the lengthy interrogations of Dr. Esfandiari by the Ministry of Intelligence of Iran stopped on February 14, 2007, but she heard nothing for ten weeks and was denied her passport;

Whereas, on May 7, 2007, Dr. Esfandiari was summoned to the Ministry of Intelligence and taken immediately to Evin prison, where she was arrested and is currently being held;

Whereas Iran's Intelligence Ministry has implicated Dr. Esfandiari and the Wilson Center in advancing what it alleges is the United States Government's aim of a ''soft revolution'' in Iran;

Whereas Parnaz Azima holds dual citizenship in the United States and Iran;

Whereas Ms. Azima is a journalist for Radio Farda;

Whereas the Iranian Government confiscated the passport of Ms. Azima when she arrived in Iran to visit her ill mother in January of 2007;

Whereas the Iranian authorities have interrogated Ms. Azima on multiple occasions;

Whereas Ms. Azima's attorney was told in April 2007 that she would be detained in Iran for at least two years or more;

Whereas social scientist Kian Tajbakhsh was arrested in mid-May by Iranian security officials while consulting for the Open Society Institute, which runs humanitarian programs in Iran;

Whereas Mr. Tajbakhsh holds dual citizenship in the United States and Iran;

Whereas Mr. Tajbakhsh was retained by the Open Society Institute as a consultant to facilitate public health, humanitarian assistance, and urban planning projects that were undertaken openly and with the knowledge of the Iranian Government;

Whereas on May 31, 2007, a State Department spokesman announced that California businessman Ali Shakeri, who holds dual citizenship in the United States and Iran, had been arrested approximately ten days earlier;

Whereas Mr. Shakeri serves on the board of University of California at Irvine's Center for Citizen Peacebuilding, a research institution that seeks to promote reconciliation and sustainable peace in areas of international conflict;

Whereas Mr. Shakeri's arrest occurred as he sought to leave the country after having visited his ill mother, who passed away during his stay;

Whereas reports indicate that a fifth dual American-Iranian citizen, who has thus far remained anonymous, has also been imprisoned unjustly by Iranian authorities;

Whereas the Iranian Government has yet to produce evidence of wrongdoing by any of these individuals to justify its actions toward them; and

Whereas Dr. Esfandiari, Ms. Azima, and Mr. Tajbakhsh have been charged with espionage and, if convicted, face execution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Iran should immediately and unconditionally release dual Iranian-American citizens Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, Ms. Parnaz Azima, Mr. Kian Tajbakhsh, Mr. Ali Shakeri, and a fifth unnamed individual also being detained against his will, replace their lost travel documents, cease its tactics of harassment, and permit them to leave Iran.

Amend the title so as to read: A resolution ''calling for Iran to immediately release five dual Iranian-American citizens currently being held unjustly.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANNER. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a few short months ago, a remarkably accomplished Iranian American woman, Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, made a decision that any of us would make under a similar circumstance. Her 93-year-old mother was failing and she needed to visit her in Tehran without delay. She boarded a flight to Iran, completely unsuspecting of what would unfold.

After a visit with her ailing mother, Dr. Esfandiari reached the Tehran airport. As one of the leading Middle East scholars in the United States at the highly respected Woodrow Wilson Institute, she had no reason to believe she was about to encounter trouble. But on

her way to the airport, she was attacked by plain-clothed, knife-wielding thugs and her passport was stolen.

This was only the beginning of her nightmare. Iranian authorities refused to grant her a new passport. She was interrogated and put under house arrest. She was told she would not return to the United States. And the ordeal grew worse. Dr. Esfandiari, a slender woman of 67 years, has been detained without just cause ever since, under the outlandish pretense of being an enemy of Iran. And, ominously, late last month she was formally charged with espionage.

She now sits in Iran's notorious Evin Prison. She has been allowed to make but a few painfully brief phone calls to her family. She has been interrogated at excruciating length. At the height of absurdity, she has been pressured to acknowledge participation in some kind of alleged coup against the Iranian government. This type of effort at forced confession is beyond absurd. It goes to the heart of the injustice of the Iranian regime.

Despite quiet initiatives of diplomacy undertaken by many countries, organizations, and individuals on Dr. Esfandiari's behalf and frustrated by her audacious commitment to the truth, the Iranian security services have done what they know best, and that is arrest without cause.

In discussing Dr. Esfandiari's case, news articles have also cited at least four other cases of dual Iranian American citizens deplorably being detained in Iran for no justifiable reason. It is particularly worrisome that two of these detainees, like Dr. Esfandiari, have now been charged with espionage.

□ 1645

Oddly enough, what all of these five seem to have in common is a commitment to U.S.-Iranian engagement. The government of Iran has unjustly detained five American citizens without due legal process. And Mr. VAN HOLLEN's resolution today aptly expresses the serious concern we have on their behalf and our justifiable demand that they be released without delay. These outrageous arrests are indicative of the blatant excesses and obvious shortcomings of the Iranian political system, too much tyranny and too little rule of law. This is a matter of basic human rights, and we cannot allow the Iranian government to continue trampling on the fundamental liberties of our citizens in this manner.

Ten Iranian parliamentarians have recently formed a Parliamentarian American friendship group. I call on these parliamentarians and all Iranians of good will, all people of good will, to use whatever influence they have to help bring about the immediate release of all American citizens in Iran who are held so unjustly and against their will.

I commend my friend and colleague from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for introducing this important measure.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 430, which decries the unlawful imprisonment of dual U.S.-Iranian citizens by the regime in Tehran. As this resolution illustrates, Iranian intelligence officials have unlawfully detained, interrogated and imprisoned numerous dual U.S.-Iranian citizens, in particular Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, who works for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

The Iranian government incarcerated Dr. Esfandiari in Evin Prison in Tehran on May 9 of this year. However, as I noted, this is not an isolated incident by any means. The Iranian government also confiscated the passport of Radio Farda journalist Parnaz Azima, an American citizen, when she arrived in Iran to visit her ill mother in January earlier this year.

Iranian government officials have interrogated Ms. Azima and pressured her to collaborate with Iranian intelligence. Iran has also imprisoned a consultant for the Open Society Institute and a fourth American citizen who has chosen to remain anonymous and who has been unlawfully detained in Iran for 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot stand. The Iranian government's recent actions are particularly egregious in light of that regime's past involvement in the killing of Americans and its past incitement and support of the taking of 66 American citizens hostages at the U.S. embassy in Tehran on February 4, 1979, with 52 of those Americans held in captivity for 444 days.

In response, we must remain resolute in our condemnation of the Iranian regime for detaining innocent American citizens for political purposes and demand that the Iranian regime immediately and unconditionally permit all American citizens detained in Iran against their will to leave.

These threatening actions by the Iranian regime come amidst Tehran's ongoing support for Islamic militants in Iraq that are killing Iraqis and Americans alike, its arming and support for Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza and its continued pursuit of nuclear capability in contempt of international demands that it suspend its enrichment activities. I therefore believe that the United States should suspend all contact with any agent, instrumentality or representative of the Iranian regime until Americans held hostage by Iran are released and other issues critical to the United States are addressed.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the author of the resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) for his leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee and for our national security interests around the world, and I thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. LANTOS, and the ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for their bipartisan support in sending a strong message to the government of Iran that their actions are absolutely unacceptable and to pass this legislation to immediately and unconditionally release the Americans of Iranian descent that are being held by the government of Iran.

It was on May 30 of 2007, just a few weeks ago, the day after Washington and Tehran held their high profile talks with respect to Iraq that Iran turned around and charged three Iranian Americans, one academic, Haleh Esfandiari, a social scientist, Kian Tajbakhsh, and a journalist, Parnaz Azima, with spying, a charge which under Iran's Islamic law is punishable by death.

These trumped up charges are absolutely ridiculous. Haleh Esfandiari is a constituent of mine. She lives in Bethesda, Maryland. She is a 67-year-old Director of the Middle East program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Kian Tajbakhsh is a respected social scientist who is consulted by George Soros' Open Society Institute at the World Bank, and Parnaz Azima is a Radio Farda journalist.

The government of Iran accused these Iranian Americans of endangering state security and fomenting a, quote, soft revolution. These are ridiculous charges under any circumstances and clearly an excuse by Iran to once again take action in violation of international law.

Just to emphasize the point, Ms. Esfandiari is someone who has invited scholars and statesmen from Iran to the United States to conferences and events and has even been criticized by some members of the Iranian American community for being too soft on the current regime in Tehran. Mr. Tajbakhsh has consulted directly for the Iranian government and, working with the Open Society Institute, helped run its humanitarian health outreach program in Iran with full cooperation of the Iranian government.

The lists of foreign detainees doesn't stop there. Iranian American businessman Ali Shakeri, who is on the board of the University of California at Irvine's Center for Citizen Peacebuilding, was arrested on May 8 as he returned to the United States from visiting his ill mother, who died during his stay.

These detainees have dedicated their lives to building bridges between the Americans and the people of Iran. Their presence in Iran to visit their parents or to conduct humanitarian work poses absolutely no threat to the people or the government of Iran.

Their detention is a gross perversion of the rule of law. And the claim that

the Iranian government has made that they seek dialogue and improved relations with the West is belied by the actions they have taken with respect to these individuals.

So we call today upon the Iranian government to do as they say they want to do, which is to have a better relationship with the United States and the people of the United States and to immediately, unconditionally release these Americans.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 430.

This resolution calls on the government of Iran to release Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, who is being held captive in Evin prison, despite the Ministry of Intelligence offering no evidence of wrongdoing.

Dr. Esfandiari is a respected member of academia, holding the position of director of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars, having previously taught Persian language and literature at Princeton University.

While visiting her ailing 93-year-old mother in Iran, Dr. Esfandiari was held up at knifepoint; her travel documents and luggage were taken in the process. It was while attempting to procure subsequent documents that Dr. Esfandiari was taken into custody by the Ministry of Intelligence in Iran.

Dr. Esfandiari is not the only American taken prisoner in Iran under the guise of being a ''spy.'' With U.S. and Iranian diplomatic relations resuming again after 25 years, it is important that the United States remain vigilant in opposing these unconscionable tactics employed by the Iranian Government toward United States citizens abroad.

This resolution is a strong first step in standing up for the safety of all American citizens traveling abroad. No American should ever be deprived of their liberty simply because they crossed the safe haven of U.S. borders.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the H.R. 430, introduced by my esteemed colleague Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland, calling for the immediate and unconditional release of dual Iranian-American citizens Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, Ms. Parnaz Azima, and a third unnamed individual also being detained against her will. Mr. Speaker, these three Americans have been unjustly incarcerated without due legal process. They have had their travel documents stolen, and they have been subjected to tactics of harassment. I strongly support this legislation, which expresses the serious concerns we have for these three individuals, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, one of the detained individuals, is head of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars and widely recognized as one of Washington's top experts on Iran. Dr. Esfandiari was robbed of her passport upon her arrival at Tehran airport in December of last year when she went to visit her ailing, 93-year old mother. After being refused new documents, she was interrogated at excruciating length by Iranian intelligence, and pressured to make forced confessions that would falsely implicate herself and the Wilson Center in trying to launch a full-fledged coup in Iran. She consistently refused to tarnish her good name or the reputations of her colleagues.

Dr. Esfandiari was arrested on May 7th, and has been incarcerated, despite numerous efforts by countries, organizations, and individuals on her behalf. She faces ludicrous charges of seeking to launch a one-woman coup against the Iranian government. The United States government has called for her immediate release.

Unfortunately, Dr. Esfandiari is only one of a number of American citizens who have recently been detained in Iran without adequate legal grounds. Another case involved a journalist for Radio Farda, who was courageously involved in the effort to bring free and open media to the Iranian people. These outrageous arrests are indicative of the Iranian political system, including the concentration of power and the lack of rule of law.

Another American missing in Iran, former FBI agent Robert Levinson, disappeared after flying to Iran's Kish Island in March. I call on the Iranian government to use all the powers at its disposal to locate Mr. Levinson, if it has not already done so, and to repatriate him.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an issue of basic human rights. We as a Congress, and we as a nation, cannot allow the Iranian government to continue trampling on the fundamental liberties of our citizens in this manner. Therefore, I rise in strong support of this resolution, calling for the unconditional release of these three American citizens unjustly being held in Iranian prisons, and I call upon all of my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 430, which calls on the Islamic Republic of Iran to immediately release Dr. Haleh Esfandiari.

Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, a highly respected member of the Washington, DC and Maryland communities, is currently serving as the Director of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. In December, she traveled to Iran to visit her ailing mother, something that she has done countless times before. On her return to the airport, her travel documents and personal effects were taken from her. When she attempted to obtain replacement travel documents in Iran, she was instead subjected to days upon days of interrogation and essentially placed under house arrest for several months.

Last month, Dr. Esfandiari was summoned by the government and was taken to the infamous Evin prison, where she is currently being held. She has been accused by the Iranian Intelligence Ministry of trying to set up networks of Iranians to start a revolution to bring down the government. In fact, she has long advocated for building bridges between the United States and the Middle East

Iran's imprisonment of Dr. Esfandiari is entirely baseless and shows a disregard for the rule of law as well as the Iranian government's continued claim that they would like to gain the world's respect. We must demand Dr. Esfandiari and all other Americans that are being held without just cause be released by the Iranian government.

I urge all my colleagues to join us in support of this important resolution.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on December 30, 2006, Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, a prominent Iranian-American scholar, was in Iran to visit her sick 93-year-old mother when she was stopped by the Iranian authorities.

What followed was nearly 5 months of a series of intense interrogations and pressure tactics where she was harassed, threatened, and forced to make false statements against her employer, the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars. On May 8, she was again detained and imprisoned.

Her arrest and detention has angered analysts, human rights groups and lawmakers throughout the world. Yet still, the Iranian regime refuses to release her, claiming she is a spy who was plotting to overthrow the Iranian government.

I would like to submit a statement issued from the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars on May 21, 2007 for the record.

Mr. Speaker, these charges are a farce. Professor Esfandiari is an accomplished scholar of Persian literature, language and history who taught at Princeton University before becoming the Director of the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars Middle East Program. Her husband, Mr. Shaul Bakhash, is a professor at George Mason University of Fairfax, VA. The Woodrow Wilson Center is a non-profit, non-partisan organization whose work is to research and foster dialogue within the scholarly world on current and future public policy issues.

Dr. Esfandiari's tireless dedication to teaching and advocating on behalf of Iran is clear. She has focused on building bridges and opening doors for peace in the Middle East. She has sought to facilitate and strengthen Iranian-American relations through numerous seminars, lectures and workshops with educators, policymakers and groups from both countries and has pressed wider freedoms to communicate about our common bonds and negotiate over our disagreements.

Like thousands of other Iranians living abroad, Professor Esfandiari is an academic who took a personal trip to see her family. If she as one individual scholar threatens this regime so much that they have to interrogate her for almost five months and detain her in a notorious prison cell known for human rights abuses, then one has to assume this regime is desperate to retain whatever control it can.

Today, the Iranian leadership's lack of courage and conscience is as clear as it is disappointing.

It is evident that this regime is criminalizing scholarly work of any kind, despite the fact that Iran's very own history is filled with centuries of scholarly research and discovery. This regime's egregious decision to imprison Dr. Esfandiari reflects a deepening departure from the values and ideals the Iranian people have historically prided themselves on.

Iran's renowned nationalist Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh once said ''There is no better way to govern Iran than democracy and social justice!''

Professor Esfandiari should be released immediately. Every day she is so unjustly detained, Iran proves the case of its detractors and makes it all the more difficult for institutions like Dr. Esfandiari's Wilson Center to treat the Iranian people with the respect that should be afforded to ah historic civilization and citizenship of 70 million people.

STATEMENT ON THE ARREST IN TEHRAN OF ESFANDIARI, DIRECTOR OF THE WOODROW WILSON CENTER'S MIDDLE EAST PROGRAM

Haleh Esfandiari, director of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and a dual Iranian-American national, was arrested in

Tehran on May 8 and incarcerated in the Evin Prison.

The background to this entirely unjustified arrest is as follows. Timeline of events:

December 21, 2006, Haleh Esfandiari, director of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and a dual Iranian-American national, traveled from Washington D.C. to Tehran, Iran to visit her 93-year-old mother for one week.

On December 30, 2006, on her way to the airport to catch a flight back to Washington, the taxi in which Dr. Esfandiari was riding was stopped by three masked, knife-wielding men. They threatened to kill her, and they took away all of her belongings, including her Iranian and American passports.

On January 3, when applying for replacement Iranian travel documents at the passport office, Dr. Esfandiari was invited to an ''interview'' by a man from Iran's Ministry of Intelligence.

Beginning on January 4, she was subjected to a series of interrogations that stretched out over the next six weeks, sometimes continuing for as many as four days a week, and sometimes stretching across seven and eight hours in a single day. Dr. Esfandiari went home every evening, but the interrogations were unpleasant and not free from intimidation and threat.

The questioning focused almost entirely on the activities and programs of the Middle East Program at the Wilson Center. Dr. Esfandiari answered all questions fully; when she could not remember details of programs stretching back five and even eight years, the staff at the Wilson Center provided her all the information requested. As a public organization, all Wilson Center activities are on the public record. Repeatedly during the interrogation, she was pressured to make a false confession or to falsely implicate the Wilson Center in activities in which it had no part, but she refused.

On Friday, January 15, in the third week of interrogations, Dr. Esfandiari was told (misleadingly as it turned out) the questioning was over. On January 18, the interrogator and three other men showed up at Dr. Esfandiari's mother's apartment. Dr. Esfandiari was taking a nap and was startled to wake up and see the door to her bedroom open, her privacy violated, and three strange men, one of them wielding a video-camera, staring into her bedroom.

On February 14, the lengthy interrogations stopped.

On February 17, Haleh received one threatening phone call, and then she did not hear anything from her interrogators for ten weeks.

On February 20, Lee Hamilton, president and director of the Wilson Center, wrote to Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad asking that Dr. Esfandiari be allowed to travel. However, President Ahmadinejad did not reply to the letter.

At the end of April or early May, she was telephoned once again and invited to ''cooperate.'' In effect, she was being asked to make a confession. She refused to make the false statements.

On Monday, May 7 she was summoned to the Ministry of Intelligence once again. When she arrived for her appointment on Tuesday morning, May 8th, she was put into a car and taken to Evin prison. She was incarcerated and was allowed only one phone call to her mother.

On May 9 she called her mother asking her to bring her clean clothes and her medicine. Her mother delivered the small package at Evin Prison on May 10, but was not allowed to see her.

On May 12, the hard-line daily ''Kayhan'' in an article accused Dr. Esfandiari of working with the U.S. and Israeli governments and with involvement in efforts to topple Iran's Islamic regime.

On May 15, Iranian judiciary spokesman Ali Reza Jamshidi said that Dr. Esfandiari was being investigated for crimes against national security and that her case was being handled by the Intelligence Ministry.

On May 15, Haleh made a brief telephone call to her mother.

On May 16, Haleh's family retained the legal services of Nobel Peace Laureate Shirin Ebadi to represent her.

On May 17, in an interview with Washington Post Staff Writer Robin Wright, Shirin Ebadi indicated that the Iranian government has rejected her request to represent Dr. Esfandiari. She also noted the court refused information on the legal charges against Dr. Esfandiari, and denied her legal team the ability to see Haleh.

On May 21 state-run television broadcasts in Iran indicated that Haleh is being charged with seeking to topple the government of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Our efforts to obtain Haleh's release will continue and will be redoubled. She will be in our thoughts and prayers every day.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 430, 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. TANNER. 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.

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 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1802

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROSS) at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 451.

QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 452) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 452

Whereas, clause one of House rule XXIII (Code of Official Conduct) states, ''A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall conduct himself at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House.'';

Whereas, on June 4, 2007, the United States Department of Justice filed an indictment by a grand jury against the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable William J. Jefferson, in the United States Court for the Eastern District of Virginia;

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment of Representative Jefferson, the grand jury specifies sixteen counts, including but not limited to Solicitation of Bribes by a Public Official, Violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, Money Laundering, Obstruction of Justice and Racketeering;

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment, the grand jury alleges that Representative Jefferson did knowingly engage in an unlawful conspiracy ''to provide for the unjust enrichment of Defendant Jefferson and his family members by corruptly seeking, soliciting, and directing that things of value be paid to him and his family members in return for Defendant Jefferson's performance of official acts'';

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment, the grand jury further alleges that ''Defendant sought to and did conceal his and his family members' expected or actual receipt of things of value by directing congressional staff members, family members, and others to form nominee companies that entered into business agreements to receive things of value sought by Defendant Jefferson while not referencing him or disclosing his involvement in obtaining the agreements'';

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment, the grand jury further alleges that ''Defendant Jefferson failed to disclose his and his family's financial interests in these business ventures by omitting this material information from travel and financial disclosure forms required to be filed by the Rules of the House of Representatives and, in some cases, by failing to make any of the required filings'';

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment, the grand jury further alleges that ''On or about July 30, 2005, in Arlington, Virginia, Defendant Jefferson received $100,000 in cash from [cooperating witness]'' for use in an illegal bribery scheme;

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment, the grand jury further alleges that ''On or before August 3, 2005, at his residence in Washington, DC, Defendant Jefferson secreted in his freezer $90,000 of the $100,000 in cash provided by [cooperating witness] as part of the front-end bribe to Nigerian Official A, which was separated into $10,000 increments, wrapped in aluminum foil, and concealed inside various frozen food containers'';

Whereas, on February 27, 2007 the House Democratic Caucus unanimously approved the recommendation of House Democratic leaders that Representative Jefferson be elected to the Committee on Homeland Security, a position in which he would have had access to highly sensitive Top Secret information concerning national security matters;

Whereas, on June 5, 2007 Representative Jefferson resigned from the Committee on Small Business to which he was elected by vote of the House on January 23, 2007;

Whereas, the Constitution of the United States authorizes the House of Representatives to ''determine the rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member'';

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is charged with enforcing the Code of Official Conduct and related rules of the House governing the Conduct of Members and staff;

Whereas, during the 109th Congress, on May 17, 2006 the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct issued a public statement which noted, ''[t]he Committee has voted to establish an investigative subcommittee to conduct an inquiry regarding Representative William J. Jefferson'';

Whereas, absent any subsequent public statements by the committee concerning Representative Jefferson and in light of press accounts describing the Jefferson inquiry as ''halted'' and ''stalled'' it is essential that the House act to ensure that appropriate and timely action is taken to complete the Jefferson inquiry and protect the integrity of the House;

Whereas, clause 5(a)(4)(A) of House rule X states, ''At the beginning of a Congress, the Speaker or his designee and the Minority Leader or his designee each shall name 10 Members, Delegates or the Resident Commissioner from his respective party who are not members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to be available to serve on investigative subcommittees of that committee during that Congress. The names of Members, Delegates or the Resident Commissioner so named shall be announced to the House.''

Whereas, Republican Leader Boehner, having chosen ten Republican Members for the ethics pool for the 110th Congress earlier this year and Speaker Pelosi only having named the Democrat Members of the pool earlier today: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is directed to investigate without further delay alleged illegal conduct and violations of House rules by Representative William J. Jefferson and report its findings and recommendations to the House, including a recommendation regarding whether Representative Jefferson should be expelled from the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of privilege.

Under rule IX, the minority leader and the majority leader or his designee each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, will instruct the Ethics Committee to review the serious allegations and evidence against the gentleman from Louisiana and report back to the House whether the gentleman should be expelled for conduct that brings dishonor on this institution.

This resolution is not intended to cast innocence or guilt on the gentleman from Louisiana. It is intended to ensure that the Ethics Committee process, a process that all the Members of this House want to see work fairly and honestly, begin its deliberations of this issue.

This Ethics Committee last year, over a period of approximately 6 months, was looking into this matter, but as of today there has not been a subcommittee established to look at the facts of this case. The Republican pool was announced several months ago, and we have been waiting for the majority party to put their pool members onto the Ethics Committee so, in fact, this investigation could continue. And it is somewhat of a sad state that these members weren't announced until today and it took the indictment of Mr. JEFFERSON for the majority to outline to the House who the members will be that will make up their pool.

But the point I make is that all of us have been through a very difficult period in this House, and I think that I have made clear to my colleagues on the minority side of the House that I intend to hold our colleagues to a higher standard. And when we talk about the standard here, we all know that bringing honor on this House is a standard that all of us attempt to meet and make sure that there is no dishonor brought. And we are not talking here about a standard that is very different from that of a criminal plea or a criminal indictment. We are talking about behavior that brings dishonor on this institution.

So I believe that the Ethics Committee can, in fact, do its work. I think they can do it efficiently. And the purpose of this resolution is to ensure that the House speaks to our Ethics Committee to make sure that it is doing its job in resolving this case as soon as possible.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this resolution, and I agree with the minority leader. The allegations that have been made are extraordinarily serious. They, if proven true, should lead to the expulsion of the Member in question. They, of course, have not been proved true. They are allegations.

Having said that, I also intend to and have called for a resolution to be considered tonight under suspension. That resolution speaks not only to the Jefferson case, to which the gentleman from Ohio limits his privileged resolution, but also speaks to any allegations of serious criminal conduct that may be made either through indictment or other charging documents; and it calls for action by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in any and all of those cases.

We appreciate the sensitivity of the minority leader to this issue at this time. It is, frankly, the first time I recall such a resolution being offered by the minority. For over a year, the Ethics Committee essentially didn't act, didn't operate. In fact, when it did and it held the former majority leader as having adversely affected the ethics of the House, the chairman was summarily removed from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; and, in fact, two of the members that had the temerity to vote to have a consequence for actions that reflected on the House were removed from that committee.

But I welcome the minority leader and the minority party's interest in pursuing this matter. I presume that the gentleman's resolution will pass unanimously. I also hope that the suspension resolution will also pass unanimously because there are, of course, unfortunately, a number of allegations being made publicly about Members of this House; and irrespective of what party they may fall into or be members of, it is critically important for us to hold accountable those Members and to assure the American public that the Ethics Committee is looking at those allegations, investigating those allegations, and making reports not only to the House of Representatives but to the people.

□ 1815

We swear an oath to not only defend the Constitution, but to uphold the laws of our land. As Members of this House, we have an absolute obligation to conduct ourselves in a way that does not violate the standards of official conduct or bring into disrepute the House of Representatives. Hopefully, we will agree on that proposition.

So I say to my Republican friends, we welcome them to this focus on holding accountable Members who violate the trust of the American public. We certainly intend to support it. I hope they will support the subsequently offered resolution, which says that in every case we will pursue this focus.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's support of our efforts, and in support of the Ethics Committee taking up this case and moving as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that the gentleman refers to has been shown to us just moments ago. The gentleman, the majority leader, is well aware that legislation does not come to the floor without the cooperation of both sides. And to have seen this bill just moments ago strikes me as something that we never, ever, ever would have considered doing on the floor of the House without clear consultation and advisement of the minority. And so, I will look at the bill. I'm not quite sure what it says because, again, we have just received it moments ago.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would yield to the gentleman from Missouri, the minority whip, for as much time as he may consume.

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

I am pleased that the body will move forward this evening to approve this resolution that the Republican leaders offered.

The majority leader indicated in the last Congress that the Ethics Committee didn't meet for a year. I think

that is because the Members of the minority at that time, now the majority, wouldn't meet for a year. And now we are in the sixth month of this Congress, and only today is there a group of Members made available by the majority to choose a panel from to investigate this case. Now, maybe that was just an accident. Maybe that's just starting a new majority. Maybe that's not remembering that this investigation was stopped at the end of the last Congress and couldn't start in this Congress unless there was a new panel put in place. Those of us in the minority, I suppose, have less to worry about, so we put our panel of Members out immediately at the beginning of Congress, as we have in the past. We put our panel out there immediately. And now, in June, the sixth month of the Congress, the majority makes Members available suddenly to investigate this case as if it just occurred today, or as if we were just aware of it today. That is almost too big a coincidence to overlook.

We are going to start looking at this case. I am pleased that our friends on the other side are going to join us in that effort. This case has been known to Members of Congress for some time now. It rises to a level of accusations and an indictment that has seldom been met in the history of the Congress. A 94-page indictment that alleges conspiracies on this and at least one other continent that could result in 230 something years of prison time if the Member is found guilty.

Mr. Speaker, even if all of those things did not turn out to produce guilt at the end of this pathway, the standards that have been referred to here on the floor are clearly standards that the Ethics Committee should have been looking at. Those standards that violate the official conduct of the House, you don't have to necessarily have violated a law to violate those standards. You certainly don't have to have violated a law to have brought disrepute on the House, or whatever language is used in the code of conduct we attempt to hold each other to.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I think it's high time that we did start this investigation. I think it is unfortunate that we had the time this entire Congress where nothing has been done to look at this case. And because of that, I hope that we not only ask the Ethics Committee to look at the case, but do everything we can to encourage them to not decide necessarily the legal matters, they will be decided somewhere else, but to decide whether or not this Member has violated the ethical code of the House; and if that is the case, what should the action of the House be in the future.

So not only do I stand as the majority leader just did to join the Republican leader in supporting this resolution, but also in encouraging all of our Members to.

Mr. Speaker, if my friend has a quick response, I would be glad to just yield 1 minute to him for that purpose.

Mr. HOYER. I can do it shorter than that. I just wanted to make one point, because I checked.

The important issue is going forward. We agree with that. We can argue about what happened in the past, we certainly have our perspective. Your panel was named last month, not at the beginning of the session, not in January or February or March or April, but last month. So we need to move forward on this, and we are going to. We are going to support this resolution.

I welcome your support of the suspension resolution, which will ensure that in these kinds of cases, that we go forward in every instance as we are going forward today.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time back to the gentleman from Ohio. I think that our panel was available before that, but he is the one that would know more about the specifics of that than I do.

I do know that going forward is important. And in fact, if we could set a standard of moving forward we would probably all be better off, but it is awfully hard in any political environment to not keep looking backwards.

We do need to move forward. We need a resolution of this. And it doesn't have to go hand in hand with the resolution of legal matters, it needs to go hand in hand with the code of conduct of the House and what happens there.

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

The gentleman referred to when our panel members were named, which was on May 1. The gentleman should be aware that our panel was picked and members had agreed to serve on the panel by the end of January of this year. We held the list, trying to work with our colleagues in the majority so that the panels on both sides could be named as soon as possible. And finally, right before Easter, we filed our 10 panel names and they were certified. That occurred on May 1. I am sorry that it is a fact that your panel members were not named until today, and not until after the indictment of a sitting Member.

So the fact that almost 6 months have gone by in this Congress without any work on the part of the Ethics Committee with regard to Mr. JEFFERSON's case I think is a sad record.

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

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

Mr. BOEHNER. I am pleased to yield for as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say, this is a very sad debate. I was one of the members of the Ethics Committee that was not reappointed that was referenced to in the distinguished majority leader's presentation. I will tell you this; before coming to Congress I was a prosecuting attorney in my hometown.

I served on the Ethics Committee for 4½ years. I found the Ethics Committee to be a place where five Members of each party came together and treated the rules fairly, treated the Members fairly, and treated the rules of this House more than fairly.

I sat through and listened to only the second time since the American Civil War that a Member of this House was expelled, my friend, James Traficant of Ohio, but the evidence warranted it.

These competing resolutions, in my opinion, continuing the dumbing down of the House. Now, I don't know whether Representative JEFFERSON is guilty or not guilty of the things that he has been indicted for by the Justice Department. But even Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, are entitled to a presumption. And there was a reason that in the Traficant case the Ethics Committee waited until the judicial process worked its will, and that is two things; one, you've got to find out whether the person is guilty or not guilty of what they are accused of. Two, when you have competing investigations, you can actually impede the prosecution of someone who has committed a crime with the Department of Justice.

Your side started this ''culture of corruption'' last year; we're going to start the ''House of hypocrisy'' this year. Stop dumbing down the institution.

Members of Congress are human beings. When they are charged with a crime, they should get the full weight of the law. If they are guilty, they should suffer the penalty not only of going to prison or jail, but they should be expelled from the House. But to rush to judgment and to permit the United States Department of Justice or some rogue district attorney, like I happen to believe in Tom DeLay's case, I know you guys aren't big fans of Tom DeLay, but you are sending a message that a common prosecutor in my district, your district, your district, your district can indict you tomorrow, and on the basis of that you are removed from your leadership position, you are removed from your committees, and you may not have done a darn thing.

I think this is a sad day for this House. And I know that I am going to be in the minority tonight, I'm actually in the minority, so it will be a double minority, but I intend to vote against both of these resolutions. I am sorry we've come to this.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time for us to have sort of a status report of how we got here.

Two years ago, it was publicly revealed that one of our Members of this

House, a gentleman from New Orleans, had an FBI raid on his home and had discovered 90,000 in cash wrapped up in aluminum foil and in Tupperware containers in that freezer. It was also publicly revealed that that same gentleman used National Guard assets that were then being used as part of the rescue and recovery efforts after Hurricane Katrina to go to his home and recover something resembling the boxes that were later found in his freezer to be containing $90,000 in cash.

Since that time, he continued to serve on the Ways and Means Committee for some period of time, which was the committee that he is alleged to have used to conspire on a continent-wide basis in bribery and racketeering of several African nations to profit himself, his family and bring shame and discredit upon this institution. He later left that committee and was unanimously approved by the Democratic Caucus to go to the Homeland Security Committee, that committee being the committee that has jurisdiction over a number of the assets that he misappropriated in the wake of Hurricane Katrina to retrieve the boxes that resembled the ones that had the cash of $90,000 in the freezer.

When it was brought to light that the Republicans would demand a public vote on that Democratic Caucus action, that vote was never called for. He remained on the Small Business Committee until today, several days after the actual indictment.

That same individual, for the first time in the history of the Republic, had his congressional office raided by the FBI. Now, in the course of all those events did the House Ethics Committee, now led by Democrats, ever open an investigation into his behavior in this Congress? The answer is no. Now why is that? Because if an FBI investigation, $90,000 in cash, an FBI raid on a congressional office, and misappropriation of National Guard assets isn't enough to merit an ethics investigation in this body then perhaps the majority leader could share with us what is. And he could also explain to us why, if there had been an ethics investigation, it could not have proceeded because the Speaker had not appointed Members to the investigative pool until today.

□ 1830

So even if they had been proactive, there would have been no one to look into the allegations that have brought shame and discredit upon the People's House.

So it takes a peculiar rhetorical bravado to come to this House floor and say with a straight face that they have been moving forward with these investigations, when for over half of the 109th Congress the Ethics Committee could not function because the Democratic members refused to show up; and in the 110th Congress the ethics investigative pool could not function because no Members had been nominated by the Speaker until today. That undermines this institution; and it is the reason why it requires a very rare motion, the privileged motion that the minority leader is offering today.

Now, Mr. HOYER has offered a suspension bill. Suspension bills are typically used to name post offices. They are typically used to designate National Fishing and Boating Month, National Jewish History Month, National Smoke-Free Awareness Week. That is typically the route that suspension bills are pursued. And suspension means that they enjoy broad, non-controversial support in this House. So while it is, I hope, broadly supported that we would refer the Jefferson case to Ethics, it seems as though that in this new open and accountable House Chamber that the language of such a suspension that would suspend the rules would have been shared by all the Members. The rare motion that is afforded the Republican leader was available in the public domain for days, which presumably has led to the timing of the suspension vote also being offered today.

As we move forward with this I think it's important that we recognize that the real losers here are the constituents in a Louisiana congressional district who have been denied representation by someone who has brought shame and discredit upon this House, potentially, depending on the outcome of a 16-count indictment that could result in 235 years in prison. And I hope that the majority leader in his haste to craft the suspension bill that we will consider today has included in it improvements to the existing law as it relates to Member pensions. Because nothing drives the American taxpayer more crazy than to know that potentially, if the gentleman from Louisiana is convicted and if the gentleman from Louisiana is sentenced to prison, he would still have his family entitled to a pension. That is a watered-down version of what the House Republicans passed last year that would deny a pension to Members who use their office to engage in criminal activity. And in this particular case, the people who would be eligible to continue collecting the pension are in the public domain as having been coconspirators, beneficiaries of the illegal activity.

So I hope that in his haste to craft a suspension bill, he would bring the pension issue back up for this body to put the teeth back into it that Republicans put in a year ago and add to that additional language that perhaps the majority leader, Mr. REID, would find acceptable in the Senate so that we can actually get it to the President's desk so that the American taxpayer doesn't have to foot the bill for convicts, thieves, racketeers and people who engage in bribery by abusing their office.

This is a very serious issue for this institution, and it should be treated as such, and we should have the highest possible standard for all Members who enjoy the trust in public service, and that includes the issues that follow all of us, including access to the pension, including enforcing the House rules on earmarks that have been routinely abused, and maintaining all of the other rules that we have passed and taken a victory lap for allegedly making this the most open and honest and accountable place. And yet when the rubber meets the road, the path chosen is to airdrop in earmarks, cover up misbehavior on the House floor in terms of threats and intimidation, and unanimously affirm someone who is now under a multi-page indictment, unanimously affirm that person to have a position on the Homeland Security Committee.

I urge this body to endorse, support and vote for the Republican leader's motion that will begin the process of restoring the dignity and honor and respect that this institution deserves.

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

Chutzpah is a wonderful word. Chutzpah is the position of a person who has been involving themselves in activities for a long period of time and then accusing somebody else of doing the same and being sanctimonious in the process.

That aside, Mr. Speaker, this House was told in November of last year by the people of this country, clean up your House, get rid of the culture of corruption. That's what they said in 2006, on November 7; and that's what we're doing. We adopted one of the strongest rules packages dealing with ethics in the history of this House, eliminating all meals and gifts from lobbyists. Arm's-length transactions. No travel. We just passed a lobbying disclosure bill 2 weeks ago, which most of us voted for because we want to be in on the effort of cleaning up this House.

My young friend from Florida apparently forgets that in January we passed a pension bill which says that if you're convicted and expelled, you won't get your pension. That was the Boyda bill, NANCY BOYDA from Kansas, who came to Congress on a pledge to clean up the Congress. And she was elected to do just that.

Earmarks. Earmarks were quadrupled over the last 14 years. We have now adopted a rule that says they're going to be transparent. You're going to know who made the request for earmarks, that there is going to be some check on those earmarks.

Now, my young friend from Florida says that our resolution, which will be on suspension, was just seen. I will tell him, and there is no way he would know this, I saw the leader's resolution just minutes ago.

But that is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. The issue is the American public did indeed send us here to act ethically, honestly and openly and do the people's business, not the special interests'. And that's why they made a change in this House in November of 2006, that's why we unanimously on our

side are going to support this resolution, and that's why we're going to support the suspension bill.

Because not only do we believe it ought to be done in this instance, but there are a lot of Members publicly under investigation in this House whose homes have been raided by Federal officials, but they're not in this resolution. They have not been indicted.

Mr. Speaker, we need to act. The public needs to know we're acting, and we need to hold accountable those who fail to meet their public duty and trust to the American people. This leadership is committed to making sure that we do just that.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) so much time as he may consume.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Republican leader for yielding.

I would like to begin by engaging my very good friend and classmate, the distinguished majority leader, in a colloquy, if I might; and I would be happy to yield to him to respond.

Our Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER, has just referred to the fact that, on May 1, we saw the appointment of the pool of those on the Ethics Committee who would in fact be responsible, or they will be impaneled to deal with this question, and he referred to the fact that we have gone for, really, almost the first half of this year without any action taking place. And as he correctly said, a decision was made to empanel that group on the majority side today.

We got the news yesterday of this very unfortunate indictment. I would just like to inquire of my friend exactly why it is that it took us this long to see action taken, when, in fact, so much other action was taken in the 109th Congress.

I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I don't have a specific answer for that. But let me say this. You gave your list last month. We have given our list this month. The minority leader is correct on that time frame. We heard about this indictment. We determined to take specific action. The minority leader also determined to take specific action. We believe they complement one another, but the real issue is that we need to take decisive action and we intend to do so.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, and I thank the distinguished majority leader, Mr. Speaker, for his comments and for being forthright in saying that they really don't have an answer in response to the fact that this has been open for literally months, this entire year. A very serious question was carried over from the 109th Congress to the 110th Congress, and I listened to my friend just a few minutes ago provide a great campaign speech about the message that was sent last November and the fact that we've got this great degree of openness and transparency and all, the likes of which didn't exist in past Congresses.

But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I am really very troubled when I look at this resolution that as our Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER, said was just provided to us.

Now, let me state very clearly for the record, this falls within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Rules. This has not been referred to the Rules Committee, and with our first look at it, again it was just handed to us, it would be an understatement to say that we're very troubled with the potential ramifications of what this resolution would do, Mr. Speaker.

One of the staff members just said to me, it would be possible that one of our Members could be protesting at the Sudanese Embassy. We know that there is a great deal of controversy and question around policy that takes place in Sudan as it relates to Darfur and other things, and conceivably if a Member of this institution were protesting and were arrested, it would have to be referred to the House Committee on Ethics, and they would be required to empanel an investigative committee to look at this or report back as to why it didn't take place.

In this resolution, it says any Federal or State court. I don't know if someone possibly might be exceeding the speed limit and pulled over and ticketed. I don't know whether or not that Member would have to be referred to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and see an investigative committee empaneled to investigate that speeding ticket.

The point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, is we continue to hear about this great new openness and transparency and the deliberative nature of this institution, when we have a resolution that the majority leader correctly has introduced, and he is certainly entitled to do that, to say it is to be referred to the Committee on Rules. Yet from what the majority leader has said, Mr. Speaker, we're scheduled to vote on this in just a matter of a few minutes, and we've just looked at this three-page measure, and those are the questions that we have initially that I would have certainly raised if we had had a hearing up in the Rules Committee on this measure.

Everyone wants to make sure that this institution is held to the highest possible ethical standard. I believe that we all sincerely want to do that.

□ 1845

The issue of ethics and lobbying reform and all has been greatly politicized by our friends in the majority; greatly politicized by our friends in the majority. We had a debate on this just before we adjourned before Memorial Day, and to me it was just outrageous to hear the kind of rhetoric that was used, pointing the finger of blame on this issue.

I think it is very sad. We are here responding to an indictment, the likes of which has not been seen for a Member in a long, long period of time, and I hope very much that as we do seek greater deliberation that we will take resolutions like this and run them through the regular order process.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know when Mr. Cunningham was indicted and convicted, but ''a long, long time'' seems not to be my recollection of how long ago it was.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are entitled to see this institution held to the highest ethical standards. They clearly expect more of us than maybe they have in the past. And the reason to bring this resolution here tonight is to not profess innocence or guilt. It is to make sure that the process that we have in this House for protecting the House and protecting the institution and protecting our Members, we want to make sure that that process works the way it was intended.

So I appreciate the support of my colleagues for this resolution.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, my love of the Constitution of the United States of America, and my hatred of unfair precedents, equals my vote against the Minority Leader's resolution.

Mr. Speaker, today, I was one of the 26 Members of Congress who voted against the privileged resolution offered by Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER. My opposition to this resolution has little to do with the serious allegations against Congressman WILLIAM JEFFERSON, and everything to do with the oath that each and every Member of Congress took in this very chamber—to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. In America, we have a Constitutional principle of innocence before being proven guilty and that no citizen shall be ''deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.'' The resolution by the Minority Leader will not allow our system of justice to work. If the system of justice is not allowed to work for a Member of Congress, for whom should the system work?

I also oppose this measure because of the horrible precedent it establishes. Instead of illustrating and penalizing those instances of law breaking and working toward establishing higher standards for all Members of Congress, the Minority Leader's resolution puts the behavior of one individual under a microscope. Instead of seeking an opportunity to improve the behavior of all Members of Congress, this resolution makes the political low blow of focusing on the behavior of one.

Members of Congress certainly know, or should know, that the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, also known as the Ethics Committee, has traditionally deferred criminal matters to the Department of Justice. This makes perfect sense. The Department of Justice will carry out an investigation, offer a platform for the proving of innocence or guilt, and allows the adjudication of

citizens before their peers. The resolution offered by the Majority Leader allows this process to occur, and upon its conclusion, for Congress to then make a decision based on the merit of the facts. The Minority Leader's resolution reaches a conclusion before the facts have even come to court. Indeed, it reaches a conclusion before Congressman JEFFERSON is even formally arraigned.

The disrespect this resolution has for our Constitution that we have all sworn to uphold and defend by not allowing our system of justice to work its will; the absolute terrible precedent this resolution makes in establishing guilt based not on facts but politics; and by focusing on only one Member of Congress instead of seeking to reform or address the behavior of all Members of Congress, are the reasons why I cast my vote against this measure.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT TO RESPOND TO THE INDICTMENT OF ANY MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 451) directing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to respond to the indictment of, or the filing of charges of criminal conduct in a court of the United States or any State against, any Member of the House of Representatives by empaneling an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations not later than 30 days after the date the Member is indicted or the charges are filed.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 451

Whereas on June 4, 2007, Representative William Jefferson was indicted on 16 criminal counts by a grand jury in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia;

Whereas recent credible media accounts indicate that the Department of Justice is investigating the conduct of other Members of the House of Representatives, and these investigations may lead to further indictments;

Whereas the One Hundred Tenth Congress, in its first day of session, strengthened the rules concerning the ethical behavior of Members of the House;

Whereas the House has approved on an overwhelming and bipartisan basis H.R. 2316, the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007, to establish strict standards and penalties concerning the relationship between lobbyists and Members; and

Whereas these actions by the One Hundred Tenth Congress demonstrate that illegal, unethical, or inappropriate conduct by Members of the House will not be tolerated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That whenever a Member of the House of Representatives, including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, is indicted or otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct in a court of the United States or any State, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall, not later than 30 days after the date of such indictment or charge—

(1) empanel an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations; or

(2) if the Committee does not empanel an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations, submit a report to the House describing its reasons for not empaneling such an investigative subcommittee, together with the actions, if any, the Committee has taken in response to the allegations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. Speaker, the minority leader, in closing on the resolution that will be voted on in a short time, correctly observed that every Member of the House needs to be held accountable for conduct which undermines the faith, respect and confidence that the American public has in this institution. We agree with that. In fact, we have been saying that for years and we have acted to effect that objective. This resolution, we believe, furthers that effort.

Essentially, Mr. Speaker, what this resolution says, it directs the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to respond to an indictment of or the filing of charges of criminal conduct in a court of the United States of any State against any Member of the House by empaneling an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations not later than 30 days after the date the Member is indicted or charges are filed.

As I said in my statement with reference to the previous resolution, this will be a general process of the House so that every Member knows that this process will be employed, not on a partisan basis, but on the basis of conduct and on the basis of actions that have been taken.

It also says, however, to the committee that if they find that such an investigative committee, under the circumstances that the bipartisan committee reviews, do not feel that going forward is appropriate, they can report that back. That, I think, responds to the concerns properly raised by the gentleman from California. This resolution under this suspension is the general of what the other resolution is on the specifics.

Mr. Speaker, I said that NANCY BOYDA from the State of Kansas came here and offered legislation which essentially said that if Members were found guilty of a crime that adversely affected their service in the Congress of the United States, that their pensions would be at risk. That legislation was overwhelmingly adopted. I congratulate the gentlelady from Kansas for her focus on ensuring the ethics of this body and that the public is not subsidizing criminal or unethical behavior which subjects a Member to removal.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume in support of the suspension to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA).

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last November, voters charged a new congressional majority with a clear mandate: End the scandals and clean up Congress. At first, we embraced the voters' charge. The Democratic majority passed an ethics reform package that banned Members from accepting gifts from lobbyists, we blocked Representatives from flying on corporate jets, and we prevented Congressmen from pressuring private businesses to hire or fire for political reasons.

Now the time has come for another step, and our actions in the next days will determine the strength of our resolve. Did we mean it last November when we said we would change Congress, or were our words just mere election-year slogans?

If we meant what we said, then it is clear what must happen next. First, the House Ethics Committee must launch investigations into public reports of congressional corruption, including accusations that Mr. WILLIAM JEFFERSON committed crimes such as racketeering, soliciting bribes and money laundering. This committee must investigate. No excuses and no delays. And if the Ethics Committee proves unable to complete this, its most basic responsibility, then Congress must create a more independent Ethics Committee, capable of the initiative and oversight that the American people deserve.

But that isn't enough. Although Mr. JEFFERSON should and must enjoy the presumption of innocence granted to all American defendants, as a Member of Congress he has a special pact with the American people. If Mr. JEFFERSON left Congress today, if he were to resign today, as I know many of us wish that he would, then tomorrow he will begin drawing a Federal pension for his service in Congress. According to the National Taxpayers Union, that pension will exceed $40,000 a year.

This, and I mean this word literally, is an outrage. Taxpayers should not fund the pensions of Members of Congress who had to resign or have resigned in disgrace, and Congress has the responsibility to end this state of affairs.

We must strip the pensions of any Member of Congress who commits a major Federal crime while in office. I offered a bill, the Pensions Forfeiture Act, to do precisely that, and it passed the House of Representatives earlier this year. A similar bill has passed the Senate, and now it must be sent to the floor as a reconciled bill that we can finally send to the President.

Let's not permit committee delays or needless procedure to interfere one more day with real, meaningful ethics reform. Let's pass the Pensions Forfeiture Act into law, and, what's more, let's end the revolving door. Let's establish an independent ethics commission, and let's begin to rebuild the trust of the American people.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, but I have to say that I am very, very troubled that we are where we are.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, my very good friend from Detroit, Mr. CONYERS, on the floor. Just before we adjourned for the Memorial Day break, he and I were in a lengthy exchange, both upstairs in the Rules Committee and then here on the House floor dealing with the issue of lobbying reform, and I was very pleased that Mr. CONYERS supported an amendment that I offered dealing with disclosure of post-employment plans for Members. It was a very thoughtful process. Concern had been raised about that, and Mr. CONYERS was very, very generous in looking at that issue, in dealing responsibly with it, and accepting the amendment that I proposed to that issue.

When we were in the midst of debate, and I will have to say when he stood there, I was somewhat concerned over the fact that we saw gross politicization from some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who have continued to try to make campaign speeches on this issue of lobbying and ethics reform, talking about the message that was sent last November.

We all know that the American people want an institution, a United States House of Representatives, that is above reproach. We all know that Members of this institution should in fact be held to the highest possible standards.

But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, what troubles me about where we are at this moment. I just today looked at a report that was issued on the great new openness and the way this institution has been run and how dramatically improved it is. And then we are given, with this resolution, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, a very, very poorly drafted resolution. That is the reason that we have a referral process.

In the 109th Congress, we had many, many issues that we had to address. And original jurisdiction matters that were referred to the Committee on Rules in fact were addressed in hearings, were addressed in markups, and in fact were resolved.

We listened to colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, talk about all of these great reforms that were implemented on the opening day of the 110th Congress and these great changes that have taken place. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that we also have been spending time in the 110th Congress cleaning up the poorly worded, messy language that we dealt with.

One example: In a rule that was passed by this House we self-executed a provision which actually allowed Members to once again attend charitable events. In the opening day rules package that was put into place on this issue, Mr. Speaker, there was a provision that actually denied Members, it denied Members, the opportunity to attend charitable events.

Now, that was rectified. But I use that one example, Mr. Speaker, to point to the fact that if we had handled this issue the way Mr. CONYERS had handled the issue of lobbying ethics reform, which we supported in a bipartisan way, we would not be dealing with a resolution that creates the potential, Mr. Speaker, for Members of this House who face a traffic ticket, Members who might want to protest, as I said earlier in my remarks, at the Sudanese Embassy over policies that are taking place there.

What it would mean, Mr. Speaker, is under this resolution, a Member who gets a traffic ticket, gets a ticket for littering, is arrested for protesting at the Sudanese Embassy, that that would have to be referred to the Committee on Standards.

My friend has just said there is a provision in here, it is the last line, item 2 in the ''resolved'' clause, which says if the committee does not empanel an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations, submit a report to the House describing its reasons for not empaneling such an investigative subcommittee, together with the actions, if any, the committee has taken in response to the allegation.

So, Mr. Speaker, this very, very poorly crafted resolution basically does state that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct does in fact have to deal with this, even if they choose, because it was a protest or a traffic ticket or a littering ticket, they still have to deal with this issue by choosing not to empanel an investigative committee to address that.

Now, our new colleague from Kansas stood up and very proudly talked about the fact that she is dealing with this issue of pension reform. We all want to do everything that we can to make sure that Members don't have the taxpayers subsidizing these pensions of criminals, people who are imprisoned.

□ 1900

We know there was concern raised about family members, but I will say there is nothing in this resolution that we are debating right now, Mr. Speaker, that addresses the issue of ensuring that criminals who have served in this institution are not going to continue to benefit from their pensions. In this very unique case, Mr. Speaker, I will say that we are very troubled over the fact that there are co-conspirators involved in this charge; and, Mr. Speaker, they are in fact family members who potentially could become the beneficiaries of this pension.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will say again I am going to vote in favor of this resolution, but I am very, very troubled about the way it has been worded. I am very troubled over the fact that it was not referred to the Rules Committee of which I am privileged to serve as the ranking minority member. I think this is a very poor way of doing business.

Our Republican leader came forward with an appropriate privileged resolution which simply called for the Ethics Committee to expeditiously take action. We have had to wait for nearly half a year without any action whatsoever being taken to follow up on the action that was taken in the 109th Congress.

I believe everyone should in fact be deemed innocent until proven guilty beyond a shadow of a doubt. I believe that as we look at this, though, it is imperative that we have action taken as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my very good friend from Texas, Judge GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office and was so encouraged to hear the majority leader earlier say, as I understood it, unethical conduct would be pursued no matter where, no matter who. And, of course, we just recently had an allegation by MIKE ROGERS regarding unethical conduct, and the majority leader moved to table that action in that pursuit.

We know the majority leader to be an honorable man. I am deeply encouraged that apparently if Mr. ROGERS will remake that resolution or motion, this time the majority leader would not move to table it, would not marshal forces to stop the pursuit of alleged unethical conduct, and we can get this body on track. And I am greatly gratified.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SPACE), who comes to the Congress replacing Mr. Ney because the people wanted honest representation.

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this issue.

I rise today to support this resolution. In order to restore the integrity to this Chamber and restore America's faith in its elected officials, we must continue to undertake substantive action with regard to ethics reform.

This Congress has made huge strides in reforming itself and cleaning up Washington, as our majority leader alluded to earlier this evening, but there

is still more to be done. Our actions today will not only enhance the most fundamental principles of a democratic society, they will remind our constituents that we are a body of the people, and not above the people.

Simply put, when a Member of Congress is indicted, there should, as a matter of course, be an immediate ethics investigation.

Coming from a district whose previous Congressman became mired and then consumed by scandal, my fellow district residents and I understand all too well the perils associated with weak and loosely monitored ethics regulations. We have suffered the frustration, disappointment, and anger associated with a betrayal. We suffered from not having a Member of Congress available to attend the needs of the citizens of our district.

But we are not alone. Other districts have suffered similar tragedies, and that is inexcusable and unconscionable. The people that we serve in this body deserve a Member of Congress that is committed to representing their needs, and we cannot afford to wait any longer in addressing this issue.

The time to act is now. As Members of Congress, we have an extraordinary burden to those who have bestowed this great honor upon us. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important measure.

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

I would like to once again engage in a colloquy with my very good friend from Maryland, the distinguished majority leader, if I might.

As we are standing here today, I will say, unfortunately, on the House floor this has become sort of the Rules Committee original jurisdiction process. We are now doing it on the House floor because a decision was made by the majority leadership to prevent the Rules Committee from having an opportunity to even consider this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, if I might just pretend as if this is a committee hearing and assume that the distinguished Chair has yielded time to me, I would like to inquire of the author of the resolution as to whether or not it is the intent to have Members of this institution who might possibly be engaging in a very, very great protest over which they feel very strongly and they are arrested, I would like to inquire is it the intention of the author of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, to have that measure, have that Member, referred with a potential huge, huge legal fee, $450 to $1,000 an hour, to action taken by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct?

And, similarly, I ask whether or not it is the intent of the author of the resolution to have the measure if someone, a Member of this House, gets a traffic ticket and they have to face a legal challenge there, if it is their intent that the issue of a Member's traffic ticket be referred to the Ethics Committee so the Ethics Committee can decide whether or not they want to empanel an investigative group to look at this, or choose to waive it. Or, as I said earlier, for littering or any other small instance.

My concern with this very poorly crafted resolution, my concern, Mr. Speaker, is we will see a situation whereby Members are faced with that kind of challenge.

I would be happy to yield to my friend to have him respond if that is the intent of his legislation here.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question.

What the resolution anticipates is applying generally that which the resolution offered by the minority leader raises specifically because we believe that the Ethics Committee ought to ensure for the American public that ethical conduct which does not call in question the House of Representatives' standards of official conduct is being pursued.

But I will tell the gentleman further that I have great confidence in this Ethics Committee, led by a former member of the judiciary, I might add, who knows the law and who knows process. And I have full confidence that she and the Members of the Ethics Committee on both sides, and, as the gentleman knows, it is five Republicans and five Democrats, would summarily have a form available to them that would say if someone gets a traffic ticket that is not subject to further action. You and I would agree with that without hesitation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

Mr. HOYER. I wanted to fully answer the gentleman's question in this committee hearing we are having.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman did say and he talked about the great colleagues we have who serve on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and he did refer to the fact that this measure and the concern over a traffic ticket would, in fact, have to be referred to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. So I am inferring from that that it is the gentleman's intent that a measure like a traffic ticket or a protest at the Sudanese Embassy is to be referred to the Committee on Standards.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield for a very specific response to that.

Mr. DREIER. Sure. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, a traffic ticket is a charge, not a conviction. It is a de minimus charge that I think the committee would summarily deal with.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just say if the gentleman were to read the resolution which he has authored, he would see there is no specificity. And, in fact, it is very possible, it is very possible that if we pass this legislation, we would be in a position where the Committee on Standards would be forced to deal with the issue of a traffic ticket, a protest, a littering ticket or any measure like that. My only question of the gentleman was that in fact his intent. He said this was authored in response to the Republican measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I would say to the gentleman, the intent of the resolution I think is clear. And that is to say when charges are made, and the gentleman tries to bring up de minimus charges that no American would think violates the ethics of the House of Representatives or essentially major transgressions.

I think the Ethics Committee, if that was brought before them pursuant to this resolution, would deal with them summarily as not being worthy of consideration as you and I would deem them not worth of consideration.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the only point I am trying to make to my very good friend from Maryland is that this is a measure that clearly should have been referred to the Committee on Rules. The gentleman has on three occasions talked about the intent, the intent of his legislation.

This is drafted. We are about to vote on it. Why is there not specificity as to how Members are treated when dealing with an issue like of a traffic ticket juxtaposed to the 16 counts we are dealing with in the case of Mr. JEFFERSON?

There is not clarity in this measure, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it is very important for us to recognize that if we are in fact in this House with a great new sense of openness and a greater deliberative nature, this is a sad commentary on where we are. As I said in my remarks, everyone wants to talk about and is a proponent of holding this institution to high ethical standards. This is not a partisan issue. Unfortunately, it was used as a very partisan issue in last November's election.

But as we have found, there are problems of corruption on both sides of the aisle. It seems to me that as we deal with an issue that is as important as holding this institution to the highest possible ethical standards, Mr. Speaker, it is very important for us to do it right.

Unfortunately, and again, while I am going to vote for this resolution, I think it was very, very poorly crafted. I think we as an institution, Mr. Speaker, can do much, much better than we did with this.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, clearly what the gentleman is trying to do in a debating framework is trying to say we didn't mention every specific instance,

whether very serious, moderately serious, or extraordinarily serious.

The gentleman is correct. I have responded to the gentleman that the Ethics Committee clearly, we believe, can make those judgments; and we believe and are confident that the committee will make such judgments and will not treat de minimus assertions as seriously calling for investigative subcommittees or further action by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the bribery and corruption charges against Congressman JEFFERSON are serious. They go to the very heart of our ability as a representative government to do its job. It is fundamental that the people trust their elected representatives to act in the people's interest, not in their own. The very appearance that these allegations create is damaging to the image of this institution.

In the coming days, Congressman JEFFERSON will answer in a court of law to the 16 charges on which he was indicted. Congressman JEFFERSON is entitled to the presumption of innocence in the allegations against him, including bribery, racketeering, money laundering and obstruction of justice.

However, the Congress should be held to the highest standards. Earlier today, I called for the Ethics Committee to initiate its own investigation into the charges against Congressman JEFFERSON.

I support this resolution which calls for the automatic initiation of an Ethics Committee investigation when a Member of this body is indicted or formally charged with criminal conduct. This principle applies not just to Congressman JEFFERSON but to any Member of this House.

In the opening days of this Congress, I rose on the floor in support of a tough new ethics package.

□ 1915

I said then that Members of Congress should be held to the highest regard by the people they represent. Illegal, unethical or inappropriate conduct by Members of the House cannot be tolerated.

I was elected to this Congress to help change the way we do business in Washington, and I will continue to do so without regard to person or party.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side of the debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my friend from Maryland would be very generous. Most of the time that I yielded was for his very thoughtful explanations as we were going through what I consider to be the Rules Committee hearing process here.

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

Mr. DREIER. Well, 5 minutes, actually I'm going to reserve the time. If the gentleman would like to answer on his own time, the gentleman has twice as much time as I have. We have requests, and we are trying to get through the entire Rules Committee hearing here in a matter of 15 minutes. It's going to be a challenge for us, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman reserve the balance of his time?

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

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman from Maryland has many people who are very interested in speaking on this issue, and I will have to yield to them and use the time to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader, and I rise in support of this resolution. Ethics reform must be more than rhetorical. It simply must be real. I, like many of my colleagues, came to Congress with a promise that corruption should not be tolerated from either party. This is not about partisan politics, but this is rather about upholding strong ethical standards.

I was extremely disappointed to hear that another Member of Congress was indicted on such serious charges and this is not something that we can take lightly. A Member of Congress under such serious charges really should think long and hard about whether or not they can remain in Congress.

This is truly about justice, about doing the right things for the Member of Congress and for the Member of Congress' constituents.

Should the Member, in fighting these allegations, think hard about stepping down? Can the Member truly defend himself or herself and adequately represent the constituents of his or her district?

This is something I think that people under indictment should consider, as well I would encourage Mr. JEFFERSON to take this under advisement and encourage him to step down.

I rise in support of this resolution. Ethics Reform must be more than rhetorical—it must be real. I came to Congress with a promise that corruption should not be tolerated from either party. This is not about partisan politics; it is about upholding strong ethical standards.

I was extremely disappointed to hear that another Member of Congress is indicted on such serious charges and this is not something that can be taken lightly. A Member of Congress under serious indictment does not belong in the United States House of Representatives.

It is my hope that this situation with Congressman JEFFERSON can be resolved quickly and judiciously. However, given the serious allegations and ethical issues the indictment presents, I call on Congressman JEFFERSON to resign from the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to reserve the balance of my time, and I really, really look forward to continuing our Rules Committee hearing process with my friend, the majority leader, after we have our line of very thoughtful speeches being made by our friends on the other side of the aisle. He said he had a whole lot of them, so I'm going to reserve my time if I might, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. He will observe that our speakers have all been from districts where this was a compelling issue in the November election, and that is why they are so interested in speaking about it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, my position is similar to that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I had the opportunity the last 2 days to be down in the gulf coast, to be in New Orleans today, and quite frankly, Mr. JEFFERSON is entitled to a presumption of innocence. That is the way of our judicial system and our code in this country.

Mr. Speaker, first, I rise in support of this resolution. An investigation needs to be conducted. We need to have the Ethics Committee take a look at this.

But I would also suggest to this House that when someone, anyone, is under indictment, it's a difficult position for him to do justice to himself or herself and to also do justice for their particular district, and those concerns were raised by people in New Orleans today, as well as in the newspaper.

So, as with Mr. CARNEY, I would suggest that the Ethics Committee take a good long look at this, that Mr. JEFFERSON obviously is going to take a good long look. I would suggest that he do justice to himself, prepare his defense, and that his district have someone else.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes, with the possibility of an additional minute, to my good friend from the State of Florida, Mr. TIM MAHONEY.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, no party's immune from corruption. Democrats and Republicans alike share the blame for outrageous ethical lapses that have occurred in Congress. In order to rebuild the trust of the American people and restore integrity to this great House, it is clear that we need to change the way ethics rules are enforced.

While I am pleased that the House will consider legislation tonight to strengthen enforcement of ethics rules, I would like to reiterate the need to create an independent ethics office.

We need independent ethics enforcement to prevent the kind of rampant corruption that was condoned in the last Congress and hold all Members accountable for questionable and illegal behavior.

Creating an independent ethics office with the authority to blow the whistle

on questionable behavior would introduce the impartiality and accountability that has been missing from the enforcement of House ethics rules. It would depoliticize ethics enforcement and get the fox out of the hen house once and for all.

We have seen the costs of corruption. It erodes the trust of the American people, hurts our constituents and damages our ability to solve the critical challenges facing our great Nation.

In order to offer real solutions to the many challenges facing our country, we need a solid foundation. I'm committed to supporting efforts to hold all Members of Congress to higher standards of ethics and integrity, but it is time for this body to listen to the will of the American people and establish once and for all an independent ethics office.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my very good friend, the distinguished majority leader, how many speakers he has remaining on his side?

Mr. HOYER. I think that we are concluded with our speakers and I will close.

Mr. DREIER. Okay. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I'd like to during this period of time engage my friend in a colloquy.

And let me say as we begin this process, that I'm very troubled that we have this 40 minutes of debate, and we are in a position right now where we had to hear a whole line of campaign speeches that were, as the gentleman from Maryland said, a very important part of last November's process, the election, and we had to listen to those speeches again rather than trying to clean up this very, very poorly crafted legislation.

Now, I asked my friend to yield earlier, and he refused to yield to me, Mr. Speaker. And as I made that request, I was struck with the fact that the report that was just issued today continued to talk about this great sense of civility, openness and bipartisanship that exists in this institution. So I will say that I was somewhat troubled by that.

Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that the distinguished majority leader has another speaker from which we're going to hear, and before I engage in my colloquy with him, and I hope he might be generous with whatever time is remaining so that we can try to clean up this legislation or at least the intents of it, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we believe this resolution is well-crafted, and it's well-crafted to effect the end that it seeks. And the end that it seeks is very simple, that when issues are raised, the Ethics Committee will pursue them and that they will give confidence to the American public that we are taking seriously the allegations and/or the transgressions that might undermine the integrity of this House.

We think that's what the American people want. That's what we are pursuing. We think this legislation is very clear on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND).

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

I rise today to speak on the issue of ethics. This body must focus its attentions on ethics and accountability. In the last election, the American people demanded such, and I think this resolution offered by Mr. HOYER is something that will begin to address that concern.

The Ethics Committee must begin to respond to allegations of wrongdoing by this House. I think a mandatory 30-day return time makes an extraordinary amount of sense.

As a member of the freshman class who cares a lot about ethics and accountability, we also hope to eventually have an independent ethics counsel which will also provide recommendations to the House Ethics Committee.

I think this is the first step in the progress of making sure that the American people can begin to have faith and confidence in its government and its elected leaders.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

As we've been sitting here listening to what frankly have been a flow of campaign speeches, we've been trying to sort of study and analyze and scrutinize what the majority leader, for whom I have highest regard, describes as well-crafted legislation.

So I'm going to with the remaining time that I have continue to try and inquire about this legislation which should have been referred to the Rules Committee, that should have been an original jurisdiction hearing.

A question that has just come to my attention, Mr. Speaker, and I would be happy to yield to my friend for an answer on this, is whether or not a Member who conceivably receives a traffic ticket, and again, the language here says, ''be it Resolved, That whenever a Member of the House of Representatives, including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, is indicted or otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct.''

Now, my question to my friend would be, if a Member were to get a speeding ticket, and I was just informed by one of our crack staff people here who is aware of the fact that in the State of Virginia, if someone exceeds the speed limit by 10 miles an hour, they could be out here on the George Washington Parkway, there is in fact a criminal charge leveled against them. If that were to happen to a Member, is that Member under this resolution that we are going to be voting on compelled to actually inform the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct that that person faces that criminal charge?

And I'd be happy to yield to the majority leader to clarify this bit of confusion that we have in this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

My friend continues to focus on traffic tickets. He tries to—

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, when the gentleman says I'm just focusing on traffic tickets, if in fact someone is arrested for a protest at the Sudanese Embassy, is it the intent that that Member be compelled to inform the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of this action?

These are the questions we want to have answered, and I'm underscoring, Mr. Speaker, the fact that there is a lot of confusion about this resolution. I'm happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a short resolution. The gentleman may not think it's well-written, but nor has he well-read it. There is nothing in there that says the Member is compelled to do anything.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, that is the reason we need to have that clarified. Let me read the resolution on which we're about to vote.

It says, ''otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct.'' That is the language that is here. If that happens, then the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is expected to take action, whether or not they choose to empanel an investigative committee or choose to waive it. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is compelled to take action, whether it be a traffic ticket, an arrest at the Sudanese Embassy or a littering ticket.

And I'm happy to yield to my friend if he wants to further clarify the confusion and explain to us what ''otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct'' is, and Mr. Speaker, the reason I'm doing this is to simply underscore the fact that this measure should have been referred to the Committee on Rules so that we could have held an original jurisdiction and done what we've already had to do in this Congress so far, and that is clean up on issues like the charitable events attending, we had to clean that up

through a self-executed measure in a rule that was passed last month.

□ 1930

That's why we have a chance to do it. I believe it should be done.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will tell the gentleman that this resolution that we are now considering does not seek to trivialize the issue. I suggest that the gentleman is trying to trivialize this issue. This issue does not deal with traffic tickets.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, I am not trivializing. I am not trivializing this issue at all.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman wants an answer, then he ought to give me the time to answer.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am not trivializing this issue at all. There is nothing trivial about this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. My time has expired? Will the gentleman from Maryland yield me time to respond?

Mr. HOYER. How much time do I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOYER. I yield the gentleman from California 1 minute.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say there is absolutely nothing trivial about this issue. We are here on the floor because of the fact that we have faced a very serious attack with an indictment against one of our colleagues. That Member happens to be a Democrat.

We have all discussed the fact that this is a bipartisan issue, and there is a goal to ensure that this institution is held to the highest possible ethical standards. We have before us a resolution, which, based on my experience in this House, is very poorly crafted. It is a resolution which creates the potential for all kinds of havoc.

I have been spending the last 40 minutes making a feeble attempt at trying to create some kind of legislative history as to how Members of this institution in the future are going to be treated, as our friends on other side of the aisle have rushed to the floor and tried to politicize this very, very important substantive issue.

They have done it. They have done it through the campaign process last fall, and I believe that we need to do what we can to put this measure before the Committee on Rules so we can, in fact, have a decent hearing on it.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is welcome.

The pain of accountability is evident. What this resolution says, and I am pleased that the gentleman from California is going to vote for it, is that the American people are going to have confidence that when a criminal act is committed by a Member, whatever that act, that the Ethics Committee will look at it.

I said earlier in the course of this debate that I have full confidence that the Ethics Committee will dismiss summarily, summarily, the examples that the gentleman from California raises. That's not what the American public are concerned about.

Yes, perhaps it's politicized. But when Duke Cunningham takes $2.5 million of bribes to put earmarks in bills and calls the Defense Department and says, give Mr. Wade a contract, the American people knows that's something they want looked at. They want action taken. That Member was not expelled until conviction.

When Mr. Abramoff takes trips with a lot of people to Scotland for free, the American people knows that's not a traffic ticket. It's not demonstrating in front of the Embassy of Sudan to say stop the genocide in Darfur. The American public knows the difference.

When a gentleman gets $5,000 in chips to put in his pocket and pay his bills with, they know that's not a traffic ticket, particularly when legislative action is taken shortly thereafter on this floor. They know the difference.

I would hope that every Member would vote for this, because I believe that every Member in this House wants an ethical House, Republican and Democrat. Why? Because unethical conduct, yes, criminal conduct, reflects on every one of us, because the American public too readily assumes, well, if one does it, all do it.

That is not the case. I believe that I am privileged to serve with those of you on the Republican side and those on the Democratic side with some very ethical members of our society who have been chosen by your neighbors to represent them in this body.

All we are saying in this resolution is that, ladies and gentlemen of America, we are going to hold accountable each and every one of us if we do not act in accordance with your justifiably high expectations. I hope every Member of this body votes for this resolution and says to our constituents, this body will be an ethical, honest body representing your interest.

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. HOYER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 451.

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. HOYER. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 397, by the yeas and nays; motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 422, by the yeas and nays; motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 430, by the yeas and nays; motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 451, by the yeas and nays; adoption of H. Res. 452, by the yeas and nays.

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

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE IN ESTONIA AND ATTACKS ON ESTONIA'S EMBASSIES IN 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 397, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 397, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge

Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Baca
Becerra
Cantor
Cooper
Hastings (FL)
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hunter
Jefferson
Meehan
Myrick
Paul
Payne
Pickering
Reyes
Tancredo
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

□ 2007

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO STOP GENOCIDE AND VIOLENCE IN DARFUR, SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 422, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 422.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Baca
Becerra
Cantor
Cooper
Hastings (FL)
Hobson

Holden
Holt
Hunter
Jefferson
Knollenberg
McNerney
Meehan
Myrick
Paul
Payne
Pickering
Reyes
Tancredo
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2014

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN TO RELEASE DR. HALEH ESFANDIARI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 430, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 430, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Baca
Becerra
Braley (IA)
Cantor
Cooper
Hastings (FL)
Holden
Holt
Hunter
Jefferson
Manzullo
Meehan
Myrick
Paul
Payne
Pickering
Reyes
Tancredo
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2022

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: A resolution ''calling for Iran to immediately release five dual Iranian-American citizens currently being held unjustly.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 428, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

WELCOMING COLE RODGERS

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we are very, very privileged tonight to have a guest on the floor. Little Cole Rodgers is here with his mother, Representative CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

There was no objection.

DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT TO RESPOND TO THE INDICTMENT OF ANY MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 451, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 451.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 10, answered ''present'' 15, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

YEAS—387

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—10

Clay
Conyers
Doolittle
Filner
LaTourette
McDermott
Nadler
Stark
Whitfield
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—15

Barrett (SC)
Bonner
Brown, Corrine
Delahunt
Doyle
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (WA)
Jones (OH)
Kline (MN)
McCaul (TX)
Roybal-Allard
Schakowsky
Waters

NOT VOTING—20

Baca
Becerra
Cantor
Cooper
Hastings (FL)
Holden
Holt
Hunter
Jefferson
Meehan
Murtha
Myrick
Paul
Payne
Pickering
Reyes
Tancredo
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2030

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 452, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 26, answered ''present'' 13, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—26

Bishop (GA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Davis (IL)
Doolittle
Ellison
Filner
Gutierrez
Honda
Johnson, E. B.
Kilpatrick
LaTourette
Lee
McDermott
Nadler
Rohrabacher
Rush
Schakowsky
Stark
Stupak
Thompson (MS)
Whitfield
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—13

Barrett (SC)
Bonner
Delahunt
Doyle
Engel
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Kline (MN)
McCaul (TX)
Roybal-Allard
Waters

NOT VOTING—20

Baca
Becerra
Cantor
Cooper
Hastings (FL)
Holden
Holt
Hunter
Jefferson
Meehan
Murtha
Myrick
Paul
Payne
Pickering
Reyes
Tancredo
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2037

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2446, AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM AND SECURITY SUPPORT ACT OF 2007

Ms. SUTTON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–174) on the resolution (H. Res. 453) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE CRAIG THOMAS, A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 454) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 454

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Craig Thomas, a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

Resolved, That a committee of such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 40

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 40, which was added by the sponsor without my permission.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING HUNGER AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Hunger Awareness Day.

Each day millions of our fellow Americans will go to bed hungry. In my home State of Washington, around 95,000 families suffer from hunger. Each day, approximately 300,000 families in Washington State are forced to choose between putting food on the table and paying their bills. Worst of all, 39 percent of those served by Washington's largest hunger relief agency are children.

In the wealthiest and most agriculture-rich nation in this world, this is simply unacceptable. As Americans, we all must do our part to make sure everyone in our communities, young and old, get enough to eat.

In my district, organizations like the Boys and Girls Club of Monroe, Washington, are using today to hold food drives and benefit dinners to support local food banks. Many organizations across the State and Nation are doing their part to fight the hunger epidemic. We need to match their efforts in Congress.

So as Congress works to reauthorize the farm bill this year, we need to make sure that Federal anti-hunger programs and emergency food assistance programs get the resources they need. I want to thank our local leaders in Washington State and across the country for their work fighting hunger, and I call on my colleagues in Congress to join their efforts.

CONGRATULATING THE CLEVELAND CAVALIERS ON WINNING THE NBA EASTERN CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to all my colleagues, I want you to join me in saying congratulations, Cleveland Cavaliers, Eastern Conference champions. Come on now.

It is such a wonderful experience for the great City of Cleveland to have an opportunity to have a team like the Cleveland Cavaliers, to be led by ''King'' Lebron James. We are so excited, because, Cleveland, we needed a boost, and we got a boost in our basketball team, and we ask you to turn us on, because we will turn you up.

Cleveland Cavaliers, Eastern Conference champions.

THE LAST GAVEL

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, pending before this body June 5, 1941, Mr. Speaker, was a debate on the war in Europe. Everyone listened as Representative John Elliott of Mississippi delivered yet another unfortunate anti-Semitic diatribe. Not even the events of Hitler's rise to power stopped him. Not even knowing there were six Jewish Members of the House stopped him.

When he was done, New York Congressman Mike Edelstein jumped to his feet and responded to this diatribe of anti-Semitism and he said the following words: ''I deplore the idea that men in this House attempt to use the Jews as their scapegoat. I say it is unfair and I say it is un-American. All men are created equal, regardless of race, creed or color, and whether a man be Jew or Gentile, he may think what he deems fit.''

Those were the words of Mike Edelstein, June 5, 1941. He left this podium, went into the Speaker's Lobby and died of a heart attack, and I wanted to recognize this on the anniversary of his passing.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 2045

HONORING PARREN MITCHELL

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise a great man, a former Member of Congress, a former colleague of many who are still here, Parren Mitchell of Maryland.

Today, with the Maryland delegation, our distinguished majority leader, along with ELIJAH CUMMINGS, gave the eulogy today with both Senators present, the Governor of the State, the mayor of the city, all of the clergy, not all but a representation of it, and family and friends of this great man, Parren Mitchell.

Many Members of Congress who still serve here served with Parren, and they know he was a champion for economic and social justice.

Mr. Speaker, I want the rest of our colleagues to know about the Mitchell family. They were in the forefront of the civil rights movement; and, as a native Baltimorean, I knew full well the quality of their leadership and the extent of their effectiveness.

Parren Mitchell was a part of that leadership. He came to the Congress in 1971. He was the first African American from Maryland to serve in the Congress and the first African American since 1898 to come to the Congress from south of the Mason-Dixon line. So he made history when he came here, and he was a fighter who made progress while he was here. He was a pioneer and patriot. He fought for our country on the battlefields of Europe. He received the Purple Heart. He fought in the civil rights movement, and then fought here on the floor of the Congress until he decided to leave Congress.

It was wonderful to hear his nephew speak about him, and other representatives of the family speak about him, as an uncle and a friend and a mentor.

It was wonderful to hear the clergy speak of him as a child of the church, a truly religious person who brought his religion and his faith into public service.

It was wonderful to hear the elected officials sing his praises as ones who had learned from him, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator CARDIN. They had learned from him and worked with him. Again, he was a champion for many issues.

He was a founder of the Congressional Black Caucus, and I am so happy that he lived to see five members of the Congressional Black Caucus become chairs of the full committee in the House. We have Chairman RANGEL, who will be making our economy fairer and all of the economic justice that Mr. Mitchell talked about; and Chairman CONYERS, who did speak today about bringing the civil rights movement into our Congress, into our legislation, protecting and defending our Constitution and our civil liberties.

So it was a happy occasion, although he will be greatly missed. It was a celebration of his life that was enjoyed for many hours today in St. James Episcopal Church in Baltimore, Maryland.

Congressman SARBANES was there, along with his full family, his mother and father, former Senator Paul Sarbanes, his brother, Michael, and of course a Member of Congress we are very proud of, JOHN SARBANES.

And AL WYNN was there. We almost had all of the Maryland delegation, the Democrats, that is. And the delegation is almost all Democratic, but that is for another discussion on another day. AL WYNN was there representing the area nearest Washington, DC, but close to the service of Parren Mitchell.

When I spoke at the service I said we would be gathering here tonight to talk about Parren Mitchell and his wonderful contribution to our country and that they should tune in. But I wanted to tell you tonight what we saw today, which was a community who truly respected this great man and truly loved him and who will miss him sorely.

With the passing of Parren Mitchell, our Nation has lost one of its most passionate champions of justice and equality. I offer my deepest condolences on behalf of all of my colleagues in the House to Congressman Mitchell's family, friends, and all who loved him.

Growing up in Baltimore, I learned to revere the Mitchell family for their dedication to economic and social justice. Parren, his brother Clarence, and indeed his entire family, devoted their lives to ending racism and ensuring that our Nation's bounty was shared by all of its citizens. For that, we have all benefited. That is because their advocacy brought us closer to the ideal of equality that is both America's heritage and our hope.

The story of Parren Mitchell's life tracks the progress we've made. But it also shows how much farther we must travel to truly achieve justice for all.

At age 11, Parren Mitchell understood the reality of racism at its most violent and brutal. His older brother, Clarence, a true champion of social justice in his own right, came home one day and told of having just seen the body of a man who had been murdered—lynched—in Somerset County. In that moment, Congressman Mitchell would later say, he decided to dedicate his entire life to fighting for the rights of African Americans.

Years later, in 1950, after graduating from Morgan State, the University of Maryland refused to admit Congressman Mitchell to its College Park campus, telling him that it was "inadvisable" for blacks to attend. But that injustice would not prevent Parren Mitchell from pursuing his dream. He fought back. He won his court case. And Parren Mitchell became the first African-American graduate student at the College Park campus, and earned his master's degree in sociology. Because Parren Mitchell refused to see his dream of attending graduate school denied, many more were able to pursue their own dream of a graduate education.

Then, in 1971, when first sworn in as a Member of the House, Congressman Mitchell became the first African-American Member of Congress elected from the State of Maryland. This achievement must have been tempered by the knowledge that he was the very first African-American elected to Congress from below the Mason-Dixon line since 1898. It took almost a century for a Black American from the South to find a seat here in the People's House.

Across the 85 years of Parren Mitchell's life—in his own story and the story of America—we see the slow march of progress. We celebrate today a man who made sure that, however slow at times, we continue to march in the right direction—toward peace, understanding, and justice for all.

Congressman CUMMINGS recently described Mr. Mitchell as "never concerning himself about fame or fortune but, rather, devoting himself entirely to uplifting the people he represented." That was apparent through his leadership as the first African American to chair the House Small Business Committee. There, he put into law guarantees that minority-owned business would share in public works and transportation contracts.

It is also a great testament to the leadership of Parren Mitchell that the organization he helped found—the Congressional Black Caucus—continues to serve as the conscience of the Congress and increase its ranks to the benefit of all Americans. I am sure Mr. Mitchell is looking down upon us today and that he is pleased that so many CBC members are here to honor him today.

With Congressman Mitchell's passing, we have lost a friend, a former colleague, and a passionate advocate for seeing that America's promise of freedom and equality are realized by all of our citizens. Whether in the Army, where he earned a Purple Heart, teaching at his alma mater, Morgan State, or serving his community as a social worker or a member of this body, Parren Mitchell dedicated his life to service. His loss leaves a void that we must work together to fill.

I hope it is a comfort to Congressman Mitchell's family and friends that so many people mourn their loss and are praying for them at this sad time.

REMEMBERING PARREN J. MITCHELL

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as a young man I worked on Capitol Hill for a United States Senator, along with the Speaker, Senator Daniel Brewster.

From time to time, Clarence Mitchell, Jr., one of the giants of American history in civil rights in America, would visit Senator Brewster; and I would have an opportunity to meet him. I was honored and awed to meet him. Many called him the 101st United States Senator. Clarence Mitchell, Jr., was the brother of Parren James Mitchell.

Shortly after I graduated from law school, I was honored by the citizens of my district who elected me to the State Senate. I went to the State Senate as a young man, but there was a young man 6 months younger than I. His name was Clarence Mitchell, III, Clarence Junior's son. We served together.

Over the years, I got to know very well Juanita Mitchell, an extraordinary family, an extraordinary family whose matriarch, Ms. Jackson, was an extraordinary leader in her own right.

Parren J. Mitchell was my friend. In 1981, many years after I met the Mitchell family for the first time, I ran for Congress. Juanita Mitchell and Parren Mitchell and Clarence Mitchell, III, were very helpful to me in that campaign. I represented a large African American population. They have always been very supportive of me and I of them. Parren Mitchell did a radio ad for me during the course of that campaign urging all in Prince George's County to elect me. That was a significant help, in my opinion, to my election.

He has been succeeded when he decided voluntarily to leave the Congress by two extraordinary representatives. One was Kweisi Mfume, who spoke at the funeral today; and the other was my colleague and my friend, the immediate past chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus which was founded by Parren J. Mitchell with Lou Stokes and others.

ELIJAH CUMMINGS spoke. He spoke powerfully and eloquently about the relationship that he throughout his life had with the Mitchell family and the impact that they made on him as an individual. The Mitchell family and Parren J. Mitchell in particular were extraordinary servants of the people, of our democracy, of our country.

When Parren J. Mitchell was sworn in as the first African American to represent the people of Maryland in Congress, he joined this institution at a landmark moment for equality in America. It was 1971. The Voting Rights Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 1968 had already been signed into law. African Americans were making strides that once seem unimaginable; and the assassinations of leaders like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X and Robert Kennedy raised questions as to what the future of the civil rights movement would be.

Parren Mitchell. Parren Mitchell, a man who took it upon himself to not only protect the legacy of the civil rights pioneers who had come before but to build upon the progress that made it possible for him to come to Washington in the first place.

Rather than be satisfied with how far the struggle for freedom and equality had come in recent years, Parren took responsibility for moving America even further, dedicating his life to ensuring that American society reflected the values and the principles for which this great country stands.

Parren was a founding member, as I have said, of the Congressional Black Caucus, a body that has transformed the way we approach issues of social and economic justice through an understanding that unity is the key to lasting change here in the United States.

Parren fought for fairness in American workplaces and institutions of higher learning as a staunch advocate of affirmative action programs that opened the doors of opportunity to thousands of minorities. As the Speaker said today in her remarks, he was not only committed to equality but understood that equity, particularly ownership in our society, a piece of the pie, was absolutely essential as well.

Parren helped to enhance the fortunes of America's minority business community by introducing legislation ensuring that minority owned business enterprises have a fair shot at Federal contracts, a provision we see mirrored in local and State government contracting practices all over our Nation today because of the leadership and commitment of Parren Mitchell.

Parren's life was one of historic firsts, from the first African American congressman from Maryland to the first African American to receive a degree from my alma mater, the University of Maryland.

His life was also one of service, serving his country proudly and honorably as an officer in the 92nd Infantry Division during World War II and serving the people of Baltimore and our Nation as a man who would never give up fighting for what he knew to be right and just.

Coretta Scott King once said that struggle is a never-ending process, and freedom never really won; you earn it and win it in every generation.

We are all profoundly fortunate that a leader like Parren Mitchell was here to carry the torch of human progress that was passed down to his generation, and we all are profoundly grateful for his contribution to expanding the reach of civil rights and equal opportunity in America.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the life of Parren J. Mitchell, I would like to offer my sincere condolences to his family and loved ones and many friends, to express my deep gratitude for his years of service to this House, the State of Maryland and this great country.

Parren J. Mitchell was short in stature, but he was a giant of a man. He stood tall. He stood with courage, he stood with commitment, and he stood with conviction for the rights of all Americans, not just those who were African Americans but of all Americans, irrespective of who they are, what they were, where they came from, how they worshipped. He knew that equality for one was absolutely essential if there was to be equality for all. America was blessed by the service of Parren J. Mitchell.

Today we heard of the love, the respect, and the honor with which he was held by his community. I am proud to join Speaker PELOSI from his beloved city of Baltimore; ELIJAH CUMMINGS who represents that city so well today and that district that Parren represented. He would be so proud, ELIJAH, of the representation you give to the 7th Congressional District. And to JOHN SARBANES whose father served shoulder to shoulder with Parren Mitchell in this House from 1971 to 1976. He would be so proud of you, JOHN, and the role you play in representing that great city.

I was blessed, Mr. Speaker, to serve with Parren Mitchell for the time that he served and I served together. I learned from him. I am better because of him, and I miss him deeply.

□ 2100

HONORING THE MEMORY OF PARREN J. MITCHELL

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great honor this evening to talk about my good friend and mentor, former Congressman Parren Mitchell.

I said today at his memorial service that Parren Mitchell was without a doubt a man of great humility. He was a mentor of mine; and many, many years ago we came in contact with each other. One of the things that he made clear was that being in elected office is not about seeking to be a celebrity. It must be about service. He was one who made it his business to serve his constituents to the nth degree.

If you were to ride around the 7th Congressional District, much of which is in the inner city of Baltimore, you would hear people, from presidents of corporations to the folks working in the markets to the bank tellers, call him PJ. They called him PJ not out of disrespect. They called him PJ because of their love for him and because of his humble spirit.

It was not unusual for Parren Mitchell to show up at a church or show up at a funeral or show up at somebody's Eagle Scout ceremony. He was the kind of guy who spent his lifetime trying to lift up other people.

The interesting thing, too, is that he did something for African American young people that very few have been able to do. When he ran for office in 1968, he lost by about 5,000 votes. Now, in many instances, if somebody got a total of 15,000 votes, which he did, and lost by 5,000, which he did, they would give up.

Two years later, Parren Mitchell came back and in 1970 was elected by a tremendous landslide margin of 38 votes, and that was so significant for us because back then I was in high school, and it showed me that an African American could be elected to the Congress of the United States of America.

In other words, what Parren Mitchell showed us was what we thought to be impossible was possible, and since that time we have seen Kweisi Mfume come to this body, and yours truly, and we've seen African American Congressmen from all over this country, and I would venture to say that he had a tremendous impact on others, in the Hispanic community and women and

many others, who may have thought at one time it was almost impossible to come here.

And so we pay tribute to this great man. His record is clear: a staunch advocate for small business; a staunch advocate for those who have been left out; a staunch advocate for making sure that civil rights are adhered to.

And finally, let me say this, Mr. Speaker, as I summarize Parren's life in a written piece for the Afro-American newspaper, Parren Mitchell was one who built bridges to opportunities and tore down walls which caused people not to be included in this society.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CONGRESSMAN PARREN J. MITCHELL

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join others in commemorating the life and legacy of Congressman Parren J. Mitchell. Growing up in Baltimore, I came to understand the tremendous positive impact this great man had on my community, the State of Maryland and indeed this country.

The first African American Congressman from my State, Parren Mitchell fought against racism at every turn, but he fought on other fronts as well, wherever he saw injustice, and inhumanity. At his memorial service earlier today in Baltimore, we heard again and again of a man unafraid to speak truth to power.

I would like to share my own personal story of how I felt the presence of this man.

Some years ago, Congressman Mitchell was honored at the 15th anniversary of the Public Justice Center, an organization committed to building systemic change in our society.

It was an easy choice to salute Congressman Mitchell, but it was not easy for him to attend the event. He was by then quite frail, and as he was helped to the stage to receive the honor, I remember wondering whether he would have the energy to speak.

I needn't have worried. A steady and resonant voice filled the hall, and from this slightly built man, at that point in his life no longer able to stand up, came simple and powerful words of gratitude and inspiration.

He spoke at length and without hesitation about his core principles of honesty, justice and compassion. It was, Mr. Speaker, a tour de force. I can only imagine what that voice was like when it held forth in this Chamber and carried the day on so many critical issues.

Something else happened that night that is worth relating. After Congressman Mitchell finished speaking, the organization honored a young man from the community who had struggled and succeeded in overcoming unfair labor practices in his industry. That young man, looking out on a crowd of 500 people, said this: ''We need to make sure that the big corporations pay the little guy for the hard work.''

I looked at Congressman Mitchell, and I saw a smile creeping across his face. It was truth to power at its very best, all that Parren Mitchell had ever stood for.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to salute this fine American and great son of Baltimore.

TERMS OF SURRENDER

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the United States is being invaded by millions of people from many countries throughout the world.

The invasion has taken place by land, sea and air. The rulers of some of those Nations have encouraged the invasion, by words and other methods such as providing tactical maps as to how to illegally enter the United States.

The people coming here want what the United States has. Some claim the land in the Southwest actually belongs to their native country and are retaking it. Some here are to commit lawless acts, but most are here as occupiers that have intentions of living here and reaping the benefits of the United States. No matter the reason, they are all here illegally. It is an invasion when masses of people move to someone else's country without permission.

So, we have been invaded by people from other Nations. So what do we do? Some want the invasion to stop. I am one of those. Some in the United States want the invasion to continue. And some here in the United States are indifferent.

But what about our government? Is it fighting to protect our sovereignty? Well, no. Rather than protect the United States border, the United States Federal Government is raising the white flag and has already drawn up terms of surrender. It is called the ''Grand Bargain.'' It's a plan to allow the illegal occupiers to just stay in America. The United States Government appears to take the position that it cannot stop the invasion so it will just legalize the invasion. So the occupiers will win the day and they will get to stay.

The propaganda machine of our government is trying to convince Americans that this proposal is not amnesty. The idea is to change the meaning of the word ''amnesty.'' Sort of a new take on what definition of ''is'' is. The political propaganda people are trying to convince Americans it is better to surrender to the occupiers than to prevent illegals from coming across our borders, but it's still amnesty.

Even though I was a judge in Texas for over 20 years, you don't have to have a law degree to know that amnesty means forgiveness or pardon. To give you an example, if somebody trespasses on your land or is a squatter on your land, as some people call it, if that person is caught and they pay a fine but they get to remain on your property, it's still trespassing, and if they get to remain on your property, even paying a fee, it is amnesty.

Trespassers are required to leave when caught, no matter how long they have been trespassing on somebody else's property. This has been the law of nations for thousands of years. But our government's going to legalize trespassing and let squatters stay whether Americans and legal immigrants like it or not.

Make no mistake. This plan, or treaty of capitulation, lets the illegal occupiers stay here. It's cold hard amnesty. The Feds have their priorities wrong.

When a Nation is invaded, the duty of government is to stop the invasion. That is the first duty of our government, to defend, protect and secure the Nation. We protect the borders of other nations, but we don't protect our own. Our government has not protected the border but talks about legalizing the illegals. In other words, agree to the invasion and give in to the demands of the occupiers. And this is absurd. This is surrender.

The first answer to an invasion is to defend the land, seal the border. Stop the people from coming here and don't give in to them. Simply stop the invasion.

It's in the best interest of America that the government realizes there's a border war going on, and rather than surrender the government needs to get on the right side of the border war, the American side, and stop the invasion. Secure the border, then decide what to do with the people that are here illegally. But if the border's not protected, more occupiers will continue to come here illegally, and our government will continue to be missing in action.

And that's just the way it is.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN IRAQ

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, there is hardly anyone asking the right question at this time, and it is whether the U.S. involvement in Iraq will end as it did in Vietnam or last forever as it has in Korea. Last week, the President declared his intention to keep America in Iraq forever. That's a sure sign the President's been talking to the Vice President again.

Iraq looks nothing like Korea did in 1952. There is no DMZ and no 38th parallel separating the opposing forces. In Iraq, the war is everywhere. In Korea, the DMZ is one of South Korea's most popular tourist destinations, with buses hauling people back and forth. It's so popular you have to book the

trip weeks in advance. It costs $42, by the way, and that's without lunch.

At the DMZ, you can visit the small building where an armistice was signed, and risk stepping across a painted line on the floor separating North and South Korea, which remain technically at war. Is this the President's vision of Iraq? Hardly, but that's what he would like the American people to believe.

It sounds so simple and so safe and so utterly detached from Iraq, where every street corner in Baghdad is a war zone. The President wants an indefinite military presence in Iraq, but a majority of the Iraq parliament signed a petition demanding a timetable for the U.S. to leave, which the President ignores.

The President wants permanent military bases in Iraq despite the thoughtful and bipartisan conclusion of the Iraq Study Group. That group said, ''The United States can begin to shape a positive climate for its diplomatic efforts internationally and within Iraq, through public statements by President Bush that reject the notion that the United States seeks to control Iraq's oil or seeks permanent bases within Iraq.''

But the President rejected their common sense and ordered the base building to go forward. What exactly are we protecting with the Iraqi people fleeing by the millions? South Korea never looked like this.

In Iraq, students graduating from college used to dream about getting a good job and raising a family. Now they dream of getting out of Iraq alive and as quickly as possible.

Just today, the United Nations issued a new report that says 4.2 million Iraqis have been displaced, half driven out of their homes by rampant and unrelenting bloodshed, and the other fleeing the country. It's estimated by the U.N. that 30,000 Iraqis cross into Syria every month, and Syria says the actual number is much higher. Jordan, meanwhile, has already taken over 1 million Iraqis. What have we done? We have granted 701 Iraqi refugees asylum in the United States.

The President recently announced we're willing to accept up to 7,000 Iraqis. Over 2 million Iraqis have fled their homeland so far, and we're going to take in a few thousand.

When we left Vietnam, we took hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese with us. Within a few months 130,000 Vietnamese had resettled here, and within a few years the number topped 320,000. These were our Vietnamese friends, people who had risked their lives to help us in Vietnam. We didn't desert them and they didn't desert us.

In Iraq, the President says we're willing to take a few thousand in a Nation losing millions of its people. The Iraqi people are fleeing their homes and their homeland in increasing numbers, flooding into nearby countries unable to cope with the refugee crisis.

Millions of peaceful, law-abiding Iraqis from its intellectual establishment, to its merchants, professionals, civil servants, and ordinary citizens are doing whatever they can to leave. And the President is doing everything he can to stay, building bases and demanding a so-called law to gain access to Iraqi's oil.

The President's stay-the-course strategy has evolved into his stay forever strategy. It hasn't worked before and it won't work now.

The President's military escalation is an absolute failure, and the sooner the President admits his mistake, the faster we can develop a national exit plan that protects our soldiers and gives Iraq back to the Iraq people, no strings or military bases attached.

Mr. Speaker, please pass the message to our President. It's time to bring the troops home. A hundred a month are dying, more and more. Last month, the third highest month in the war. It's not getting better. We've got to bring the troops home.

□ 2115

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

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

INFECTIONS AND HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am here to talk about a sad but true problem in our health care institutions in this country, and that is this. The Centers for Disease Control tells us in any given year some 2 million people will catch an infection while either in their hospital or health care center. Some 90,000 people will die, and some $50 billion is spent on this each year in our hospitals.

Now this chart here depicts what we have as of this evening, 853,747 cases so far, over 38,000 deaths and over $21 billion already spent as of today. These are bacteria, viruses, fungi and parasites that cause these common hospital infections. Most common are influenza, flu or colds. The thing about this is so many can be prevented, but a huge problem among the bacteria types, some 70 percent of the bacteria are resistant to at least one medication. There is a huge problem in American hospitals, which is causing so many deaths and a big part of our health care costs.

Now these microorganisms can be present when a patient comes in, and that's why it's so important to understand how the staff, the hospital staff, the doctors, the visitors, the patients themselves need to adhere to some special procedures in order to prevent this problem from occurring and killing so many and costing us so much on our health care dollars.

For example, diseases are passed on by poor hygiene from poor hand washing; clothes that are not necessarily clean on even the doctors, nurses and visitors; unclean equipment, catheters that are left in too long that lead to urinary tract infection; respiratory infections from those with colds or flu who are around patients; bed sores. The list goes on and on.

This is not rocket science how we prevent this, and some estimates are as high as 25 or 30 percent or more of things such as methicillin or resistant Staphylococcus Aureus can be prevented by hand washing before and after contact with any patient.

Many of these diseases can be prevented by sterilizing all equipment used with patients, including making sure that hospital staffs have clean stethoscopes, otoscopes, thermometers, et cetera, making sure they clean up after every procedure, the proper use of antibiotics, pretesting patients on admission to evaluate the presence of an infection, wearing masks if someone is suspected of having some illness, using infection control boards at hospitals to monitor and manage patients, empowering staff to stop or intervene on any procedure when clean rules are violated, and using aggressive educational campaigns for staff and visitors in the hospital.

The point is it can be done. Yes, indeed, it can be done. As a matter of fact, Allegheny Hospital in Pennsylvania reduced the rate of central line-acquired infections from 19 to almost zero within 90 days through staff training and control.

A major teaching hospital in Saint Louis found that they saved costs up to $1.5 million. Mercy Hospital in Oklahoma performed 400 surgeries without any infections. The VA Pittsburgh Healthcare system has reduced MRSA infections by 85 percent in an inpatient surgical unit because they paid attention to these things.

Now here is one of the sad truths in America. Hospitals don't have to report when they have infections. Although 13 States are considering legislation, only 6 States require reporting of health care associated infections: Florida, Illinois, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia. Pennsylvania is the only State that makes its information available to the public.

It is time we change this. I have introduced H.R. 1174, the Healthy Hospital Act, to encourage others to reduce and eliminate these deadly infections and to take some of the savings from this and set aside 10 percent to allow the Secretary of Health to use this for grants back to hospitals that reduce their infection rates to zero.

We have got to transform our health care system into what it needs to be: an affordable, accessible, quality health care system that focuses on patient safety, patient qualify and patient choice. But in order to do that,

we need to have this information available.

Now, another sad truth. While I have been speaking, the number of cases has gone up. While I have been speaking, another person has died in the hospital. While I have been speaking, the costs have gone up $100,000.

Something is terribly wrong with this system. We know hospitals can clean this up. We also need to know that we need to stop wasting our health care dollars on preventable infections. Let's join together as a Nation and pass H.R. 1174.

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2007 AND 2008

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

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 207(f) of S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revised 302(a) allocations for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal years 2007 and 2008. I am also providing current law mandatory allocations for informational purposes only.

REVISED ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2007 [1]	2008
Discretionary action:		
BA	950,316	953,053
Outlays	1,029,465	1,028,398
Current Law Mandatory:		
BA	549,102	548,676
Outlays	533,495	536,972

[1] Includes emergencies incorporated into the Congressional Budget Office March baseline.

IRAQ AND U.S. SECURITY

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

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, I commanded an aircraft carrier battle group of 30 ships off Afghanistan during the war from the Indian Ocean. We were told one day to take those 30 ships into the Persian Gulf, which some thought would be the running start to the Iraqi war.

Of those 30 ships, 20 of them were not United States' ships. They were Japanese. They were Australian. They were Italian. They were Greek. There were many other ships from throughout this world. But when we entered through the Strait of Hormuz into the Persian Gulf, none of those ships came with us except the British and the Australians. At that time, I knew that this war in Iraq would be a tragic misadventure.

Two months after the war in Afghanistan commenced, I was actually on the ground in Afghanistan. I saw for a very short period of time what needed to be done in order to bring about a successful resolution of that conflict.

After the war in Iraq was over and I left my carrier battle group, I was on the ground again for a short period again in Afghanistan and saw what had not been done, because we had diverted not just our attention but our resources, our PSYOPS forces, our special forces, our civil affairs units to Iraq. To me, Afghanistan is a poster child, as it is pre-terrorist and the Taliban have shifted into the southern provinces again and what Iraq has done to U.S. security worldwide.

So, therefore, I believe that the only strategy that we can pursue for success in Iraq is to have a date that is certain by which we will redeploy out of Iraq. We have to do this for two primary reasons.

First, a date certain changes the structure of incentives within the countries that are in that region to change the behavior. Iraqis need to step up to the plate, understanding we will not be there providing political and military cover to pursue the personal fiefdoms within the ministries of Baghdad's governments.

Also, Iran and Syria are involved destructively in this war. Once they know that we will not be there, they have an incentive to work for stability. They do not want the more than 4 million refugees that are dislocated within Iraq, and some have already filled our borders, to continue to overflow it, if we are not there to contain that instability.

Second, they do not want a proxy war between these two allied nations, Syria, Sunni and Iranian Shi'a. If we are not there, they do not want to fuel a proxy war between themselves as they support different religious factions.

But there is a second reason why we must have a date certain with sufficient time to redeploy our troops.

It took us 6 months to redeploy out of Somalia, a much smaller force. In Iraq, we have 140,000 troops and over 100,000 civilians. No one should ever try to redeploy those troops, and what is the hardest military operation to do is withdrawal, when they are most vulnerable in a short period of time.

We must have a date certain as a strategy, as the only leverage remaining to change the behavior of nations within that region to work for stability and to have our troops, those who wear the cloth of this Nation, that we sent there to have a redeployment that can be safe.

I ask this Congress to think the next time, as we must work for an end to this open-ended commitment, that we do so with sufficient time, as my bill said, by the end of December 31, but on an authorization bill, not an appropriations bill, where we again would be forced to vote, as I had to, for the safety of our troops versus the need to redeploy from Iraq, under a strategy which can leave behind an unfailed state.

To bring about greater security, an authorization bill is needed. Being in the military is a dangerous business. It has the dignity of danger. It should never be unsafe because we are forced in an appropriations bill, with a short period of time, to not provide the resources for our forces.

I therefore say that it needs to be an authorization bill with a date certain to bring about a greater security for the United States.

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.)

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

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

HONORING THE HOUSTON FOOD BANK ON THEIR 25TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of us have experienced hunger in our lives. I wonder how many recognize the number of Americans who go to bed every night hungry.

It is for this reason that I rise to salute the Houston Food Bank on its 25th anniversary and to acknowledge the 25 years that the Houston Food Bank, connected to many food banks around America, has served our community, serving nearly 500,000 hungry men, women, children and their families.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to the staff, the board of directors, volunteers and friends of the Houston Food Bank that have generated this most important and especially deserving organization in our community.

Hunger is devastating, but, more importantly, hunger can kill. It can kill, because those who suffer can have low nutrition that leads, if you will, to their vulnerability to disease and, yes, ultimately death. Most Americans are not familiar with the extremes of hunger. But, yet, it faces our community, or we are faced with it every single day.

In southeast Texas alone, more than 900,000 people are food insecure, meaning they do not know where their food will come from or the next meal will come from. Many children go to school, and their only meal are the free lunches and breakfasts.

So it is with great honor and privilege that I pay tribute to the Houston

Food Bank and for the celebration that they had today on the steps of City Hall. I was delighted to be able to briefly attend, as I headed back to Washington, and I am even more privileged to be able to salute them tonight.

Might I also acknowledge the End Hunger Network, whose programs remove the barriers, lack of transportation, marketing and experience, that prevent Houston from using available food resources. They are a very able partner to the Houston Food Bank.

But let me acknowledge again that this organization that acknowledges the fact that nearly 900,000 individuals in southeast Texas are food insecure and this very organization that on a given day in the greater Houston area, where more than 33,000 people suffer from hunger, the Houston Food Bank feeds more than 80,000 people each week, because they are very much aware of the struggles that people who cannot feed themselves or provide for themselves engage in.

This organization was first developed in the mid-1960s by retired businessman John van Engel, using surplus crops from local farmers. The Houston Food Bank first opened on March 8, 1982, operating from a donated storefront in a local shopping center.

That organization now is on the 59 North freeway in the 18th Congressional District, which is my congressional district. During its first year alone, the organization was able to distribute 1 million pounds of food to hungry families in the Houston area. By 1984, the Houston Food Bank had joined the Second Harvest Network, an organization formed in the mid-1970s, to set up food banks throughout the country. This is part of a national commitment and a national passion, a national avocation.

I believe that we should, in our lifetime, stamp out hunger. By the end of 1984, the Houston Food Bank was handling more than 3 million pounds of food. Since that time, the Houston Food Bank has continued to exponentially expand its operations, moving to a new permanent home and reaching more and more needy citizens, again located in the 18th Congressional District.

My community has also been represented in the past by the Honorable Mickey Leland. The Houston Food Bank is a tribute to him. Mickey Leland lost his life on the side of an Ethiopian mountain trying to deliver food to the starving Ethiopians in the 1980s.

Today around the world, people are hungry, and here in the United States they remain hungry. One in four children in Houston lives at or below the poverty level. On any given day, as I said earlier, 33,000 gulf coast residents are hungry. But we are grateful for the Houston Food Bank for its 38 million pounds of food distribution last year, the 80,000 people fed each week, nearly 400 hunger programs that are supported by the food bank in 18 southeast Texas counties, church food pantries, homeless shelters, safe havens for the battered and abused, nutrition sites for children and the elderly, more than 100,000 volunteer hours contributed annually, and 73,000 square foot central warehouse and other space truck fleet. We can be assured of the fact that the Houston Food Bank is on the front lines of the war against hunger. It is my privilege to pay tribute to them today for 25 years of selfless, hard work of the volunteers and the leadership of their organization.

Might I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, as I close that they also serve the Kids Cafe, the Backpack Buddy Club, Operation Frontline, Community Kitchen Culinary Academy, and today Kroger food store gave $100,000 to the Houston Food Bank.

Keep the fight up for another 25 years for together we will stamp out hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to the Houston Food Bank, on the occasion of their 25th anniversary. For the past 25 years, the Houston Food Bank has been serving our community, feeding nearly 500,000 hungry men, women, and children. I would like to express my sincere thanks to the staff, Board of Directors, volunteers, and friends of the Houston Food Bank for all their courageous work, and commend them for making a positive difference in the lives of hundreds of thousands of people in the Houston area.

Hunger is a devastating condition that plagues communities in America, as well as nations throughout the world. We have all experienced the symptoms of temporary hunger, and we know all too well the lethargy, weakness, and inability to concentrate that hunger pains can cause. Even with this knowledge, it is difficult to imagine living with these symptoms daily, always wondering where the next bit of nourishment will come from. It is unthinkable to fathom the plight of parents, forced to choose between feeding their children and paying to heat their homes. It is nearly impossible to envision the prospect of facing the world with a perpetually empty stomach.

And yet, this is a scenario that is all too real for hundreds of thousands of Americans. In southeast Texas alone, more than 900,000 people are "food insecure," or they do not know where their next meal will come from. Nationwide, the statistics are just as staggering, with one in 100 households experiencing hunger, and 11.9% of families nationwide suffering from food insecurity.

Particularly vulnerable are children. In southeast Texas, 44% of those hungry are under 18 years old, while nationally one in every five children does not know where their next meal will be found. These children suffer particularly in the summer, when schools are closed. Mr. Speaker, our children should be concerned about their grades in school; they should spend their days studying, dreaming up and planning future careers, engaging in athletic activities, and socializing with their friends. They should not be expected to worry about food; they should not have to wonder where they might find proper nourishment.

Into this bleak situation come organizations like the Houston Food Bank. Food banks were first developed in the mid-1960s by retired businessman John van Engel, using surplus crops from local farmers. The Houston Food Bank first opened on March 8, 1982, operating from a donated store-front in a local shopping center. During its first year alone, the organization was able to distribute 1,000,000 pounds of food to hungry families in the Houston area.

By 1984, the Houston Food Bank had joined the Second Harvest Network, an organization formed in the mid-1970s to set up food banks throughout the country. By the end of 1984, the Houston Food Bank was handling more than 3,000,000 pounds of food. Since that time, the Houston Food Bank has continued to exponentially expand its operations, moving to a new permanent home and reaching more and more needy citizens.

Today, the Houston Food Bank distributes 38 million pounds of food each year to nearly 400 hunger agencies in 18 counties in southeast Texas. This food reaches 80,000 different people each week, and about 498,000 people a year. These numbers are absolutely staggering. That's nearly 500,000 grateful men, women, and children, who, thanks to the tireless efforts of the staff, volunteers, and supporters of the Houston Food Bank are granted some security in their uncertain worlds.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud to mention the Houston Food Bank's programs for children. Of the 80,000 individuals that the food bank feeds each week, about 44% are children. Children who are hungry cannot concentrate in school; they will not have the energy to play sports or enjoy other activities with their peers. They are also more prone to illnesses and other health issues. With these unfortunate facts in mind, the Houston Food Bank has developed the Kid's Café program, one of the nation's largest nutrition education programs, providing children with the nourishment they may not get at home. Through the collaboration of local chefs, dietitians, students and volunteers, Kid's Café is able to provide 500 kids each month with nutritious meals in safe surroundings. The program goes on to emphasize food safety, nutrition education, and hands-on instruction, helping to instill in these children the skills and knowledge they need to create healthy lifestyles.

The Houston Food Bank also touches the lives of needy children through the Backpack Buddy Club. Because many hungry children receive meager or no meals on weekends, the Houston Food Bank has implemented a program to give children backpacks, filled with food that is child-friendly, nonperishable, easily consumed and vitamin fortified, every Friday in participating schools. This program ensures that local children can receive proper nutrition even on days that they are not in the classroom.

In addition to these two programs, the Houston Food Bank operates a number of other initiatives designed to provide nutrition education, outreach, and job training to the local community. These programs are crucial to the development of positive nutrition habits, and they speak to the very real long-term needs of the community.

The Houston Food Bank has also proven its leadership in disaster relief, successfully accommodating the sharp increases in demand following the catastrophic Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Since September 2005, volunteers

traveling from as far away as Hawaii have distributed nearly 9 million pounds of food in disaster relief. The Houston Food Bank successfully provided relief to hurricane evacuees displaced from their homes, their belongings, and their livelihoods. Organizations like the Houston Food Bank have been a crucial aspect of ensuring that hurricane victims have felt welcome and well-treated in Houston.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Brian Greene, the President and CEO of the Houston Food Bank, together with the Board of Directors, the staff, the many dedicated volunteers, and all other supporters of the Houston Food Bank. These individuals are making a profound impact in their local community, and they are changing the worlds of thousands of hungry children. I thank you for your service to our community and your compassion to your fellow humans, and I wish you every success in future endeavors.

□ 2130

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

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

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

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

IMMIGRANT SOLDIERS

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I stand here today to honor the contribution of immigrants that have been made to our Nation, particularly defending our Nation in support of comprehensive immigration reform.

We need effective legislation that strikes the right balance between national security and reforming our current immigration system. This should include a path to permanency for millions of law abiding and tax paying immigrants who call the United States their home.

It's my hope that the Senate finalizes debating their immigration reform bill, and that our Chamber continues to work to adopt legislation that will truly reform the system and enhance our Nation's security.

Immigrant families are an important part of our social fabric and our economy. Undocumented workers, you may not know, contribute as much as $7 billion a year in Social Security into our system and $1.5 billion in Medicare every year, yet do not collect those benefits.

Immigrants, you may know, play an important role in defending our Nation. In all of our wars throughout our history, immigrants have fought side by side and have given their lives to defending America's freedoms and ideals.

Twenty percent of the recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest honor that our Nation bestows on our war heroes, has been granted to sons and daughters of immigrants. Their bravery is proof that immigrants are as willing as any other Americans to defend our country's freedom, and their service is no less important and valuable because of their immigrant status.

For example, as of May 2006, 33,449 noncitizens served in our Armed Forces, and more than 26,000 servicemembers have become U.S. citizens since the Iraq war began, and 75 servicemembers received posthumous citizenship.

Immigrants make up 5 percent of all enlisted personnel on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces, and immigrants continue to demonstrate that they are a part of this country through their service in the military.

Without the contribution of immigrants the military, as we know it today, could not meet its own recruiting goals. Without the assistance of immigrants, the military could not fill the need for foreign language translators, interpreters and cultural experts.

Immigrants provide unique incredibly valuable contributions to the military, and it's critical that we continue to recognize and appreciate their efforts and that of their families.

In the district I represent in California, we've unfortunately suffered several casualties, including that of immigrant servicemembers who gave their lives for our country. One is the fallen Marine Lance Corporal Francisco Martinez Flores who died while serving overseas in Iraq. At the age of 21, and only 2 weeks away from gaining U.S. citizenship, Francisco was killed in the line of duty. He was one of thousands of lawful permanent residents who have volunteered their service to protect the United States by joining the U.S. military.

On April 2003, Francisco was granted posthumous U.S. citizenship and Congress honored his memory by passing a bill that I authored to celebrate his life in the City of Duarte by naming a Post Office after him.

But in 2003, Sergeant Atanacio Haro-Marin, from the City of Baldwin Park, from my district from California also died in Iraq. He came under heavy enemy fire. This young man was born in Zacatecas, Mexico and moved to Los Angeles at 2 years of age. He'll be remembered as a proud and courageous soldier who was living out a long held dream of serving in the U.S. military and will be honored by having a Post Office named after him in the City of Baldwin Park.

The sacrifices that my constituents made inspired me to pursue legislation to help other legal permanent residents who risk their lives every day and die protecting our country's liberties and values, achieve the dream of becoming a citizen.

And in 2003, I introduced the Naturalization and Family Protection for Military Members Act. The bill, which was included in the Department of Defense Authorization Conference Report, was signed into law, and recognizes the enormous contributions of immigrants in the military by providing them with easier access to naturalization and immediate family immigration protections for those killed in action.

It is a tribute to them and their families and all veterans for the enormous sacrifices they've made so we and others around the world can live in freedom.

I'm proud today to tell you that I support our military men and women, and especially those that continue to serve us that are legal permanent residents. We need to see an immigration reform program come forward that is comprehensive, and salute soldiers such as this who have given their ultimate sacrifice for our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, as I do most Tuesday evenings, on behalf of the 43-member strong, fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. Some people may say, what's the Blue Dog Coalition and what's it all about?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're a group of fiscally conservative Democrats that are trying to restore fiscal discipline and common sense to our Nation's government. We're a group of conservative Democrats that were founded back in 1994 after the Republicans took control of the Congress. And at the time, it was a group that felt like they were being choked blue by the extremes of both parties. And today, we believe that we are in the middle, which is where we believe the majority of the people in America are.

We talk a lot about fiscal discipline. We talk a lot about accountability, because it is important, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress and this administration is responsible and accountable for how your tax money is being spent.

As you walk the halls of Congress, it is not difficult to know when you're walking by the office of a fellow Blue Dog Member, a fellow fiscally conservative, common-sense Democrat, because you will see this poster that says

the Blue Dog Coalition, and it reminds Members of Congress and the constituents, the citizens of America who walk the halls of Congress that today the U.S. national debt is $8,831,299,779,793. Again, 8,831,299,779,793. That's a big number. But if you were to divide that by every man, woman and child living in America today, including those born today, every one of us, our share of the national debt is $29,242. It's what those of us in the Blue Dog Coalition refer to as the debt tax, D-E-B-T tax. And that is one tax that cannot be cut and that cannot go away until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

So for the past 6 years we've seen record deficit after record deficit, which has resulted in this record debt. Now that the Democrats have a majority in this Congress, we, as members of the Blue Dog Coalition, are trying to put our Nation's fiscal house back in order. We are trying to restore fiscal sanity to our Nation's government. We are trying to restore common sense to our Nation's government.

As a small child growing up, I always heard it was the Democrats that spent the money, and it was the Republicans that balanced the budget. And after 6 years of the Republicans controlling the White House, House and Senate, what did they leave us? They left us the largest debt ever, ever in our Nation's history and they gave us record deficit after record deficit.

When I first came here in 2001, the first bill I filed as a Member of Congress was a bill to tell the politicians in Washington to keep their hands off the Social Security Trust Fund. Republican leadership refused to give me a hearing or a vote on that bill and now we know why, because they have continued to raid the Social Security Trust Fund to fund tax cuts for folks earning over $400,000 a year, and they have continued to pass record deficit after record deficit and leaving our children and grandchildren with the bill.

The total national debt from 1789 to 2000 was $5.67 trillion. But by 2010, the total national debt will have increased to $10.88 trillion. Mr. Speaker, this is a doubling, a doubling of the 211-year debt in just 10 years. Interest payments on this debt are one of the fastest growing parts of the Federal budget, and the debt tax, D-E-B-T is one that cannot be repealed until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order and return to the days of a balanced budget.

At the Ross household in Prescott, Arkansas, my wife makes sure that we live within our budget. And I can assure you that most of the people in America live within their budget. Small businesses, big businesses, the majority of businesses in America live within their budget. Farm families live within their budget, and I don't believe it's asking too much to ask our Nation to do what 49 States are doing, and that's living within their means, requiring a balanced budget.

Why do deficits matter? Deficits reduce economic growth. They burden our children and grandchildren with liabilities.

They increase our reliance on foreign lenders who now own 40 percent of our debt. Let me repeat that. They increase our reliance on foreign lenders who now own 40 percent of our debt. The U.S. is becoming increasingly dependent on foreign lenders. Foreign lenders currently hold a total of about $2.199 trillion of our public debt. Compare this to only $623.3 billion in foreign holdings in 1993.

Who are they? Our Nation continues to borrow money not only from the Social Security Trust Fund, but under the past 6 years of Republican rule, not only have they borrowed money from the Social Security Trust Fund, with absolutely no provision made on how it's going to be paid back or when it's going to be paid back, but they've also borrowed money from foreign central banks and foreign investors.

And much like David Letterman, we have a top 10 list. The top 10 current lenders, countries loaning money to the United States of America that, for the past 6 years, under these failed policies of the Republican leadership, have given tax cuts to people earning over $400,000 a year leaving the rest of us to foot the bill.

□ 2145

So who are they? Rounding out the list, number one, Japan, our Nation has borrowed $637.4 billion from Japan; China, $346.5 billion; the United Kingdom, $223.5 billion; OPEC, imagine that, $97.1 billion; Korea, $67.7 billion; Taiwan, $63.2 billion; the Caribbean Banking Centers, $63.6 billion; Hong Kong, $51 billion; Germany, $52.1 billion.

And rounding out the top 10 countries that lend money to the United States of America to help us pay off these massive debts: Mexico. That is right. The United States of America has borrowed $38.2 billion from foreign central banks and foreign lenders in Mexico to fund tax cuts in this country for folks earning over $400,000 a year.

Record deficit after record deficit equals what? The largest debt ever in our Nation's history: $8,831,299,779,793. That is right. Today, the U.S. national debt, $8,831,299,779,793 and some change, but we ran out of room on our poster.

Well, as I mentioned earlier, another reason deficits should matter is because interest payments on the debt are one of the fastest-growing parts of the Federal budget. In fact, our Nation is spending about a half billion dollars a day, that is with a ''b.'' Our Nation is spending about a half billion dollars a day paying interest on the national debt. And that, Mr. Speaker, is before we borrow an additional billion dollars every day. And that is money that cannot go to education, to homeland security, to veterans' benefits, to build highways and roads, that can create jobs and economic opportunities, because it is going to pay interest on the national debt. It is going to pay interest to Japan, China, United Kingdom, OPEC, Korea, Taiwan, Caribbean Banking Centers, Hong Kong, Germany, and Mexico.

In my district, I represent about half of Arkansas, 29 counties. About 13 of them are in the delta region, one of the poorest regions in our country. A lot of hope in that region that I–69 will some day bring jobs and economic opportunities. I–69 was announced 5 years before I was born in Indianapolis; and with the exception of 40 miles in Kentucky and the section they are now building from Memphis to the casinos, there has not been any of it completed in 50 years south of Indianapolis.

We need about $1.6 billion to complete Interstate 69 across my district in Arkansas. That is a lot of money. At least for a country boy from Prescott, Arkansas, that is a lot of money. But, Mr. Speaker, we will spend more money paying interest on the national debt in the next 4 days than it would take to build I–69 across the delta region of my district, the delta region of this country, creating jobs and economic opportunities for generations to come. That is on the eastern side of my district bordering Mississippi.

On the western side of my district, bordering Texas and Louisiana to the south and also Oklahoma to the west, there is a lot of hope for the completion of Interstate 49. It will be the first north-south corridor through the middle of our country. We need about $2 billion to complete Interstate 49. They have been talking about it since I was a small child. About $2 billion is needed to complete Interstate 49. A lot of money. But, again, we will spend more money paying interest on the national debt in the next 4 days than it would take to complete I–49 across Arkansas.

There are a lot of people that would like to see U.S. Highway 82 four-laned across Arkansas from Texas to Mississippi. It is the only section of U.S. Highway 82 that is not four-laned. I don't know. It would take $3 or $4 million to do it. We will spend more money paying interest on the national debt today than it would take to four-lane U.S. Highway 82.

Interstate 530 is under construction in my district. We need $300 million to complete it. It will connect I–30 and I–40 in Little Rock and Pine Bluff with someday I–69 between Monticello and Warren, Arkansas, and eventually, hopefully, find its way to connect with I–20 in Louisiana at Bastrop, Louisiana. We need, depending on what section of it you want to complete, between $300 million and $800 million to complete that highway. A lot of money. But, again, we will spend more money paying interest on the national debt in the next 2 days than it would take to complete this interstate, creating jobs and economic opportunities.

If you think back with me, the last two Presidents to make any significant

investment in our Nation's infrastructure was Roosevelt with the WPA program and Eisenhower with the interstate program. It is time that we invest in this Nation's infrastructure. We can create jobs and put people to work to build this Nation's infrastructure; and, once it is completed, it will create economic opportunities and jobs for many generations to come. But as long as we are spending half a billion dollars a day paying interest on the national debt and borrowing another billion dollars each day from places like Japan and China and Mexico, we will continue to neglect our Nation's infrastructure. And that is one reason why it is important that we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Let me tell you another reason that interest payments on our national debt do matter, and this chart makes it crystal clear. In the red, Mr. Speaker, you will see the amount of money that we spend each year paying interest on the national debt. That is the red bar. Contrast that to what we spend on education.

We say we love our children. We talk about how we want to ensure that they receive a world-class education. We talk about making college education more affordable for our young people. We talk about giving 3- and 4-year-olds a fighting chance, and we should.

We live among the freest of all people in the world. One of the few things in life we do not get to choose is who our parents are. Some children get really lucky; some don't. I did, and I can tell you that as an American citizen and as a Member of this House I believe that we have a duty and an obligation to be there for all of God's children. We can invest a little bit in them at an early age and have a good chance at turning a lot of children that have been neglected at home into productive, taxpaying adults. Or we can continue to neglect them and do what? Spend tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of dollars warehousing them for a lifetime behind bars. I believe that we should commit ourselves to education.

But look at the light blue bar. Look at how much we are spending on our children's education compared to the red bar, how much we are spending simply paying interest on the national debt.

Homeland security, a lot of talk these days about homeland security. But look how much we are really putting into homeland security. Again, the red bar demonstrates the amount of money that we are spending of your tax money, Mr. Speaker, paying interest on the national debt. Contrast that to the light green bar, which demonstrates how much money we are spending protecting our homeland.

And, finally, and very sad, the dark blue bar, look at the amount of money we are spending on our veterans, on our veterans. And we all know that we have got a new generation of veterans coming home from places like Iraq and Afghanistan. Contrast the dark blue box, the amount of money we are spending taking care of our veterans, keeping our promises to our veterans, ensuring that they receive health care, compare how much we are spending on our veterans to how much we spend paying interest on the national debt. And I believe that chart very clearly demonstrates why deficits matter, why debts matter, and why the 43 members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition are committed to commonsense principles that will help get this Nation's fiscal house back in order.

One of the new Members of Congress and new member of the Blue Dog Coalition is my good friend from Indiana, Mr. JOE DONNELLY. At this time, I yield to him and thank him for joining me this evening.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you, Mr. ROSS. It is a privilege.

And as you look at that chart and you see the indicator of how many of our veterans are waiting for service, waiting for care, when we are spending $300 billion, Mr. ROSS, on interest payments and on the veterans approximately $25 billion, I have the privilege of being on the Veterans Affairs Committee, and we have crying needs in almost every part of this country.

We were blessed in my home area just this past week. We were able to announce that there will be a new veterans' clinic opening in approximately 8 months in Elkhart County, Indiana. But, Mr. ROSS, we need so many more. There is a need in the southern part of my congressional district down around Cass County and Fulton County, but we have to plan so carefully because our financial needs require that we spend $300 billion on paying down interest.

Mr. ROSS, I ask you to think of what we could do for veterans, opening new clinics and new hospitals, if just a small portion of those funds could be used instead of paying down a national debt that has exploded over the last years.

Mr. ROSS. The gentleman is correct. I mean, we talk a good game when it comes to our veterans, but then we saw the truth about what was really going on at Walter Reed. And tomorrow there will be a hearing with the Armed Services Committee that is a follow-up to a series that NBC News did about whether or not our men and women in uniform are really getting access to the very best body armor on the market today.

I don't care who makes it. I don't care where it comes from. I would prefer for it to come from America. I believe that is important. But if our Nation is going to continue to send $12 million an hour, $12 million an hour of your tax money to Iraq, I believe it is time to tell the Pentagon and this administration and the Iraqis that it is time for them to be accountable for how this money is being spent. And part of that is ensuring that our brave and dedicated men and women in uniform and, yes, my brother-in-law is in his 18th year in the Air Force, and I am very proud of him. My first cousin is in the Army and getting ready to go back to Iraq for a second time.

We all have been affected by this war. We all know someone who has been to Iraq. Unfortunately, too many of us know people who have been injured or have died; and I question this government on how many of those deaths and life-changing injuries could have been avoidable had we ensured that our men and women in uniform were properly equipped.

So this hearing tomorrow is going to be about body armor. And, again, I don't care who makes it. I don't care where it comes from. I want it to come from America. But just because our men and women were receiving the very best body armor when the war began in 2003 does not necessarily mean that in 2007 that that is still the very best body armor on the market.

And John Grant, I want to thank John Grant from Pearcy, Arkansas, in Garland County, the father of a soldier in the 39th Brigade of the Arkansas National Guard. His son has been to Iraq once. You know the deal with the Guard. You are supposed to go once every 5 years, but the President did that waiver thing, and now they are headed back again.

□ 2200

They haven't even been home 3 years. It is my understanding that by Christmas, or shortly thereafter, they will be back for a second tour of duty. These are not full-time military, these are members of the Arkansas National Guard, 39th. John Grant wants to ensure that his son and all soldiers, not just the 39th, but all soldiers in Iraq are receiving the very best body armor possible.

This hearing tomorrow before the Armed Services Committee tomorrow will be very important. I am committed, as are some 42 Members of Congress that signed a letter with me to the Pentagon, in ensuring that our brave men and women in uniform are provided the very best in equipment and the very best in body armor so that we can ensure their safe return.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. We, in my hometown of South Bend, just this past weekend, last Saturday, sent off 175 young men and women who will be going over to serve in Iraq, and again, a number of them on their second tour of duty. The best, the bravest, the finest you could ever see. I want to make sure that they have the finest body armor that they could possibly have; the best vehicle protection that they could have; the best equipment; the best training. All of that costs funds. We want to make sure those funds are there, and we will.

But think, Mr. ROSS, of $300 billion just to pay down a debt that never should have been run up in the first

place. Those Guardsmen, as they were leaving, I was telling them all good luck, Godspeed. And they said, sir, it's our privilege to serve this country. It is a right that we look at and cherish, and it is a great honor for us to have this opportunity. Well, our obligation is to make sure they have everything they need. As you said, there is a hearing tomorrow on body armor.

I have been fortunate enough over the last few months to have gone to Walter Reed Army Hospital on a number of occasions. I went through Building 18. I saw the holes in the ceiling; I saw the mold on the wall; I saw the wallpaper peeled off and hanging down. I saw plastic buckets along the floor because the roof was leaking in a United States medical facility, an outpatient housing center. And living in there were our brave Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who had been wounded and come back, and what they received when they came back was a room with a leaking roof, with mold. This facility is being closed in 2011, but part of the concern is do we have enough funds to cover everything? And here we are sending $300 billion a year to the Chinese, to the Japanese, to the Mexicans because they are holding our paper.

Our obligation is to clean up this mess. That is what we are trying to do with PAYGO and similar systems that the Blue Dogs have sponsored and have brought to the floor of this House. So, I am proud to be an Indiana Blue Dog, along with my fellow Hoosier Blue Dog, BRAD ELLSWORTH of Evansville, BARON HILL of the Ninth District, along with my 40 other colleagues. And I know we are hoping next week to add approximately five more. We will continue to try to bring common-sense, moderate policies, not partisan fights, to this country so we can restore sanity back to the operations of this country again.

I yield to my good friend, Mr. ROSS.

Mr. ROSS. Well, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) for his insight and for his work on the Veterans Committee, among others. We appreciate what he's doing there to try to help our veterans and our men and women in uniform.

These are examples of why it is important that we get our Nation's fiscal house in order. As long as we've got record debt after record debt and record deficit after record deficit that the Republicans have given us, and we can't turn this thing around overnight, but we've got a budget that's going to put us back in balance by 2012, perhaps sooner. That is important if we are going to meet America's priorities, improving our infrastructure, improving and making health care more affordable and more accessible, funding education at the level it deserves to ensure our children receive a world-class education, keeping our homeland safe, making homeland security a lot more than just a buzz word. Let's put our money where our mouth is and ensure that every American citizen in this country is safe from terrorists. And of course, making sure that our veterans have the health care and have the things they need and were promised for their service to our country.

A lot of talk about Iraq. If you ask a hundred different people what they think about this Iraq policy, you get about a hundred different answers. I can tell you one of the things that the Blue Dog Coalition is united on is demanding accountability for how your tax money, Mr. Speaker, is being spent in Iraq. Now, for the last 4 years, if you had questioned the funding in Iraq, the President would tell you you're unpatriotic. Well, members of the Blue Dog Coalition are now standing up and saying enough is enough, and we demand accountability for how your tax money, Mr. Speaker, is being spent in Iraq.

What are the Iraqis doing with your tax money, some $12 million an hour? Is enough of it going to protect our men and women in uniform? Is enough of it going to provide them the most advanced body armor on the market today? Well, we all know that waste, fraud and abuse of taxpayer dollars has happened in the Iraq war. In fact, over the past several years, media and government reports have detailed examples of the abuse of taxpayer dollars in the government's funding of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. As recently as April of this year, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, has released reports detailing examples of how long-standing problems with the management of government contracts, yes, government contracts, continue to provide opportunities for fraud, waste and abuse in the funding of the war in Iraq. Specifically, the GAO identifies the following major factors contributing to the mismanagement of contracts and ultimate waste of taxpayer dollars.

Number one, military commanders and senior officials at the Department of Defense do not have visibility over contractors, which prevents the Department of Defense from knowing the extent to which it is relying on contractors for support in Iraq. Also, the Department of Defense lacks clear guidance and leadership for managing and overseeing contractors. The Department of Defense personnel lack the most basic ability to make sure that government contractors even provide the services they are being paid to provide. The report finds that the Department of Defense's limited visibility has unnecessarily increased contracting costs to the Federal Government and introduced unnecessary risk.

For example, one Army official estimates that about $43 million, $43 million is lost each year on free meals provided to contractors' employees at deployed locations who also receive a per diem, food allowance. Additionally, the GAO found that the Department of Defense and its contractors all too often do not have a clear understanding of reconstruction objectives and how they translate into the terms and conditions of a contract. As a result, at least $1.8 billion of taxpayer money has been obligated on contracts without Department of Defense and the contractors reaching an agreement on the final scope and cost of the work.

The report gives one particularly shocking example of this, where the government allocated $84 million for an oil mission and never agreed upon the final terms of the task order until more than a year after the contractor completed the work. The GAO estimates that the United States has obligated about $14 billion to restore essential services such as oil, electricity and water, and more than $15 billion to train, equip and sustain Iraqi Security Forces. However, the Iraqi government continues to be fraught with corruption, operating ineffectively and inadequately resourced accountability institutions.

U.S. officials estimate that a shocking 20 to 30 percent of the Iraqi Ministry of Interior personnel are ''ghost employees,'' nonexistent staff paid salaries with your tax money, Mr. Speaker, that are collected by other corrupt officials in Iraq.

The GAO also highlights in its report the weaknesses in the $15.4 billion program to support the development of Iraqi security forces. Consequently, poor security conditions have hindered the management of the more than $29 billion that has been obligated for reconstruction and stabilization efforts since 2003. Additional government and media reports have exposed equally as outrageous examples of waste, fraud and abuse in the funding of the war in Iraq. Is this $12 million an hour we are sending to the Iraqis being used to protect and equip our brave men and women in uniform?

One such report details an instance where U.S. administrators could not account for $20.5 million in development funds for Iraq grants. Another government report exposed a situation where $7.3 million was mismanaged, and $1.3 million entirely wasted during construction of a police academy in Iraq. The Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction just recently released its quarterly report to Congress. As in previous reports, this most recent one again describes continued abuses in the government's funding of the war in Iraq. And we are going to go into more of this in just a little bit. We are going to provide specific examples of what was contained in that report.

But at this time I want to yield to my fellow Blue Dog, a new Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, a veteran of the Iraq war, a captain that served in Iraq, and that is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Congressman ROSS.

Last month, the Blue Dogs joined a wide bipartisan margin of our colleagues in passing the National Defense Authorization Act. This bill funds defense spending at a level 10 percent

higher than in 2007. It also calls for a much needed pay raise for our troops, and a benefit boost to spouses who had to face the worst news of all.

The other thing this bill does is it institutes some much needed accountability into the management of the war in Iraq. We owe special thanks to Chairman IKE SKELTON, and to our fellow Blue Dogs who worked so hard to introduce this long overdue accountability and fiscal discipline over Iraq war operations.

Mr. Speaker, report after report has shown that billions of dollars have vanished, and thousands upon thousands of weapons have gone missing. And until recently, there have been no tough questions and no accountability. With this bill, we said that it will no longer be acceptable for blatant mismanagement to take place when our soldiers' lives are on the line.

As a former soldier who fought in Iraq, it makes me very proud to be able to fight for accountability and oversight in Iraq and to demand answers here at home. It is astonishing to me that until now no one has tried to establish a clear sense of which American agency carries out contracts in Iraq. I assure you, to our troops in harm's way, missing money and missing weapons translate into increased danger. It is that simple. Having these rules and procedures in place will be very important to our troops.

This is a war that is perhaps different than any other; there is no front line. The enemy doesn't belong to a single country. They don't wear a uniform. And they are willing to sacrifice themselves and even their children to kill Americans.

Understanding the rules of engagement and knowing exactly who is on the ground and what they are allowed to do will be vitally important in keeping American service men and women safe.

The accountability provisions also establish a database so that everyone knows which American agency is servicing a contract. These provisions that all of us fought for and Chairman SKELTON thought were worth including in the defense bill will establish the necessary oversight and fiscal discipline we have needed for a long time in Iraq.

□ 2215

Clear rules and accountability are vital to winning the war on terror. It has been more than 4 years since we invaded Iraq and since President Bush declared ''mission accomplished,'' and yet our troops are still refereeing a religious civil war, while too many Iraqis continue to sit on the sidelines.

While Iraq continues to smolder, Osama bin Laden, the murderer of more than 3,000 innocent Americans, is still at large. President Bush, when asked recently why bin Laden hadn't been brought to justice yet, said, ''Why is he still at large? Because we haven't got him yet. That is why. And he is hiding, and we are looking, and we will continue to look until we bring him to justice.'' That is unacceptable.

Meanwhile, the Taliban is resurgent in Afghanistan, and American commanders on the ground there are asking for more troops to fight terror, hunt down al Qaeda and kill Osama bin Laden.

We need to win the war on terror, and that means being successful in Afghanistan. Our troops over there are doing an amazing job and they deserve our continued support. It is getting harder for them, especially along the border of Afghanistan and Pakistan and some of the areas where we believe bin Laden is still at large.

Mr. Speaker, when I was elected, I said that we need to be tough and smart in fighting the war on terror, and I also promised to ask the tough questions of this administration. One question that needs to be asked is about Pakistan President Musharraf. Right now we can count President Musharraf as an ally, but is he doing all he can to hunt bin Laden? We need to jump-start this debate, because we cannot afford to let a mass murderer slip through our fingers again.

The U.S. has sent $5.6 billion in military reimbursements to Pakistan for counterterrorism efforts. That is $80 million per month. Just as we demanded accountability in Iraq, we have some benchmarks and goals for this funding as well.

In the early days in the war in Afghanistan, President Bush decided to outsource the hunt for bin Laden in Tora Bora, and he escaped. Now we need to examine are we relying too much on Pakistan and their accord with tribal warlords near the Afghan border for the same reason? Why is the United States continuing to make large payments, roughly $1 billion per year, to Pakistan, even though Pakistan decided to slash patrols through the area where al Qaeda and the Taliban fighters are the most active?

Why, as Senator REID said, are we not paying for specific objectives, rather than reimbursing Pakistan for their efforts?

Is it true, as two American analysts and one American soldier reported, that Pakistani Security Forces fired in direct support of Taliban ground attacks on an Afghan army post?

Blue Dogs have a long tack record of asking the tough questions and demanding accountability. I hope over the coming weeks and months this Congress gets answers to these vital questions, so we can effectively prosecute the war on terror.

Blue Dog Democrats know how to win the war on terror, and part of that is by demanding results after more than 4 years in Iraq and nearly 6 years in Afghanistan. We cannot let Afghanistan become the forgotten war. We cannot stop asking the tough questions and demanding answers from this administration. Our troops are fighting bravely over there and they need all the help we can give them.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY, an Iraq war veteran, for his insight and leadership within the Blue Dogs and within this Congress on restoring accountability, on how our tax money is being spent in Iraq, and ensuring that it is being spent to protect our men and women in uniform.

The gentleman raised an interesting point. We are in year five of this thing now, and a recent survey indicated that 71 percent of the Iraqi people don't want us there. In fact, 60 percent of them think it is okay to kill a U.S. soldier. You contrast that with Afghanistan, where 80 percent of them are glad we are there. The last time I checked, Osama bin Laden was spotted closer to Afghanistan than he was to Iraq.

So, while we continue, and I think this is just me personally, I think we have got to demand more from the Iraqi government to train Iraqis to be on the front lines, providing the police and military force for them in this civil war.

This line that it is better to fight the terrorists there than here, I don't buy that. If there are some 10 to 14 to 20 million illegal immigrants in this country, do you think we only allowed illegal immigrants into this country? Terrorists are already here in America, and that is why we need to do more to protect our homeland by properly funding the Department of Homeland Security. That is why we need to demand more of the Iraqis and to do more in Afghanistan, that is becoming more and more neglected every day.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting over Memorial Day weekend, I was back home and went to a Memorial Day service in Rolling Prairie, Indiana, which is in LaPorte County, a beautiful county right next door to where I live, and some of the World War II veterans said to me, ''You know, Joe, when we went to war, everyone sacrificed. We were all in this together.''

Then I was fortunate enough a few days later to read a book called ''The Price of Liberty'' by Robert Hormats. This book explained a simple factor, that in this war we have been asked to go shopping, while the military sacrifices every day and their families sacrifice every day.

Mr. Speaker, what was pointed out in the book is that this is the first war in history where at a time we were going to war, we also decided to cut taxes and increase other spending, and this formula has resulted in explosive deficits.

My good friend from Arkansas, next to him is a poster detailing the cost of Operation Iraqi Freedom, close to $400 million, heading to $500 billion. When this was first discussed, the Office of Management and Budget some years ago said the top cost we would have was $50 billion to $60 billion. We were told, my dear friend from Arkansas,

that the oil revenues would cover all the costs.

Look where we are some years later. There has been an air of unreality from the start in facing up to the fact that, in the past, all Americans sacrificed together. And instead of sacrificing, we borrowed the money from the Chinese, we borrowed the money from the Mexican government, we borrowed the money from the Japanese government.

My good friends throughout my district, the veterans in Cass County and in Carroll County, would roll their eyes if they knew that we were funding our war by borrowing money from the Chinese. They would say, ''Joe, how crazy is this? How does this make any sense at all?'' And the answer is, it doesn't.

Instead of looking each other square in the eye and saying we have obligations, we have responsibilities, we have a sense of shared sacrifice, this administration has told us we can take a pass. Well, my good friend, we cannot take a pass, and the policy of cutting taxes and increasing spending on other government programs while funding this war continues on, the hole gets bigger, and the burden we are passing on to our children grows every day.

So I yield back to my good friend from Arkansas, with the hope that at some point we will understand that we are all in this together and that not all the burden should be placed on our military families.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana, a fellow Blue Dog Member, Mr. DONNELLY, for his insight, and invite him to continue to stay with us for the remaining 15 minutes or so we have got here this Tuesday evening on the House floor to talk about accountability, on how your tax money, some $12 million an hour of your tax money being spent to Iraq is being spent.

You can see the cost of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Starting in 2001–2002, $2.5 billion; $51 billion in 2003; $77.3 billion in 2004; $87.3 billion in 2005; $100.4 billion in 2006; and $60 billion in 2007. That was before the supplemental that we passed about a week ago which was about $100 billion. So we are actually up to about $160 billion for 2007, which brings this number not to nearly $400 billion, but to now nearly $500 billion, nearly half a trillion dollars.

Now, I promised to show a few of the examples of the waste, fraud and abuse of taxpayer dollars that was detailed in the report from Iraq.

Number one, of 150 primary healthcare centers that were originally planned to be built, only 15 have been completed. Of those 15, only eight are currently open to the public. In addition, eight primary healthcare centers have stopped work altogether.

Number two: The U.S. Agency for International Development Office of Transition Initiatives was supported by $350 million to focus on democracy building, human rights, civic programs and investigations of crimes against humanity. However, USAID could not determine whether the intended outputs of the 4,789 grants under this contract were even accomplished because of ''insufficient documentation.''

Number three: The report also found water damage in one healthcare facility that caused bathroom floor tiles to break and ceilings in lower floors to leak and collapse, increasing the health risk to patients.

Number four: A shortage of sinks and toilets combined with workmanship deficiencies, inferior materials and insufficient maintenance, caused significant deterioration to the barracks at one military base, a facility which cost our government $119.5 million.

The report also details construction and equipment installation at the Iraq Civil Defense Headquarters that did not comply with the international standards required by the contract and task order. This particular project cost the Federal Government, our government, our tax money, Mr. Speaker, some $3 million. We will come back to this in a little bit.

Number six: At the Baghdad International Airport, an enhancement project costing the Federal Government $11.8 million required the installation of 17 new generator sets. However, when the airport was recently inspected, 10 of the 17 generator sets were not even operational.

And the list goes on and on. We will come back to it.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arkansas, and point out when I was in an earlier deployment before Iraq, I was in Bosnia in 2002. Our soldiers on the ground there would often call the contractors Kellogg Brown & Root ''Kellogg Brown & Loot,'' because of the looting, of what they were doing to their own country when it comes to our fiscal dollars. And I am not trying to be cute or funny. That is a sad commentary on what is really going on over there in these deployments.

Mr. Speaker, when I heard my colleague, Mr. DONNELLY, here from the great State of Indiana, and I know he went to the University of Notre Dame, I was with a colleague of mine on the phone yesterday. I was driving back from a memorial service for Private First Class Bobby Dembowski, who was a paratrooper in the 82nd Airborne Division who was killed recently in Iraq. He was from Bucks County, in my district.

When I was driving back from his memorial service yesterday with a heavy heart, I called my buddy, who is also a University of Notre Dame graduate, Captain Kobe Langley. I called Kobe, Mr. Speaker, and I said to him, ''Kobe, I am coming back.'' He said, ''How are you doing, Murph?'' I said, ''Kobe, not too good. I am coming back from another memorial service for one of our heroes that gave the ultimate sacrifice.'' He said, ''Well, you got to keep fighting. You got to keep doing what you are doing.''

□ 2230

He asked, What was the press conference you gave the other day?

I said I was standing up to this administration. I have the great honor of serving on the Armed Services Committee. I know my colleague and my fellow Blue Dog Representative DONNELLY serves on the Veterans Affairs Committee. We were both cosigners for House Resolution 162 because we want to hold this administration accountable when the Armed Services Committee says our troops deserve a 3.5 percent pay increase and there is already a wide gap between military pay and civilian pay.

The people who join the military are not trying to get rich. But if you are a private in Iraq, I don't think making $18,000 a year is too much to ask for. We were trying to give those privates and everyone across the board a 3.5 percent pay increase to lessen that gap. President Bush in writing said a 3.5 percent pay increase for our troops is, I quote, ''unnecessary.'' Unnecessary. A private first class making $18,000 a year in Iraq is unnecessary. It is too much money to ask for.

So this House bill in which the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. DONNELLY cosponsored says a sense of the Congress is it should be a 3.5 percent pay increase. We support the troops and understand their sacrifice. We can find the money through PAYGO rules which the Blue Dogs believe in. As the gentleman from Arkansas says, $9 trillion is what we owe in debt.

So my daughter Maggie, who is home with my beautiful wife, when my daughter was born in Lower Bucks Hospital 6 months ago, she was born $29,000 in debt, a debt that we all owe combined, every man, woman and child, $9 trillion.

Some folks, when I am meeting folks in my district, they would say, Patrick, we are at war. Of course, it is going to cost money. I tell them this Iraq war has cost $450 billion, now up to maybe $500 billion. We owe $9 trillion to Communist China, to Mexico and to Japan. In March, 2007, the interest that we pay on that debt was $21 billion.

Now I know those folks at home who believe in what the Blue Dog Democrats believe in, of fiscal responsibility, of accountability. They say to themselves, wow, Congressman MURPHY, $21 billion just in interest.

When I tell them how I used to be an educator at West Point and how we need to be more and more competitive in a global economy, I show them the numbers, we only spent $5 billion in education in March, 2007, yet $21 billion on the interest rate and the debt that we owe that we continue to rack up and rack up.

Finally, the Blue Dogs are taking such an incredible leadership role, establishing a PAYGO system and doing

the things necessary to put our fiscal house back in order.

Mr. Speaker, I know you cannot speak, but I know you are a Blue Dog, and I am proud that you are up there; and, Mr. ROSS, I am proud you are one of our leaders of the Blue Dog Coalition. I am also proud of the freshmen Blue Dogs that I serve with, because we will demand answers and we will demand accountability of this administration and the next administration, hopefully a Democratic one, to make sure that we continue the progress that we are making in this 110th Congress.

Mr. ROSS. I thank Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania for joining us this evening and for helping write House Resolution 97, providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom Cost Accountability. We are not just talking about this. We are trying to do something about it.

In fact, some of these key provisions were included in the defense authorization bill, and we want to thank Chairman SKELTON and members of Armed Services for doing that.

It does four things. It calls for transparency on how Iraq war funds are spent. It calls for the creation of a Truman-like commission to investigate the awarding of contracts. It provides a need to fund the Iraq war through the normal appropriations process and not through the so-called emergency ''let's hide the real cost of the war'' supplementals. And, finally, it encourages the use of American resources to improve Iraqi assumption of internal policing operations. In other words, put Iraqis on the front line and get our soldiers off the front line and provide our soldiers to train their soldiers so they can fight their own civil war.

I yield to Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. DONNELLY. I know we are starting to run short on time, so I just want to sum up what I have been thinking and saying here tonight with this: How far have we gone askew? How confused have we become with this administration when a 3.5 percent pay raise is unnecessary, but we lose $12 billion in Iraq that there is no trace of, that was loaded onto skids into an airplane and can't even be found. But we can't give a 3.5 percent pay raise to the best, the bravest, the finest who have ever served this country.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. ROSS, that's part of the reason we need this Iraq War Accountability Act, just one of the many glaring things, but I leave that with the American people and let them know these Blue Dogs are on the hunt to get that fixed.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his insight and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any comments, questions or concerns, you can e-mail us at BlueDog@mail.house.gov. That is BlueDog@mail.house.gov.

I am talking about House Resolution 97, providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom Cost Accountability. We are not just talking about a problem. We are trying to fix the problem. There are only 43 of us in the Blue Dogs, a group of conservative Democrats, and yet we already have 63 cosponsors on this bill.

House Resolution 97 also calls for the Iraqi government and its people to progress towards full responsibility for internally policing their own country.

Recently, members of the Blue Dog Coalition worked together with House Armed Services Committee Chairman, IKE SKELTON, to include key provisions of House Resolution 97 in the fiscal year 2008 National Defense Authorization bill. With the passage of this bill, we took the first step towards ensuring complete fiscal transparency in the funding of the war in Iraq.

The American people deserve to know that their tax dollars are being spent wisely and that our troops have the resources they need to succeed. The Blue Dogs are committed to passing legislation that accomplishes this goal.

Members of the Blue Dog Coalition also believe strongly that funding requests for the Iraq war should come through the normal appropriations process, as I mentioned earlier. Since 2003, the Republican-held Congress has been funding the war through emergency supplemental requests, two of them in 2003, another one in 2004 and 2005 and 2006 and 2007. It is time we stop hiding the cost of this war. We demand fiscal accountability in Iraq.

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my leadership for the opportunity once again to come to the floor and to shed a little light. Tonight, we are going to shed a little truth on some of the messages that we have heard just now and maybe previously here in Washington.

This is another edition of The Official Truth Squad. The Official Truth Squad is a group of Republicans who desire to make certain that some sense of factual information is provided, Mr. Speaker, as we talk about the issues that are dealt with on the floor of this House.

We have a favorite, a number of favorite quotes. One of them is from Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Senator Moynihan said, everyone is entitled to their own opinion but not to their own facts.

Mr. Speaker, it is curious to hear my friends on the other side of the aisle and their righteous indignation, the righteous indignation that they have about so many various things, particularly tonight when they talked about spending and funding the troops.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is curious because the bill that this House passed under the leadership on the other side, the majority party leadership, just 2 weeks ago, I know you will find this amazing, but that is a bill that could have been passed the first or second week of January of this year to appropriately fund the troops who are standing in harm's way, who are defending our liberty and our freedom and attempting to carry out what they believe, we believe, to be a role that will result in a more safe and secure Middle East and a more safe and secure United States of America.

That bill was held up literally for 5 months because of political posturing and gamesmanship and all sorts of things that, frankly, Mr. Speaker, Americans are tired of. They are tired of it.

We all got back in Washington from a week at home. Most of us went home to our districts. It is good to go home and hear what people are really thinking. The folks in my district on the northern side of Atlanta, they are mad as can be about the partisan games that are played here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to bring a little truth and light and fact to many different areas. But I think it is important for everybody to appreciate, especially in this body, that the bill that was passed to appropriately fund the troops, 2 weeks ago we passed that bill, that is a bill that could have been passed by virtually every single positive vote in this House the first or second week of January had our good friends, the Blue Dogs and others, not participated in the kind of gamesmanship that the American people are, frankly, tired of.

I want to talk a little bit about the fiscal house being put back in order. Our good friends on the other side of the aisle talked about putting the, quote, ''fiscal house back in order'' which is why the Blue Dogs felt that they increased their numbers and assisted the election of the majority.

I think it is curious when they talk about putting the fiscal house of this Nation back in order. Because if you look at the truth, if you look at facts, if you listen to facts and not just opinion, Mr. Speaker, you will appreciate I know that what has happened over the first, a little over 5 months of this new Congress under new leadership is that we have seen an increased authorization for over $50 billion in new spending. So are they putting the fiscal house back in order by decreasing spending? No. Over $50 billion in new spending authorized by this new majority with the Blue Dogs supporting virtually every one of those bills.

So they must be then decreasing taxes, right, Mr. Speaker, in order to put the fiscal house back in order. Well, no, they are not doing that either. Because the budget that they adopted, this Democrat majority with I think the unanimous support of the Blue Dogs on the other side of the aisle, the budget that they adopted, over $400 billion in new taxes for the American people. It is the largest tax increase in the history of the Nation. I guess that they would argue that is putting this fiscal house back in order.

Well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it has many folks at home asking me if the Blue Dogs are not just lap dogs and if they are not just kowtowing to the Democratic leadership and doing what they are told to do, as opposed to being fiscally responsible. Which is what so many of us on our side of the aisle are working so hard to do.

So things are a little curious, which is why I think it is important to bring some truth and facts to the debate and the discussion.

We had some curious things happen on the floor of the House today, Mr. Speaker. I know that you were as puzzled as I at some of the events that occurred yesterday. There was an indictment that was passed down in a court that indicted a Member of Congress, a Member of the House of Representatives. They indicted him I think on 16 counts. So the new majority party came to the floor of the House today, having known about the problem that this individual has had for years, literally. They came to the floor of the House today and they were stumbling over themselves to get to the microphone and to the floor as fast as they could to address this issue that could have been addressed long ago, and passed a resolution that said that anybody who had any criminal charge against them as a Member of Congress, a Member of the House, or any indictment would be referred to the Ethics Committee.

□ 2245

That may be appropriate. It passed by a wide margin. I was pleased to support it. I think the process was flawed. It didn't go through the regular committee process and, consequently, was a pretty poorly written bill, but it moves us in a little bit of the right direction.

In that whole process of talking about it on the floor of the House this afternoon and evening, the majority leader said something to the effect of anyone accused of wrongdoing needs to be investigated. Any Member of the House who is accused of wrongdoing needs to be investigated, which brings up, Mr. Speaker, the whole issue of earmarks, of special projects.

That's what I'd like to spend a little time talking about this evening, the whole issue of pork projects, special projects, earmarks, things that have inflated our budget to a huge degree and things that, frankly, ought not be included in the vast majority of bills, and if they are, they ought to have the greatest amount of scrutiny by both sides of the aisle, Members from both sides, and certainly greatest amount of scrutiny from our constituents, from people all across this Nation, and a great amount of scrutiny from the press.

That's what we call sunshine. That's what I call sunshine for earmarks, and it's an important thing. And the majority party made a huge deal as they ran for office last fall about the importance of spending restraint and getting the fiscal house in order, as it were, although we haven't seen a whole lot of that since they took over, but they made a huge point about controlling earmarks and putting a lid on earmarks and special projects.

And this past week, we've heard a lot about it, but what has happened is that things have actually gotten worse. Mr. Speaker, I know it's hard to believe, but they have actually gotten worse. And there are a number of people who believe that and a number of objective individuals. Again, facts will back up this case.

There was a letter written by the minority leader to the Speaker recently in which he said, We now have reached the point at which the congressional earmark process has become less transparent and less accountable than it was during the 109th Congress, directly violating pledges made last year by Democratic leaders.

That goes a long way. I tell you that's a major statement, less transparent, meaning not the kind of sunshine, and less accountable so that who knows where these projects are coming from. How are the people, how are the American citizens, supposed to hold their Member accountable if, in fact, they're doing what they don't believe they ought to do?

It has gotten so bad that a Member of even the Democrat majority has said, A lot of Democrats believe it's our turn at the trough. Quite a statement, Mr. Speaker. A lot of Democrats believe it's our turn at the trough. That's a fact that that was indeed said, and in fact, it's distressing because it appears to be that that's the fact of action on the part of this new majority.

Now, what did they do in fact? I have coined it Orwellian democracy because so often what has happened with this new majority is that they have said the right thing, they said they were going to do something, and then in fact either done exactly the opposite or ignored what they said they were going to do.

Well, what do I mean by that, Mr. Speaker? I have in my hand here the book of rules of the House of Representatives. It's a pretty dry read, but it's got some important points in it, and these are the rules by which the House operates and by which we supposedly make certain that individual Members of this House are held accountable for their actions.

One part of the rules talks about congressional earmarks. What's an earmark? How do you determine what an earmark is? How do you determine what a special project is? It's important to know that so you can say, yeah, that ought to be subject to a certain amount of scrutiny, hopefully more scrutiny, a certain amount of sunshine, that the individual Member of Congress ought to have to stand up and say that's my project, I support that project, I'm interested in having us spend Federal taxpayer money on that project.

So what's the definition of a congressional earmark? Well, in House rule XXI, subclause 9(d) it says, congressional earmark means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Member providing, authorizing or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority or other expenditure targeted to a specific State, locality, or congressional district other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process.

Now, what does that mean? That means that if an individual Member of Congress says I believe that certain Federal tax dollars, hard-earned taxpayer dollars ought to go for a specific project in my district for a specific purpose, and it's not part of any other authorization that the Federal Government has for another role or another aspect of its responsibility, it's something that a specific Member requests, that's a congressional earmark.

Now, how do you make certain that there's appropriate accountability for that? Well, Mr. Speaker, another portion of the rules it says that a list of those earmarks have to be in any bill that has an earmark, and the list has to include the Member's name who requested it. That's an important point because that allows for the sunshine. That makes it so that all Members of this body know who's requested that. It makes it so that the press know who's requested it and they can follow up on it and do investigations if they deem it to be appropriate. It's necessary so that constituents, people out across America, can know who's requesting these things.

And it goes on to say that if a list isn't included, the way that you can follow the rules as well is that a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks may suffice. So, if the bill actually contained no earmarks, then all that it took was the chairman of the committee to write a statement to the Speaker and to the Rules Committee that, in fact, the bill contained no earmarks, no special projects.

Now, one of the reasons that I've dubbed this the new Orwellian majority and Orwellian democracy is that what we've seen is that multiple bills, Mr. Speaker, multiple bills have come to the floor of the House with special project after special project after special project, millions and sometimes billions of dollars, and yet what is included in the report language from the committee is the sentence from the chairman that no congressional earmarks are in the bill, in spite of the fact that they're in the bill. That's why I call it Orwellian democracy because it just simply takes the chairman, an individual, to say, well, there aren't any earmarks in there, and so it satisfies the rule.

Now, I went to the parliamentarian on this because I couldn't believe it. I

said, Do you mean to tell me that if the chairman of the committee just says, regardless of its truth, just says there are no earmarks in this bill that that satisfies, that means there are no earmarks, even if there are? And the parliamentarian said absolutely correct, absolutely.

And so the only option that we have is to come to the floor and say, look, what they've said just isn't the truth. Remember, it's an opinion. It's not a fact. And the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that time after time this new majority has brought bill after bill to the floor with earmarks and special project after special project after special project and simply gotten around the rules because they say, oh, no, there's no earmarks here.

Let me give you a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker, because I know people would be interested in looking at that. Members of the House, if they're interested, H.R. 1100 was a bill that we voted on just a couple of weeks ago. The whole legislation really was one big earmark with a $7 million estimate cost by CBO over a number of years, and it specifically dealt with one congressional district, one specific project, and it did not have any other statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process. The whole thing was an earmark, but it had in the language of the report from the committee, no earmarks here, no earmarks here. Mr. Speaker, that emperor has no clothes I promise you.

H.J. Res. 20 was the continuing resolution to make certain that there was the money in place to continue the Federal Government's responsible activities. What did that have? Multiple earmarks, multiple. Millions and millions of dollars of earmarks, and in fact, got around the rule by just saying, oh, there are no earmarks here, there are no earmarks here. Orwellian democracy, Mr. Speaker.

And then most recently, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill had billions, billions of dollars in special projects, and in fact, all that was done in order to comply with the rules of the House was to have one of the chairmen of the committee say, oh, no, there are no earmarks here.

It reminds one of the Wizard of Oz, you know, where the wizard says, oh, don't pay any attention to that man behind that curtain. Well, that's kind of what the majority party is asking; don't pay attention to these earmarks even though we say there are none.

So what's the solution now? They have taken a lot of heat, this majority party has taken a lot of heat for trying to put these special projects, pork projects into bills. And so what's their solution? Well, they have come up with a solution.

Before we talk about that solution, it's important to remember what they promised. What did this new majority promise? And what they said was, We're going to adopt rules that make the system of legislation transparent so that we don't legislate in the dark of night and the public and other Members can see what's being done. We need to have earmarks subject to more debate. That's what debate and public awareness is all about. Democracy works if people know what's going on. That was Majority Leader HOYER last fall after the election. That's what he said about the earmark process.

And the now-Speaker said about a year ago, It's the special interest earmarks that are ones that go in there in the dark of night. They don't want anybody to see, and that nobody does see and then they're voted upon. So transparency, yes, by all means, let's subject them all to the scrutiny that they deserve and let them compete for the dollar. That's now-Speaker PELOSI. That's the statement that she made just a little over a year ago.

What's happened? What's the reality, Mr. Speaker? What's the facts, not the opinion, not the Orwellian democracy of, oh, there aren't any earmarks in that bill, don't bother looking because there aren't any earmarks in that bill? But what's the facts?

The fact is that after promising this unprecedented openness regarding Congress' pork barrel practices, what the majority party, the House Democrats, have done, they've moved in exactly the opposite direction. As they draw up spending bills, the new appropriations bills are coming on line for this new budget year, they're side-stepping the rules approved on the very first day that they took power in January where they said we need to identify earmarks. Remember those rules, Mr. Speaker, where you had to have a list of earmarks? You had to have the individual that requested them? Had to make certain that there was sunshine?

Rather than including specific pet projects or grants or contracts in the legislation as it's written, this is what's new, Mr. Speaker. Democrats are following an order by House Appropriations Committee Chairman to keep the bills free of such earmarks until it's too late in the process to challenge them. Too late in the process to challenge them. Phenomenal, absolutely phenomenal.

Associated Press writer Andrew Taylor said just 2 days ago, After promising unprecedented openness regarding Congress' pork barrel practices, House Democrats are moving in the opposite direction.

From an article by Andrew Taylor, the Associated Press of January 3, Representative DAVID OBEY, who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, says that those requests for dams, community grants and research contracts for favored universities or hospitals will be added spending measures in the fall. That's when the House and the Senate negotiators assemble their final bill. So, as a result, most lawmakers will not get the chance to oppose or even identify specific projects as wasteful or questionable when the spending bills for various agencies get their first vote in the full House this month.

So what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker, is that instead of this wonderful transparency, instead of the sunshine, all the accountability that this new majority talked about, in fact what they're doing is going way back, way back to an old time long, long ago when these special projects were put in late at night with nobody watching, no ability to gain accountability for it, no ability to see what's happening, no opportunity for average Members of this House of Representatives to see and appreciate what's happening in terms of spending in the appropriations bills as they go forward.

The House-Senate compromise bills due for final action in September cannot be amended, and it's extremely pivotal because you can't say, well, this is a project that we ought to have more discussion on, more debate on. So it can't be amended and they're only subject to 1 hour of debate.

□ 2300

It's not just those of us who believe in sunshine for earmarks, something that I have fought for a number of years. It's not just those of us in the House of Representatives who are concerned. Tom Shatz, the President of Citizens Against Government Waste says, ''Who appointed him judge and jury of earmarks? What that does is leave out the public's input.''

The article from Mr. TAYLOR goes on to say what Mr. OBEY is doing runs counter to new rules. The Democrats promised they would make such spending decisions more open. Those rules made it clear that projects earmarked for Federal dollars and their sponsors were to be made available to public scrutiny when appropriations bills are debated. The rules also require lawmakers requesting such projects to provide a written explanation describing their request in a letter certifying that they or their spouse wouldn't make any financial gain from them.

So it's important to appreciate what is happening with this new Orwellian democracy, Orwellian majority, is that what we are seeing is them saying one thing and then doing something exactly the opposite.

Again, it's not just those of us on this side of the aisle who believe that and have documented that. This is an article from the St. Petersburg Times that explains in an editorial, ''The new game that House Appropriations Chairman DAVID OBEY intends to play with budget earmarks this year is worse than the usual hide-and-seek. He's taken the whole thing underground, as though he is to be trusted as a one-man auditor for congressional pork. If this is to be the new ethic the Democrats promised, voters might want to get their ballots back.''

Something that I have talked about, the American people are paying attention, they are watching, and they are disappointed with what they see. This

new majority talked about taking the Nation in a new direction. They have taken it in a new direction, and it has been exactly backwards, backwards to a time, as documented or given the opinion by the St. Petersburg Times. It's worse than what has happened in the past.

The Las Vegas Review Journal notes that it didn't take long for Democrats to break their promise on earmark reform. ''When Democrats took control of Congress 4 months back, incoming House Speaker NANCY PELOSI bragged that it would take her party less than 100 hours to curb wasteful pork spending by requiring Members to attach their names to their earmarks, exposing such waste to the harsh light of public scrutiny. She failed to mention this reform would remain in effect for little more than the 100 days.''

Didn't even last that long, because, as we have documented already, what has taken place is this process of bypassing or skirting the rules by saying, oh, no, there is no earmarks there, when, in fact, there is a laundry list as long as your arm in there. That's the fact. That's the fact of the matter.

So while Democrats plot to hide their wasteful spending from the American people, our side, House Republicans, will continue to work to make the earmark process much more transparent and more accountable; and we will work to root out that wasteful spending and balance the budget without raising taxes, without raising taxes, which is so remarkably important.

I mentioned that I was home last week, many of us were home in our districts last week. That's what I heard, that individuals all across my district that I talked to have been concerned about spending. Over and over and over they said, we know that you can balance that budget without increasing spending and without increasing taxes.

So when our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about getting the fiscal House in order, yet they authorize more spending and they increase in their budget taxes by over $400 billion, the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation, my folks, the folks in my district at home say, well, that just doesn't wash. That's not the kind of leadership we want.

So that new direction, those ballots that that editorial talked about, folks getting back, may, in fact, need to occur. And it's a wonderful thing to be able to have accountability for Members of Congress every 2 years. I believe firmly that the American people are, indeed, watching; and they are already tired of what they see on the part of this new majority, especially in the area of earmark reform.

I have been joined by a very good friend from Arizona, who truly is the champion of earmark reform, a fellow who has worked tirelessly in his time in Congress to bring light and shed light on the egregious activity that occurs here in the special project. I am so pleased to have my good friend join me, Mr. FLAKE from Arizona. I look forward to your comments.

Mr. FLAKE. I appreciate you taking the time to bring this important issue to light.

I am the first to admit that our party didn't handle this issue very well. We went over about a decade or 12 years, depending on how you count them, from about 1,400 earmarks in all appropriation bills to more than 15,000. So the process exploded with Republicans in charge. That doesn't speak well for us as a party. We should not have let that happen.

I think right here near the end we woke up, and we passed some legislation in October of last year. Unfortunately, I think it was near the end of the appropriation process, when it was really too late to do any good.

The Democrats, to their credit, when they came into power in January of this year, passed a little stronger legislation than I think we did, and I think I and many of my colleagues gave them credit for that. It was a good thing to add more transparency to the earmark process.

The problem, as the gentleman from Georgia has so aptly pointed out, is that the rules that we set are only as good as our willingness to enforce them. So you can have pretty good rules with regard to earmark reform, with regard to transparency, but unless you are willing to enforce them, they are of little worth.

As the gentleman pointed out, when you have rules that allow the chairman of the committee to simply make a declaration that there are no earmarks in this bill, when there clearly are, we have no recourse. We have to accept that statement as if it were fact, when it clearly isn't.

The gentleman mentioned the war supplemental that came up. We actually had an example where there was a press release of one Member actually claiming credit for an earmark that had been received for that Members' district, put out a press release touting it. Yet, for that same bill, there was a statement in the RECORD saying there are no earmarks in this bill.

So, the gentleman mentioned, it was like a fairy tale. I think it's a lot like Alice in Wonderland, where you say a word has whatever meaning I give to it; and, in this case, you know, an earmark is whatever I pretend to call it. Unfortunately, that doesn't lend itself to transparency.

We have the situation now, which is far worse than anything we have heard before, that we won't have any earmarks in the House bills, but, rather, we will wait until the House bill is done, the Senate bill is done. Then the earmarks will be airdropped into the conference report.

Now, if that is the case, there is no way for any Member of this body to challenge any of those earmarks that come up. There is no way you can amend, because you can't do that to a conference report. You have to ask yourself, is that more transparency? Is that a better process?

The Chairman of the Appropriations Committee stated that more time was needed to actually scrub these earmarks, to make sure that they are proper, and that the committee was undertaking to do that.

I think, and I think those who have been watching this process will agree, that the best way to scrub the process is to let sunlight in to allow these earmarks to be made known, to allow the media, the blogging community out there, organizations that follow this and other Members of this body, to actually see these earmarks and to judge them and to determine who is it going to, who is going to benefit from this earmark?

If we are really concerned about scrubbing these earmarks, to make sure that they are proper, then let people know about them. Nobody is served well if they are kept secret.

So I commend the gentleman again for bringing this important issue to light. I would encourage him to keep up this battle and to make sure that earmarks get the sunlight that they deserve. If we want to really curb this practice that has gotten out of control, we need to ensure that we have more sunlight, not less.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much for your comments and for your good work on this matter. It's an issue that really strikes a chord, because it gets to the heart of irresponsible activity and irresponsible spending here in Washington.

So many of our friends back at home just are tired of it. They are tired of it. I think that's the message this they sent in November. I think that's the message that they sent. It wasn't some of the things that our good friends on the other side of the aisle, the message that they were sending. The message that they were sending is be responsible about your spending.

I will bet that if you had a referendum last November and you asked every single voter who went to the polls, would you think it would be a better idea to hide from the American people the special project spending that goes on in Congress to a greater degree than currently exists, yes or no, I bet you couldn't find a soul in this Nation that would support that.

Mr. FLAKE. Most certainly, I think across the country the taxpayers want to know what is going on. I think that they look at the process that we have now where Members will submit requests, earmark requests, but those requests are only made public if their earmark is actually part of a bill that comes to the House.

Now, under this new procedure that has been announced by the majority, those earmark letters, which indicate who the earmark is to go to, won't be made public at all until it's too late in the process to actually challenge that earmark.

So it means little to go through the process that we have set up if, by the

time it has any effect, it's too late in the process to change.

So the gentleman is correct, I think. Across the country, that's what I hear when I am out there. People want to know. They want open government.

When you think about it, every second that this Chamber is in session is captured on C–SPAN, this conversation and every other conversation, whenever this body is in session. When we are in committee, every word that is said is transcribed and is captured. So we have an open process.

Yet when it comes to spending money, we have a very secretive process in terms of earmarks, where, according to the majority this year, we won't know it all until it's too late to actually change it, until we have to just do one up and down, up or down vote on a bill.

There are several bills in the past, in fact, one bill, the highway bill a couple of years ago, that had 6,300 earmarks in the bill. You could conceivably have that again. At least, you know, virtually every appropriation bill is up somewhere approaching 1,000 or maybe 2,500. So, think of that, 2,500 earmarks in a single bill. The Members here won't even have the ability to challenge one of those, won't even know that they are there until you have to have to take one up or down vote on that legislation. I think every American knows that that simply is wrong.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That really brings to light the issue of accountability, what your constituents want. I know what my constituents want me to do is to make certain that I am paying attention to all of these items and that I raise questions about items that I believe they would not support.

Sometimes just a question of clarification, I have been so pleased to be able to support you in many of your efforts to shed light on so many earmarks that have been brought to the floor, and maybe you wouldn't mind sharing with our colleagues the process that that takes and how to get just one vote on a specific earmark and how this process would foil all of that and make it so that there would be no transparency at all.

Mr. FLAKE. Over the appropriation process last summer, I believe we brought 39 earmarks in several appropriation bills to the floor; and my effort was, in many cases, simply to see whose earmark this was and to have that Member actually justify the need for that earmark.

We simply didn't know who requested it. We saw it in the committee report. When the bill came to the floor, it would generally be a vague description of an earmark to a certain entity or a company. But you wouldn't know who actually sponsored the earmark until you challenged it on the floor. Then, typically, the author of that earmark would come to defend it, but not always.

I should mention that many of the earmarks that were challenged on the floor in the last appropriation cycle, the author of the earmark never even came to the floor to defend it. He or she simply knew that, through the process of log rolling, that other Members would know I won't challenge that earmark and the author of that earmark won't challenge mine.

So it was a very disheartening process to go through. But at least we could go through that process. At least we knew something about what was in the bill, because we had the reports come to the floor. Under the process that has been announced, we wouldn't even have that ability.

□ 2315

These bills would come to the floor, there would be no earmark, there would be no letters attached saying there are this many earmarks. There would be no lists listing the Members who had requested earmarks. Nothing. We would simply have to wait until it was too late in the process to actually challenge until the earmarks were air dropped into the conference report. So it's an important distinction.

I think the process has been far too secretive in the past. We would typically only get these lists in the committee reports hours before the bill actually came to the floor. But that's miles better than what is being discussed now because these earmarks would not be made known at all until it's too late. They would be kept secret from the body as a whole, and from the taxpayers across the country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank you again for your comments.

And I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, for our colleagues to appreciate that this is a proposed process that is being put in place by the majority party to correct what they have perceived as a lack of transparency and a lack of accountability. But their solution will result in less accountability and less transparency. And as I mentioned before, I don't think that's what the American people want. It certainly isn't what my constituents want, and it's not what you fought for for years and years to have greater transparency and greater accountability to the whole special project earmarking process.

Does the gentleman have any more comments?

Mr. FLAKE. Well, I just again thank the gentleman. And just to reiterate again, we have had a bad process. We recognize that. That was the reason for the reforms that we did in the fall of last year. And as I mentioned, I applauded the Democrats for the reforms that they put in place in January. The problem is we're running away from those reforms rather fast. And if we are really serious about bringing in sunlight and transparency, then we have to stop this proposed new rule, or this proposed process I should say, it's not a formal rule, to make sure that these earmarks get the sunlight that they deserve, that every member of this body and every taxpayer across the country has a chance to see what this body is doing. That's what open government is all about. And I, again, thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so very much. I appreciate you coming and joining us this evening.

So folks say well, what is it that you're asking for? Well I've talked about American values and American vision. And what we believe, what I believe Americans are asking for in this instance is open and honest leadership. It's what we oftentimes here in Washington give lip service to. But the fact of the matter is that the American people desire and I believe are demanding open and honest leadership. I believe, we believe that they have a right to transparent and fair legislative process. And the process that has been described for dealing with these earmarks, these special projects, these pork projects is neither transparent nor is it fair because it puts, it's not transparent because there's no light on it. There's no sunlight. There's no ability for, as my good friend from Arizona said, there's no ability for anybody to know who's asking for these earmarks during the process. And then there's no way for the House to work its will on an individual special project as to vote them up or down. Maybe thousands, literally thousands of them included in a particular bill. So that's not a transparent process. It's not a fair process because it concentrates power into the hands of too few individuals, the chairman of Appropriations or the subcommittee chairmen on Appropriations.

We believe that Americans have a right to sunshine on how taxpayer money is spent. That again gets to the transparency. You ought to shed light on it. How does this process work? Who's asking for the money? And so that they have to stand up and defend it in front of their constituents, in front of their colleagues and in front of the media, in front of the press.

And finally, that Americans have a right to merit based spending that's open to the public debate and open to public scrutiny.

Those are principles that I believe, we believe incorporate American values and an American vision that individuals all across this Nation have as the kind of vision for their government, how they believe their government ought to act.

Again, in November, if one had asked on everybody's ballot across this Nation, do you think that there ought to be less transparency, that there ought to be less accountability for special projects in Congress, Mr. Speaker, I'll bet you wouldn't have got 1 percent of the people across this Nation to vote in favor of that. Not one. So what we're asking for is accountability, is transparency.

I think it's also important, again, to appreciate that there are others across

this Nation who are concerned and dismayed by this process proposal that's been put forward by the new majority party. And I'd just like to highlight some of them, because I think it's important for folks to appreciate that this isn't just your usual political backbiting. This is serious business. This is how we're spending hard earned American taxpayer money. And the proposal is such that I believe, we believe, that it would be much less responsible, certainly much less transparent and much less accountable, and there are folks who believe that all across this Nation.

As I mentioned, the editorial in the St. Petersburg Times, one of the lines there said, ''The result then is that the earmark projects will receive almost no public scrutiny and no Congressional debate.'' Significant, major paper in an editorial today.

The Review Journal in Las Vegas, the Las Vegas Review Journal said, ''Democrat earmark reforms lasted 100 days. When Democrats took control of Congress just 4 months back, incoming House Speaker NANCY PELOSI of California bragged that it would take her party less than 100 hours to curb wasteful pork spending by requiring Members to attach their names to their earmarks exposing such waste to the harsh light of public scrutiny. She failed to mention that this reform would remain in effect for little more than 100 days. The anti-earmark reforms are just for show, mere window dressing.'' That's the Las Vegas Review and Journal from an editorial today.

There is a gentleman on CNN, Mr. Cafferty, Jack Cafferty, who has had a lot to say about Washington spending. Yesterday he said, ''Remember when the Democrats took control of the Congress back in January? On their very first day in power they approved rules to clearly identify so-called pet projects or earmarks in spending bills. You know, part of their promise to bring openness and transparency to government. Well, guess what? The Associated Press reports Democrats are not including the spending requests in legislation as it's being written. Instead they're following an order from the House Appropriations Committee Chairman David Obey to keep the bills free of these earmarks until the fall. Now, by doing this, nobody will know what the earmarks are when the bills are first voted on in June. And when they're finally announced in the fall, well, then it will be virtually too late to do anything about them. Clever, don't you think?'' That comes from CNN's Jack Cafferty, June 4, yesterday.

And so it's people all across this Nation who are concerned about the process that's been defined. The Toledo Blade, newspaper in Toledo, Ohio, in an editorial a little over a week ago, said, ''Backtracking on earmarks. Here's the outrage of the week from Washington. Democrats who took control of Congress by pledging reform and whacking Republicans over the issue of special interest earmarks already are perpetuating this odious waste of taxpayer money. Democrats promised to end such abuses. Now that they are in charge, they should live up to their rhetoric.'' That's an editorial in the Toledo Blade a little over a week ago.

From Montana, the Missoulian in Montana said, ''Congressional pork too tasty to leave alone. Congress is ignoring election promises and feasting on pork projects. What's on the menu on Capital Hill these days? Pork of course. Not that we're surprised, but we're scratching our heads given the promises and pronouncements of the last election season. In their first half year in office, the newly powerful House Democrats have seemingly lost their reformist zeal.'' Editorial from the Missoulian Montana this May 31 of this year.

How about Pennsylvania? Reading, Pennsylvania, the Reading Eagle in Pennsylvania said, ''Democratic vows remain unfulfilled. They can talk the talk but they seem to have difficulty walking the walk. As the approval ratings of Republicans plummeted prior to last November's general election, Democrats saw their chance to regain Congressional control. Representative NANCY PELOSI, who was soon to become Speaker of the House, said, 'We pledge to make this the most honest, ethical and open Congress in history.' That pledge,'' this is now from the Reading Eagle, from Reading, Pennsylvania. ''That pledge was broken in March when democratic leaders pushed through a $124 billion emergency supplemental bill to fund the military in Iraq and Afghanistan that was laden with $21 billion in pork barrel spending known as earmarks. A House rule instituted by Democrats that prohibits swapping earmarks for votes also seems to have fallen by the wayside.''

In fact, that brings up a specific point that is of grave concern to many of us. We highlighted on our side of the aisle a member of the Appropriations Committee who challenged and literally threatened a Member of the minority party, Republican Member, with saying that if he didn't support a certain bill, a certain provision, that his earmarks would be pulled from the appropriations bill. And it happened on the floor of the House. Many people witnessed it. And what did the new majority, when that was brought to light, what did they do with that complaint, with that concern, with that issue?

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know, and you remember, they moved to table the motion, the resolution that would have simply required an investigation of that process. And tabling, as you know, Mr. Speaker, means that it kills the issue. It's dead. So the majority party wielded their muscle and made certain that an individual who is in the majority, who is muscling another Member of the House of Representatives and threatening to withhold certain funds from a bill because he wouldn't support another provision, that will go uninvestigated. That will just be tossed under the rug, swept under the rug. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the kind of United States House of Representatives that Americans desire or that they deserve.

Further, a couple of others, Mr. Speaker, of objective individuals citing their concern about this new process for spending on the part of our new majority. CNN investigative reporter Drew Griffin said on May 25, ''The new open Democratic Party-controlled Congress promised the earmark process would no longer be secret. All earmark requests are made public with plenty of time for debate. But DAVID OBEY, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and one of those Democrats bragging about those changes, has decided that earmarks, those generous gifts of your money, will be inserted into bills only after the bill has cleared the House floor. In other words, earmarks will still be done in secret with no public debate. There was supposed to be some kind of change. In the next few months, in what Congressman OBEY says is the most open earmark process ever, the bills will be drafted, the earmarks added. But only then, just before those bills are passed, will the public learn where the treasure is buried.''

Mr. Speaker, that's not the kind of process that my constituents desire. That's not the kind of process that they voted for. It's not the kind of process that we've proposed. It's not the kind of process that is becoming of a House, especially when the majority party says that they are desirous of getting this fiscal house in order. It's more of that Orwellian democracy. Just because you say it doesn't make it so.

Associated Press on June 3 said, ''After promising unprecedented openness regarding Congress's pork barrel practices House Democrats are moving in the opposite direction as they draw up spending bills for the upcoming budget's year. Democrats are sidestepping rules approved their first day in power to clearly identify earmarks, lawmakers' requests for special projects, and contracts for their states in the documents that accompany spending bills.''

And finally, CNN's Drew Griffin said on May 31, ''Thousands of pages of earmarks in a bill time after time, and the Democrats promised reform and it's not happening.''

Mr. Speaker, what a shame. Truly what a shame. What a great opportunity we have to work together and fashion a system and a process that provides greater transparency, that provides greater openness, that answers the concerns of our constituents who say we want to make certain that there's sunshine on this process. We want to make certain that folks are held accountable. We want to make certain that our hard earned tax money that's going to Washington is

being spent in the most responsible fashion.

And so what is it that we desire? Open and honest leadership, Mr. Speaker. Americans have a right to transparent and fair legislative process. They have a right to sunshine on how taxpayer money is spent. They have a right to merit based spending that's open to public debate and to public scrutiny.

So I would ask my colleagues, I would challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to talk to their leadership, to implore them to urge them to move in the direction that they said they would move and that is greater transparency and greater openness and greater scrutiny of how these public monies are being spent.

□ 2330

So all is not lost. This is recoverable. I know that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said that it would be so, but this is a 435-Member body, and it ought to act in a majority fashion, and I am hopeful that at least some members of the majority party will see that that is not the kind of leadership and not the kind of process that their constituents desire.

Mr. Speaker, before I close this evening, I do want to touch on one other item very briefly, because I know that time is getting late, and that is the whole issue of taxes and spending.

As I mentioned, I was home this past week in the district over the Memorial Day break. And person after person, constituent after constituent kept coming up to me and talking about issue after issue, and one of the major issues was spending, spending in Washington, and taxes, making certain that tax money was being spent responsibly and that taxes didn't go up, which was why it was so concerning to them that this new majority has increased the authorization for spending already, in just 5 months, by over $50 billion; also why it was concerning to them that this new majority has passed a budget that incorporates $400 billion in new taxes. The largest tax increase in the history of the Nation, $400 billion. Phenomenal, absolutely phenomenal.

So when you think about how our economy has been relatively rolling along over the past number of months, over 16, 17, 18 quarters of growth in a row; more homeownership than ever before in the history of the Nation; the unemployment rate at its lowest continual rate in decades, lower than the average of the 1960s and the 1970s and the 1980s and the 1990s; remarkable success in terms of an economy that is performing extremely well, one would think that it would behoove the majority party to say, well, I wonder how that happened. I wonder how that economy got to be so strong.

There are issues and points in time that you can recognize and point to and say there were changes made then that resulted in a very strong economy, and one of them occurred in 2003. This graph highlights it. These are tax revenues coming into the Federal Government.

And, Mr. Speaker, as you know, between 2000 and 2003, Federal tax revenue was declining. We had been hit by some significant challenges, 9/11, a recession, the tech dot com boom burst, and so tax revenue was decreasing. So what happened in 2003, whatever this was, whatever happened on this vertical line here at that point in time, it resulted in significant increases to the Federal Government tax revenue because of a significant increase in the economy, a significant increase in productivity.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know, what happened at that time was that appropriate tax reductions were put in place. Fair tax cuts for the American people were put in place so that the marginal rates were decreased for everybody, so that there was a decrease in capital gains and dividends tax, a decrease over a period of time in the marriage penalty and the death penalty. All of those appropriate tax reductions were decreased.

Tax cuts result in more economic activity and more economic growth. It sounds counterintuitive, but, in fact, it happens every single time that you cut taxes. If you cut taxes, if you give the American people more of their hard-earned money, what they do is they determine when they save or they spend or they invest that money, and that results in a flourishing, increasing economic development and an increasing economic activity in our Nation, and it is undeniable what happened.

There is another graph that demonstrates it, that talks about jobs growth. Here you have a number of jobs created on the horizontal line from 2001 through 2007, and you see again, Mr. Speaker, before the appropriate tax reductions in 2003, what happened was a relative decrease in job growth, month after month after month after month. And what happened with the tax cuts on the American people, allowing people to keep more of their hard-earned tax money, what happens is an incredible increase in job growth, and that is why we have seen over 7 million new jobs created since August of 2003. Incredible economic activity.

So it astounds me that the majority party believes somehow that if they increase taxes, again by passing a budget that has the largest tax increase in the history of the Nation, nearly $400 billion in increased taxes to Americans, almost $2,700 for every single Georgian, a phenomenal increase in taxes, it is incomprehensible to try to understand why the majority party believes that that is the appropriate kind of policy to put in place if they want to continue this kind of activity.

If they wanted to continue this kind of activity, one would think that they would conclude appropriately, objectively, looking at the facts, that the appropriate tax reductions ought to continue. But what they have said is, no, they ought not continue, that those marginal rates ought to go up, that we ought to increase taxes on every single American who pays taxes, that we ought to increase the marriage penalty, that we ought to do away with the decreases in death tax, that we ought to have increases in taxes on capital gains and dividends and we ought to decrease the incentive for investment. It just doesn't make sense.

I know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are responsible. I know that they desire to do the right thing. I know that they have heard from their constituents back home, and I suspect what they have heard is please make certain that we continue an economy that allows our Nation to grow, that allows our Nation to defend itself, that allows our Nation to create jobs, that allows our communities to thrive. And one way to do that, one of the most effective ways to do that, is the way that it has happened every single time that it has been tried in our Nation's history, and that is to decrease taxes on the American people. Allow Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money. Allow them to be the ones who determine when they spend or they save or they invest their money.

So I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take a good look at what has happened. Take a good look at history. Take a good look at the remarkable economic growth and development that we have had across this Nation over the past 3 to 4 years. And I think what you will conclude, Mr. Speaker, is that those tax reductions ought to remain in place.

We live in an incredible Nation, a Nation that allows those of us who represent districts all across this Nation to come to the House of Representatives and to try our best as honestly and openly as we can to represent our constituents. It is a wonderful Nation. It is a beacon of hope and liberty for folks all around the world, and it is so because we are responsible when we act responsibly and we listen to our constituents and we decide issues based upon what their desires are and what is in the best interest of them and our Nation.

So I call on my colleagues to think seriously about the issues as they relate to taxes and economic development of our Nation. And I know that they will conclude what I have concluded; and that is decreasing taxes results in increasing economic development, increasing economic activity, and, amazingly enough, increasing revenue to the Federal Treasury.

GAS PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLSWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, schools will be letting out

soon, and American families will be hitting the road for their summer vacations. But how far will they get this year with sky-high prices at the pump?

The average price of regular gasoline is hovering near record highs, and this week stands at about $3.16 a gallon. This means American families are spending nearly $54 on average every time they fill up their tank, an astonishing $30 more per tank since President Bush took office.

According to the AAA, the typical American family is on course to spend over $3,600 this year just to fill up their cars if these prices persist. Gasoline prices set a new record of $3.22 a gallon on May 21, according to the AAA's fuel gauge report. Gasoline prices in 34 States broke record highs in the past month. Prices are expected to climb again as the summer driving season progresses.

Record high gas prices may not cause hardworking Americans to cancel vacation plans, but they are forcing families to cut back on other spending, putting our economic growth at risk.

Wherever I go Americans are asking, why are gas prices so high? Surprisingly, the answer is not because crude oil prices are higher than they were last year. According to the Department of Energy, the largest component of U.S. retail gasoline prices is the price of crude oil. What is unique about the current situation is that crude oil prices, the red line, are lower right now at the onset of the summer driving season than they were at this time last year. But, as we all know, gasoline prices, the blue line, are higher than they were this time last year.

The Department of Energy projects that crude oil prices will average $2 less per barrel this summer than last. But they also predict that gasoline will average about $2.95 a gallon this summer, up more than a dime from last summer's $2.84 a gallon on average. Analysts attribute this in large part to the fact that our refinery capacity has failed to keep pace with demand.

We haven't had a new refinery built in the United States in 30 years, pushing refineries to operate at capacity levels that are overtaxing the system. Refining costs account for about 22 percent of the retail price of gasoline, up from 15 percent in 2003.

With the increase in oil and gas prices over the last several years, refining margins are at historical highs. Refining profits in the first quarter of 2007 increased 36 percent over last year, and the U.S. refining margin increased to over $17 per barrel of refined oil.

High gas prices should be an incentive for expanding refining capacity, but instead of building new refineries the industry argues that it has focused on expanding and upgrading existing refineries to keep up with increased demand.

U.S. refining capacity has stayed relatively stable over the past few years, and that is the red bar here. But demand has steadily increased, and that is the blue bar. So capacity utilization has risen, regularly reaching levels above 90 to 95 percent of capacity throughout much of the 1990s and continuing into this decade.

The problems and risks associated with running near full capacity have become very apparent in recent months. As this chart shows, overtaxed refineries have required unplanned maintenance which has taken supply off line and caused short-term price spikes. Refiners typically perform planned maintenance during off-peak driving season, which impacts available stocks of gasoline when the demand is lower. But the increasing frequency of unplanned maintenance is cause for great concern. Unexpected refinery outages choke off supply and cause price spikes at the pump.

A recent spate of such unplanned outages in refineries across the country have made the price spikes a common occurrence and have kept gas prices in the headlines. BP, ConocoPhillips, and Valero Energy have all reported unexpected shutdowns at a number of U.S. refineries.

Oil companies certainly have the profits to invest in increased capacity, but they are not investing. With capacity as tight as it is, refiners can boost profits by taking capacity off line, particularly when there is a lack of competition at the refinery level. It is hard to prove that they are purposely limiting supply, but the risk of manipulating capacity to maximize profits is certainly greater with fewer players in the market.

□ 2345

Consumer advocates, such as the Consumer's Union Mark Cooper, argued that a lack of competition in the market has enabled oil companies to exploit the tight market they have created by purposefully uninvesting and mismanaging refinery maintenance.

With refining margins as high as they are, construction of a new refinery is not a losing proposition, particularly for profit-laden Big Oil companies. But ExxonMobil's CEO, Rex Tillerson, has indicated that he will not build a new refinery in the U.S., pointing to research that U.S. gasoline consumption will plateau in coming years as ethanol and energy efficiency measures become more prevalent.

The current runup in gas prices underscores the urgent need for a better national energy policy. But instead, we see stubborn inaction and complicity on the part of the administration. The Bush administration has turned a blind eye to oversight of the oil and gas industry in general, and especially with respect to mergers. Mergers in the gas and oil industry over the past decade have resulted in dangerously concentrated levels of ownership in the U.S. refining market, leaving us with only five major domestic oil companies controlling the majority of our domestic refining capacity.

The President has approved mergers at such a break-neck speed that by 2005, the top 10 refiners controlled 81 percent of the market, up from 56 percent since 1993. So it has jumped an astonishing amount. This concentration of refiners has restricted production capacity, causing American consumers to pay more at the pump than they would be with more market competition. The lack of competition is hurting consumers now and will hurt our economy in the future.

As a first step toward protecting consumers, the House passed the Energy Price Gouging Prevention Act just before the Memorial Day weekend. This legislation will provide relief to consumers by giving the Federal Trade Commission the authority to investigate and punish those who artificially inflate the price of energy. It would ensure the Federal Government has the tools it needs to adequately respond to energy emergencies and prohibit price gouging. With a priority on refineries and Big Oil companies, especially during a time of national crisis such as Hurricane Katrina, the Energy Price Gouging Prevention Act will provide the FTC with new authority to investigate and prosecute those that engage in predatory or unconscionable pricing from oil companies on down to local gas stations, with an emphasis on those who profit most. This includes the gouging of gasoline, home heating oil, propane or natural gas. It will enpower the Federal Government to impose tough civil penalties of up to triple damages of all excess profits from companies that have cheated consumers.

Until we have abundant renewable energy alternatives to benefit consumers, in the short term Congress must carefully look at the current market framework to see what can be done to improve competition in the marketplace. At the refinery level, Congress should look at strengthening antitrust laws, changing the way oil mergers are reviewed by U.S. antitrust agencies, cracking down on anticompetitive actions by oil companies, and/or improving price transparency at the wholesale level.

Mr. Speaker, high gas prices is an issue that has a supply side and a demand side, and we need to address both. Government leaders and businesses are recognizing the need to reduce our dependency on oil by making our vehicles more fuel efficient and investing in clean, renewable energy sources and technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I request additional time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker's policy of January 18, 2007 does not allow for an extension of the gentlewoman's time.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection.

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last month, it was announced in my home district that New York City cabs are going green,

as the Mayor plans to replace the city's fleet with hybrid cars by 2012.

The Joint Economic Committee recently released a report entitled, "Money in the Bank, Not in the Tank", which argues that we have to take the issue of improving fuel efficiency seriously.

America's cars were more efficient two decades ago when our fleet-wide average was 26.2 miles per gallon. Now, our fleet-wide average for cars and trucks has slipped to 25.4 miles per gallon. Clearly, we're going in the wrong direction.

And it's hurting our competitiveness—our nation ranks at the bottom of the list of industrialized nations when it comes to fuel efficiency.

In Europe, fuel efficiency averages around 40 miles per gallon and they're looking to raise it to 51 miles per gallon by 2012. Japan is trying to get to 50 miles per gallon by 2010 across their fleet.

If we raised CAFE standards to 35 miles a gallon from 27.5 miles per gallon, the average American family would reduce their spending on gas by nearly one-quarter.

With families on course to spend more than $3,600 on average filling up their cars this year, this would be a savings of $900 a year.

Despite major technology gains, especially hybrid technologies, and record-breaking gas prices, we are decades behind when it comes to making our cars more efficient.

More efficient cars mean American families spend less at the pump, we're less dependent on foreign oil, and our environment benefits from lower emissions.

The President's priority has been to give tax breaks to oil and gas companies even as their profits have soared to new heights. The big five oil companies enjoyed eye-popping profits of $120 billion last year.

Instead of using those profits to expand refining capacity or make serious investments in renewable energy, the big oil companies are buying back their own stock to enhance prices for their shareholders.

Moreover, oil companies seem to be working hard to prevent gasoline alternatives, such as ethanol-based products, from being pumped at their branded gas stations.

In our first 100 hours of work in the majority, the House voted to roll back $14 billion in taxpayer subsidies for Big Oil companies and reinvest that money here at home in clean alternative fuels, renewable energy and energy efficiency.

We have also passed a bill that encourages research and development of markets for biofuels.

Speaker PELOSI has created a Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming to develop policy initiatives and assure that progress is made toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

Democrats in Congress are working on legislation to protect consumers and increase our energy independence by investing in renewable energy sources and reducing global warming emissions.

We need this new direction for energy policy that brings relief to American families and strengthens our economy.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for 11 minutes?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight for what time is left to us to talk a little bit about health care. I do try to do that every week because this is such an important issue that faces our country, and over the next 18 to 24 months we are going to see perhaps some significant changes proposed and some, in fact, enacted in the Nation's health care system.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to draw your attention, today there was an excellent piece written in today's Wall Street Journal. This piece was on the editorial page, it was written by Dr. Robert A. Swerlick. It is entitled, ''Our Soviet Health System.''

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Swerlick does such a good job of encapsulating a lot of the issues that I have been talking about here over the past several weeks and I just wanted to share a couple of quotes with you from his article as we get started. He is talking about the imbalance between supply and demand. He became aware of it when he found no trouble finding a veterinarian for his pet, but found difficulty finding a pediatric endocrinologist for a diabetic child. And the reason for the imbalance, Mr. Speaker, according to Dr. Swerlick, is because of some of the distortions of the marketplace and the inaccurate signals delivered to the marketplace because of our manipulation of those signals and of those market forces with the pricing structure we have in our Medicare system.

I am quoting from the article from today, and it says, ''The roots of the problem lie in the use of the administrative pricing structures in medicine. The way prices are set in health care already distorts the appropriate allocation of efforts and resources in health care. Unfortunately, many of the suggested reforms of our health care system, including the various plans for universal care or universal insurance or a single payer's system that various policy makers espouse, rest on the same unsound foundations and will produce more of the same.'' Going on and continuing to quote, ''The essential problem is this; the pricing of medical care in this country is either directly or indirectly dictated by Medicare. And Medicare uses an administrative formula which calculates appropriate prices based upon imperfect estimates and fudge factors rather than independently calculate prices, private insurers'', and Mr. Speaker, this is key, and many House Members don't realize this, let me slow down and say this again. ''Rather than independently calculate prices, private insurers in this country almost universally use Medicare prices as a framework to negotiate payments, generally setting payments for services as a percentage of the Medicare fee structure.''

Then further on into the article, again quoting, ''Unlike prices set on the market, errors in this system are not self-correcting.'' That is, we make a mistake in our policy meetings, in our committee hearings, we make a mistake in setting the actual value to a medical service, and that mistake never gets corrected by market forces. It is insulated, it is anesthetized from market forces, and the consequence is it gets worse over time. And then we compound the error when we try to fix things at the committee level or at the level of the Federal agency.

One last thing that I would like to point out that the article does state so succinctly. Markets may not get all the prices exactly correct all of the time, but they are capable of self-correction, a capacity that has yet to be demonstrated by administrative pricing.

Again, a very worthwhile article. And I commend it, Mr. Speaker, to you. And perhaps some of our colleagues will also be interested in that article as well because I think it very succinctly sums up a lot of the things that I have been pointing out over the past several weeks here.

Mr. Speaker, in the few remaining minutes that I have left, I wanted to talk just a little bit about the physician workforce of the future, because that is something we have to focus on as we have this health care debate. A lot of times I worry we are getting the cart before the horse. Here is a cover of the Texas Medical Association's professional magazine back in my home State of Texas. Texas Medicine last March devoted a lot of the issue to the concept of running out of doctors. As a consequence, I am introducing three physician workforce bills tomorrow that will deal with the person perhaps thinking about a career in medicine, the young physician just starting out in either medical school or residency, and then finally, a third bill to deal with the iniquities in the Medicare pricing system that I just referenced in the article of today's Wall Street Journal.

The physician workforce crisis has to be approached on several fronts. The issue of medical liability is one that we need to take on, and we need to be quite serious about that. But when we look at perhaps the largest group of doctors that we may not have in the very near future because of the things we are doing in our Medicare pricing schedule, these are the areas where we really need to concentrate. Baby boomers are going to retire, they are going to get older. Demand for services are going to go nowhere but up. If the physician workforce continues its downward trend, as it is doing year over year, we may not be talking any longer about funding a Medicare program, we may be talking about why there is no one there to take care of seniors.

Year after year reduction in reimbursement plans from the Center of Medicaid and Medicare Services to physicians for services they provide for

their Medicare patients. This is wrong. It is not a question of doctors wanting to make more money, it's about a stabilized repayment for services already rendered. And it isn't affecting just doctors, it is affecting patients every day. It becomes a real crisis of access. Not a week goes by that I don't get a letter or a fax from some physician who says, you know what? I've just had enough and I am going to retire early, or I am no longer going to see Medicare patients in my practice, or I am going to restrict the procedures that I offer to Medicare patients. Unfortunately, I know this is happening because I saw it in the hospital environment before I left practice to come to Congress a few years ago. And I hear it in virtually every town hall that I do back in my district. Congressman, how come on Medicare, you turn 65 and you've got to change doctors? The answer is because their doctor found it no longer economically viable to continue to see Medicare patients because they weren't able to cover the cost of delivering the care, they weren't able to cover the cost of providing the care.

Medicare payments to physicians are modified annually using a formula called the Sustainable Growth Rate. I won't bare you with the intricacies of that formula tonight, I may do that at some other time. But because of flaws in the process, physicians get a mandated fee cut every year, year over year for several years to come. If no long-term congressional action is implemented, the SGR will continue to mandate fee cuts. Unlike hospital reimbursement rates, unlike reimbursement rates to HMOs or drug companies, those closely follow the cost of living index, but the physician's formula does not. In fact, Medicare payments to physicians cover only about 65 percent of the actual cost of providing the services. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, any industry or company that would continue in business if they received only 65 percent of what it cost to cover the care? Currently, the SGR links physician payment updates to the gross domestic product, which has no bearing in reality as to what it costs to deliver those services.

The problem is repeal of the SGR is very costly. The Congressional Budget Office currently scores that at about $280 billion. There are ways to approach this. There are short term and long-term ways. And we need to have the political courage, we need to have the political will to do the things necessary to ensure that we do repeal the SGR and the formula and pay doctors on a more rational Medicare economic index such as hospitals are paid that recognizes the increase and cost of delivering care. All of this information is technicomplex and it is even boring to listen to, but it is an incredibly important story for our country. It is a story of how the most advanced, most innovative and most appreciated health care system in the world needs a little help.

The end of this story should read ''happily ever after,'' but I am not sure we can reach that conclusion given where we are today. The last chapter should read ''a privatized industry leads to a healthy ending.''

As I stated in the beginning, before I began this talk, we are in a debate that will forever change our health care system. We must understand what is working in our system and what is not. We cannot delay making changes and bringing health care into the 21st century. The only way that we can have this to work is to allow the private sector to lay the foundation for improvements. The pillars of this health care system we have must be rooted in the bedrock of a thriving public sector and not the shaky ground of a public system that has proven costly and inefficient in other countries and in fact in our own back yard. Again, I reference the article from today where the errors are self-perpetuating in the system and market forces are never allowed to correct those errors.

We must devote our work in Congress to building a stronger private sector in health care. History has proven this to be the tried and true method. We can bring down the number of insured, we can increase patient access, and we can stabilize the physician workforce, modernize our technology, and bring transparency to the system. All of these things are within our grasp if we have the foresight, the determination, the courage and the political will to get things done.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your indulgence. The day is concluded, and I will yield back the balance of my time.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, MAY 24, 2007, AT PAGE H5757

[Roll No. 420]

YEAS—382

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—37

Abercrombie
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Boehner
Boyd (FL)
Buyer

Clay
Cleaver
Costa
Cubin
Dingell
Flake
Gohmert
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Honda
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Mack
Meeks (NY)
Nunes
Pastor
Paul
Pickering
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Sessions
Shadegg
Tanner
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Watt
Whitfield
Wicker
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Berman
Campbell (CA)
Cardoza
Davis, Jo Ann
DeGette
Emerson
Engel
Jones (OH)
Lewis (GA)
McMorris Rodgers
Murphy (CT)
Oberstar
Radanovich

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and Wednesday.

Mr. WYNN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for May 24, on account of attending her son's graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

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. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SARBANES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. McCarthy of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and June 6, 7, 8, 11, and 12.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and June 6 and 7.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today and June 6.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today and June 6.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, on June 6.

Mr. MACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, on June 7.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, on June 11 and 12.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program at fiscal year 2006 levels through 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 398. An act to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act to identify and remove barriers to reducing child abuse, to provide for examinations of certain children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution honoring the 50th anniversary of Stan Hywet Hall & Gardens; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 414. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 60 Calle McKinley, West in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the ''Miguel Angel García Méndez Post Office Building''.

H.R. 437. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 West Eisenhower Street in Rio Grande City, Texas, as the ''Lino Perez, Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 625. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4230 Maine Avenue in Baldwin Park, California, as the ''Atanacio Haro-Marin Post Office''.

H.R. 1402. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 South Lecanto Highway in Lecanto, Florida, as the ''Sergeant Dennis J. Flanagan Lecanto Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2080. An act to Amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to conform the District charter to revisions made by the Council of the District of Columbia relating to public education.

H.R. 2206. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 214. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys.

S. 1104. An act to increase the number of Iraqi and Afghani translators and interpreters who may be admitted to the United States as special immigrants, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on May 24, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 988. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5757 Tilton Avenue in Riverside, California, as the ''Lieutenant Todd Jason Bryant Post Office''.

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on May 25, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2206. Making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. today, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable CRAIG THOMAS.

Thereupon (at midnight), pursuant to House Resolution 454, the House adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable CRAIG THOMAS until today, Wednesday, June 6, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the first quarter of 2007, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HAITI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 22 AND FEB. 24, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. David Price	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,090.20				1,550.20
Hon. Wayne Gilchrest	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Hon. Bobby Rush	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,586.20				2,046.20
John Lis	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Tommy Ross	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Rachael Leman	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Keenan Keller	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Eric Jacobstein	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Carol Peterson	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Delegation Expenses	2/22	2/24	Haiti						12,358.27		12,358.27
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAVID E. PRICE, Chairman, May 2, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ISRAEL, SYRIA, SAUDI ARABIA, PORTUGAL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 30 AND APR. 7, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Henry Waxman	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Nick Rahall	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. David Hobson	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Dr. John F. Eisold	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Michael Sheehy	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Reva Price	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Nadeam Elshami	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Robert King	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Kenny Kraft	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Dwight Comedy	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Nancy Pelosi, Speaker	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Henry Waxman	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Nick Rahall	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. David Hobson	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Dr. John F. Eisold	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Michael Sheehy	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Reva Price	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Nadeam Elshami	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Robert King	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Kenny Kraft	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Dwight Comedy	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Henry Waxman	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Nick Rahall	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. David Hobson	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Dr. John F. Eisold	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Michael Sheehy	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Reva Price	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Nadeam Elshami	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Robert King	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Kenny Kraft	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Dwight Comedy	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Henry Waxman	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Nick Rahall	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. David Hobson	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Dr. John F. Eisold	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Michael Sheehy	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Reva Price	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Nadeam Elshami	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Robert King	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Kenny Kraft	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Dwight Comedy	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Committee total											46,839.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, May 4, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Christopher Shays	1/26	1/28	Switzerland		390.00		(3)				390.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2007—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	1/28	1/29	Greece		186.00		(3)				186.00
Hon. Barney Frank	1/23	1/28	Switzerland		1,080.00		6,846.84				7,926.84
Joseph Pinder	3/16	3/19	Guatemala		738.00		595.20				1,333.20
Scott Morris	3/16	3/19	Guatemala		738.00		1,010.20				1,748.20
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BARNEY FRANK, Chairman, May 21, 2007.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1993. A letter from the Acting Deputy Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting Notice of the decision of a public-private competition of Department of Navy military space operations services, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2462; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1994. A letter from the Director, Pentagon Renovation Program, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's certification that the total cost for the planning, design, construction and installation of equipment for the renovation of wedges 2 through 5 of the Pentagon, cumulatively, will not exceed four times the total cost for the planning, design, construction, and installation of equipment for the renovation of wedge 1, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2674 Public Law 108–87, section 8055(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1995. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2007 annual report pursuant to Section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1998, Pub. L. 105-85, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 2367; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1996. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Vice Admiral Barry M. Costello, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1997. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report on the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for FY 2006, pursuant to Public Law 109-469, section 901(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1998. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's notification of payment-in-kind compensation negotiated with the United Kingdom for the return of U.S.-funded housing and improvements in Bentwaters, Bishop's Green, Blackbushe, Burtonwood, Caversfield, Chicksands, Clayhill, Greenham Common, Sculthorpe, Upper Hayford, Welford, and Woodbridge, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2921(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1999. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Franchising Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Business Opportunities — received May 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2000. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-29, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Iraq for defense articles and services, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2001. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) and U.S. participation in that organization for the period January 16, 2006, to January 15, 2007, pursuant to Public Law 97-132, section 6; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2002. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2003. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification for FY 2007 that no United Nations organization or United Nations affiliated agency grants and official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes, condones, or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or which includes as a subsidiary or member any such organization, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 102(g); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2004. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determination that five countries are not cooperating fully with U.S. antiterrorism efforts: Cuba, Iran, North Korea, Syria, and Venezuela, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2781; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2005. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 012-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2006. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of defense articles to the Government of Israel (Transmittal No. DDTC 020-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2007. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed technical assistant agreement for the export of technical data, defense services and defense articles to the Government of the Netherlands (Transmittal No. DDTC 030-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2008. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a proposed removal from the United States Munitions List of the Category XV — Spacecraft Systems and Associated Equipment of radiation-hardened microelectronic circuits, pursuant to Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2009. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Annual Report of the Corporation, which includes the Corporation's operational and financial results as of September 30, 2006, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1308; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2010. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting a copy of the Balance Sheet of Potomac Electric Power Company as of December 31, 2006, pursuant to D.C. Code section 43-513; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2011. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the six-month period ending March 31, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2012. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Parole Commission, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act for the calendar year 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2013. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period ending March 31, 2007; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2014. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual reports for FY 2006 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2015. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, transmitting a copy of the Office's Notification and Federal Employee Anti-Discrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act Annual Report, dated March 30, 2007; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2016. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Long Term Care Insurance Program: Miscellaneous Changes,

Corrections, and Clarifications (RIN: 3206-AK99) received March 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2017. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Veterans' Preference (RIN: 3206-AL00) received March 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2018. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Employment in the Senior Executive Service, Restoration to Duty from Uniformed Service of Compensable Injury, Pay Administration (General), and Pay Administration under the Fair Labor Standards Act; Miscellaneous Changes to Pay and Leave Rules (RIN: 3206-AL21) received March 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2019. A letter from the Office of the Special Counsel, transmitting the Office's Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1218; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2020. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Labor Certification for the Permanent Employment of Aliens in the United States; Reducing the Incentives and Opportunities for Fraud and Abuse and Enhancing Program Integrity (RIN: 1205-AB42) received May 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2021. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Security Requirements for Unclassified Information Technology (IT) Resources (RIN: 2700-AD26) received May 21, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

2022. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Calculation of QPAI and W-2 wages by pass-thru entities under 199 (Rev. Proc. 2007-34) received May 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2023. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.105: Examinations of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability. (Also Part 1, 199; 1.199-1 through 1.99-9, 1.199-3T, 1.199-5T, 1.199-7T, 1.199-8T.) (Rev. Proc. 2007-35) received May 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2024. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.602: Tax forms and instructions. (Also: Part 1, 1, 223.) (Rev. Proc. 2007-36) received May 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2025. A letter from the Branch Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Credit for New Qualified Heavy-Duty Hybrid Motor Vehicles [Notice 2007-46] received May 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2026. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 482.—Allocation of Income and Deductions Among Taxpayers (Rev. Rul. 2007-35) received May 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2027. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 199.—Income Attributable to Domestic Production Activities (Rev. Rul. 2007-30) received May 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2028. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 118.—Contributions to the Capital of a Corporation (Rev. Rul. 2007-31) received May 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2029. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Deductability of Lodging Expenses [Notice 2007-47] received May 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2030. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Distributions from a Pension Plan upon Attainment of Normal Retirement Age [TD 9325] (RIN: 1545-BD23) received May 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2031. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 1221.—Capital Asset Defined (Rev. Rul. 2007-37) received May 24, 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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on May 24, 2007 the following report was filed on May 30, 2007]

Mr. LANTOS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2446. A bill to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on June 5, 2007]

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 632. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish monetary prizes for achievements in overcoming scientific and technical barriers associated with hydrogen energy; with an amendment (Rept. 110–171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 1467. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to award grants to institutions of higher education to develop and offer education and training programs (Rept. 110–172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 1716. A bill to authorize higher education curriculum development and graduate training in advanced energy and green building technologies; with an amendment (Rept. 110–173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of State of the Union.

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 453. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–174). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 2557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and extend the alternative motor vehicle credit for certain flexible fuel hybrid vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 2558. A bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 2559. A bill to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SPACE, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 2560. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit human cloning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2561. A bill to protect the United States by targeting terrorists at the border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2562. A bill to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to limit casino expansion; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2563. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 309 East Linn Street in Marshalltown, Iowa, as the ''Major Scott Nisely Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. AKIN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 2564. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 2565. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to establish a grant program to ensure waterfront access for commercial fishermen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2566. A bill to provide American consumers information about the broadcast television transition from an analog to a digital format; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 2567. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home infusion therapy under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 2568. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to establish additional reporting requirements to enhance the detection of identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 2569. A bill to codify certain changes proposed by the Department of Agriculture to the rules governing eligibility for the rural broadband access program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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 Mrs. MUSGRAVE (for herself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SALAZAR, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2570. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 301 Boardwalk Drive in Fort Collins, Colorado, as the ''Dr. Karl E. Carson Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2571. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Foreign Trade Zones Act to simplify the tax and eliminate the drawback fee on certain distilled spirits used in nonbeverage products manufactured in a United States foreign trade zone for domestic use and export; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2572. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a student loan forgiveness program for nurses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 2573. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. DENT, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SHULER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WU, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. REGULA, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 2574. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Financial Services, the Judiciary, the Budget, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. LATHAM:

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Res. 451. A resolution directing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to respond to the indictment of, or the filing of charges of criminal conduct in a court of the United States or any State against, any Member of the House of Representatives by empaneling an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations not later than 30 days after the date the Member is indicted or the charges are filed; to the Committee on Rules. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Res. 452. A resolution raising a question of the Privileges of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H. Res. 454. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Craig Thomas, a Senator from the State of Wyoming; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BEAN (for herself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. HILL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

H. Res. 455. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Internet Safety Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 456. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of an annual National Time Out Day to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H. Res. 457. A resolution calling on the Russian Federation to withdraw its military forces, armaments, and ammunition stockpiles from the sovereign territory of the Republic of Moldova; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PUTNAM:

H. Res. 458. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Fishing and Boating Week; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California introduced A bill (H.R. 2575) for the relief of Mikael Adrian Christopher Figueroa Alvarez; 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. 14: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 18: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 20: Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 21: Mr. STARK, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 89: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 96: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 154: Mr. GOODE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 171: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 172: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 174: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 180: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 260: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 364: Mr. WU, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 380: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 402: Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 473: Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 480: Mr. DUNCAN and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 491: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 507: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 532: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 566: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 579: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 592: Mr. HONDA and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 620: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 632: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 642: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 643: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 670: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 695: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 697: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 718: Mr. DOYLE Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 721: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 728: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 748: Mr. GOODE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 758: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 814: Mr. OLVER and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 821: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 829: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 849: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 850: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 864: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 869: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 871: Mr. NADLER and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 882: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 885: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 891: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 906: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 923: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 940: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 943: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 947: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 948: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 962: Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 969: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 971: Mr. BOREN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 980: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 983: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1014: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BOREN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1034: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1038: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1043: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1059: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1060: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1061: Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 1065: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1073: Mr. RUSH, Mr. SPACE, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1078: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 1088: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1104: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1107: Mr. SALI.
H.R. 1108: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BEAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 1110: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1115: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1125: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PORTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 1134: Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1152: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 1178: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1179: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1188: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1192: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1198: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1199: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1211: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. KANJORSKI.
H.R. 1216: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1222: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1223: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1226: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1229: Mr. MELANCON and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 1230: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1239: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1246: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1265: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 1267: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1268: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 1273: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 1276: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1279: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1280: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 1308: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1310: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. KIND, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1328: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 1330: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 1333: Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 1338: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 1343: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1344: Mr. WALSH of New York.
H.R. 1352: Mr. WATT and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1371: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 1380: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1381: Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 1391: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1394: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1398: Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 1400: Mr. KAGEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SPACE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1406: Mr. DONNELLY and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1439: Mr. HOLT and Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 1459: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1460: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1461: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1464: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1467: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1474: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1475: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1491: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1497: Mr. KIND, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1498: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1509: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1514: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 1532: Mr. REYES and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1542: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1551: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1559: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 1560: Mr. WAMP, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STARK, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1561: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1567: Mr. FILNER and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1582: Mr. BUCHANAN and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1589: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1608: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1614: Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1616: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1641: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1647: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. WATT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1651: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1673: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1683: Mr. HELLER and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 1687: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 1688: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1693: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. CASTOR.
H.R. 1699: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1705: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1707: Mr. NADLER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1709: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 1712: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1713: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1716: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1733: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. FEENEY.
H.R. 1742: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1743: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1745: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1746: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1755: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1759: Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BACA, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1763: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1764: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1783: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1814: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1818: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 1830: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1845: Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1849: Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1869: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1880: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1889: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1890: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 1927: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1933: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1937: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1938: Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 1940: Mr. MICA, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1947: Mr. SIRES and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1959: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1965: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1971: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1975: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1977: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. BONO, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1983: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1985: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1992: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2017: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 2035: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 2045: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2053: Mr. DICKS, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 2060: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2074: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2075: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2095: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2108: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2111: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2125: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. OBEY.
H.R. 2129: Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2134: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2135: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 2140: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
H.R. 2146: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 2147: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 2159: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 2164: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 2165: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 2167: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2169: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2173: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2185: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2192: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2204: Mr. REGULA.
H.R. 2205: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 2210: Mr. BOREN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2212: Mr. NADLER and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2253: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2265: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2270: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2289: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2292: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 2303: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2304: Mr. HONDA, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 2313: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2319: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 2327: Mr. CLAY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 2343: Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2353: Mr. SIRES, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2357: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2364: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2366: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2371: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 2395: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2407: Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 2425: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GINGREY, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2435: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2443: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2449: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2458: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2459: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2464: Mr. FORTUÑO and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2465: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2467: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 2481: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2490: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 2491: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2493: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2506: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2511: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2526: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.J. Res. 12: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. SAXTON.
H.J. Res. 37: Mr. HOLT.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Con. Res. 85: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KIND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ISSA.
H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mrs. BONO.
H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. RAHALL and Ms. SUTTON.
H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ORTIZ.
H. Con. Res. 131: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SALI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
H. Con. Res. 133: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H. Con. Res. 135: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. HENSARLING.
H. Con. Res. 138: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HILL.
H. Con. Res. 147: Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. MACK.
H. Con. Res. 148: Mr. COHEN and Mr. BACA.
H. Con. Res. 152: Mr. WEINER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H. Res. 12: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 54: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. ISSA.
H. Res. 95: Mr. TOWNS and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H. Res. 111: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H. Res. 121: Mr. LYNCH.
H. Res. 154: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HODES, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H. Res. 169: Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 231: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SALI.
H. Res. 268: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
H. Res. 281: Mr. POE and Ms. CARSON.
H. Res. 282: Mr. BERRY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. WOLF, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H. Res. 287: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. FILNER.
H. Res. 313: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 353; Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 356; Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 358: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 378: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BAIRD, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 395: Mr. ISSA.
H. Res. 401: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Res. 407: Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Res. 416: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H. Res. 417; Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H. Res. 421: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 422: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HARE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WU, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HOOLEY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FARR, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WATT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H. Res. 424: Mr. ISSA, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H. Res. 426: Mr. WOLF, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. RENZI.
H. Res. 430: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H. Res. 442: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
H. Res. 443: Mr. FORTUPO.
H. Res. 444: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. GRAVES.
H. Res. 446: Mr. AKIN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 447: Mr. WOLF.

CONGERSSIONAL 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 amendment to be offered by Representative LANTOS of California or a designee to H.R. 2446, the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2007, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.J. Res. 40: Mr. LATHAM.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 2007 No. 89

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MARY LANDRIEU, a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, whose love upholds and sustains us, thank You for revealing Yourself to us through the faithfulness of the people we see each day. Today, we think of our Senators who labor for liberty. Thank You for their dedication. Thank You, also, for our doorkeepers, who use exceptional diplomacy to assist the visitors who seek to view the legislative process. Thank You for our Senate pages, who remind us that we can excel in serving even in life's morning and that You are honored by youthful enthusiasm.

We express our gratitude for the many staffers who serve with unsung heroism behind the scenes. Bless all who serve You faithfully and whose work helps make our lives meaningful.

Lord, we pause this morning to remember our friend and colleague, Senator CRAIG THOMAS. Console us, console his family, and console his staff during this time of grief. We pray all this in Your comforting Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MARY LANDRIEU led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARY LANDRIEU, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Ms. LANDRIEU thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, a visitor to the rodeo in Cheyenne, WY, just last summer would have seen a strong, confident, 73-year-old man holding the reins under a cowboy hat riding past the grandstand with a smile. A few weeks earlier, visitors to rustic Cody, WY, would have seen the same tough cowboy riding down Sheridan Avenue in the Cody Stampede Parade. Just a few days ago, a tourist here in Washington, getting an early start on the monuments, could have seen CRAIG LYLE THOMAS racing off 395 near the 14th Street Bridge in another kind of Mustang on his way to the Capitol for a hard day's work.

In recent years, CRAIG THOMAS led an effort here in the Senate to honor the deeds and the spirit of the American cowboy, and his very full American life came to a sad end last night. We, his friends and colleagues, remember him as the modern-day embodiment of the cowboy ideals he celebrated and loved.

He was raised on a ranch just outside Cody, the rodeo capital of the world, in the Big Horn Basin, a windy town in the northwest corner of the Cowboy State. He grew up in the shadow of Heart Mountain to the north and Carter Mountain to the south and under the memory of Cody's founder, William Frederick Cody, known to history and to schoolchildren from Butte to Boston as Buffalo Bill.

He was a humble man with an adventurous spirit from a lonely corner of the country who put his family, his country, and his State above all else. He served as a marine from 1955 to 1959, retiring as a captain. He married a woman with a generous heart. My wife Elaine is a good friend of Susan's, and one of the joys of Elaine's time in the last few years was being invited out to Susan's school to speak to her students.

CRAIG was the proud father of four children—Lexie, Patrick, Gregg, and Peter—who today mourn their father's death.

CRAIG was as much at home on horseback, roping, and ranching, as he was in a committee hearing room. How many times he must have daydreamed about being back home, out of a suit, with a rope in his hand and a steer in his sights.

CRAIG had served in public office 22 years when he fell ill at a church service with Susan last November in Casper. Shortly after that, the people of Wyoming elected him to his third term in the Senate, with 70 percent of the vote. A born fighter, CRAIG's doctors said he would be back here in January. He beat their predictions by a month. He was here in December. CRAIG suffered quietly over the last half year, as all of us hoped for the best. It wasn't to be.

Every year, CRAIG pressed for a day that would memorialize the iconic status of the cowboy in American history, a day that honored their courage, hard work, honesty, and grit. I can think of no better way of honoring that spirit than by honoring this man who embodied it to the fullest. By his devotion

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

to family, country, constituents, and friends, CRAIG LYLE THOMAS showed us what it means to be an American. He embodied the best ideals of a Wyoming cowboy and made the Senate and those who had the privilege of knowing him far better for it.

We mourn with Susan, CRAIG's children, and CRAIG's staff here in the Senate. We honor them today, too, for their model of professionalism and caring concern they have shown over the last difficult months. We will miss CRAIG terribly, his calm toughness, his drive, and his cowboy spirit, but we are consoled by the thought that he will ride again, restored in body and flashing a smile as he goes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished counterpart. I think his words convey how we feel about CRAIG THOMAS.

Madam President, we hear it often said that this is a Senate family, and it is times such as these when we do realize we are a family, a very small family of just 100—99 today.

I can remember early last December I called and talked to CRAIG in the hospital, and he said: I am getting better. And he was. He did get better. It just didn't last, and we all feel so bad about that.

I remember CRAIG THOMAS for his legislative efforts. Wyoming, like Nevada, is a public land State. Wyoming has a lot of public land issues dealing with Federal agencies. I see his colleague here, MIKE ENZI, and I can remember working with them on an issue which, to most people, seemed like not much, but to the two Senators from Wyoming and to the Senator from Nevada, it meant a lot. We were dealing with a place called Martin's Cove, and even Senators from Utah were called in to see if we could resolve this, and we were able to resolve it eventually. But CRAIG was really tough when it came to public lands issues.

I can remember, as can Lula, whom we all know, CRAIG THOMAS' persistence on a piece of legislation on an issue dealing with the potash of a mining company in Wyoming. He would ask us if we had been able to get it cleared. If he asked us once, he asked us 50 times, and we eventually got it cleared. I worked hard on this side for that for a couple of reasons: First, it was the right thing to do, and second, CRAIG wanted it so badly. So we were able to work that out.

I will miss CRAIG THOMAS. CRAIG THOMAS was the kind of person with whom I liked to deal. He told you how he felt—he wanted this done; he didn't want that done. I recognized that he was very proud of being a Senator.

I would have to say, however, that he was just as proud of being a marine. His Marine Corps service was certainly commendable. He was in the Marine Corps in the late 1950s, 1955 to 1959. He went in as a private and came out as a captain. He was a graduate of the University of Wyoming with a degree in agriculture, and that is why he was one of the leading experts in the Senate—in the Congress, I should say—on agriculture and, of course, issues affecting rural communities.

Madam President, I will ask for unanimous consent in just a few minutes to do away with the votes we had scheduled this morning and reschedule them for later this afternoon so people have the opportunity to come and speak about CRAIG. And those who aren't able to come, there will be a time set aside where we will recognize the service CRAIG THOMAS rendered to the State of Wyoming and to the country.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order governing the consideration of the immigration legislation be delayed until 2:15 p.m. today and the time between 2:15 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. be divided equally between the managers and the amendment proponents, with the votes occurring beginning at 3:30 p.m., with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein, after Senator ENZI completes his remarks immediately following mine, for up to 15 minutes each—Senator ENZI can speak for whatever time he feels appropriate—that at 12:30 p.m., the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.; that upon reconvening, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1348, the immigration legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask that the Senate now stand for a moment of silence in recognition of Senator CRAIG THOMAS.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Moment of silence.)

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask that you now recognize Senator ENZI.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

REMEMBERING SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, when my plane touched down last night, I received an e-mail that told of the fate of a great man. It was a tremendous surprise to me. I just completed a week in Wyoming of explaining to people that he even timed his chemotherapy so he didn't have to miss votes, and what a tough and strong man he was.

CRAIG THOMAS was a marine at heart, but he was a cowboy in his soul. He was quiet, he was focused, he was independent, he was hard-working. He loved the Senate and he loved the Marines and he loved his horses. The flags have been lowered, and there is a great deal of sadness in our hearts today as we mourn his loss and celebrate his life. I have had a lot of thoughts, but I haven't had a chance to put them together. They come gushing back, together with a lot of tears.

For those of us from Wyoming, CRAIG THOMAS was more than just our Senator. He was our voice in the Senate, and he was never one to back off from a fight, especially when he was battling for two things most dear: what was best for Wyoming and what was best for America.

CRAIG had long Wyoming roots, and he was very proud of them. He grew up in Cody and became friends with Al Simpson. Later on the two of them would serve together in the Senate. After he graduated from the University of Wyoming, he immediately began his service to the country he loved. He joined the Marine Corps. I am convinced that experience helped to shape his character and molded his destiny. I think his steely resolve and firm will took shape during those days that helped guide him and prepare him for the battles that would come later in his political life.

When CRAIG's service in the Marine Corps was through, he began what was to be his life's work, which was serving the people of Wyoming to ensure their best interests were taken care of and their needs were addressed.

His first efforts for Wyoming brought him to the Wyoming Farm Bureau and the Wyoming Rural Electric Association.

He was proud of his service with both of these organizations. It kept him actively involved in issues that meant a great deal to him and, more importantly, it kept him in touch with the people of Wyoming and their day-to-day problems. It also set him on the road to doing anything and everything he could to make life easier for his fellow citizens in Wyoming.

I remember the days we served together in the Wyoming House. I was a mayor and had municipal electrical experience. He was with the rural electric association. We worked a lot of electrical bills together at that time. We

could bring in both perspectives, find the middle ground, and make sure all of the people, rural and urban—I use the term ''urban'' for Wyoming rather loosely, but urban—would be able to have low-cost and consistent electricity.

Nobody knew energy or electricity better than CRAIG. That led him to run for the Wyoming House. DICK CHENEY was appointed Secretary of Defense, and CRAIG ran for it and won his seat. It was not an easy victory, but it showed what a fighter and battler he was as he took on that challenge, which was done in a relatively short period of time. The executive committee just has a few days to select candidates, and then there is a very short time for an election for the position in the Wyoming House. He used his usual toughness, went around the State, talked to everybody, and won that election.

Incidentally, the person he ran against in the primary, Tom Sansonetti, became his chief of staff, which shows how people get along in Wyoming.

To no one's surprise, CRAIG focused on Wyoming issues in the House and he was reelected. Then when Malcolm Wallop decided to retire, CRAIG was such a popular choice he didn't have any opposition in the primary. He did face another battle in the general election, but once again his fighting spirit prevailed and he found a way to win. Interestingly enough, the person he defeated in the general election was a very popular Governor of Wyoming who was just ending his term. That Governor was later appointed Ambassador to Ireland by President Clinton. To CRAIG THOMAS's credit, the hearing was scheduled for that ambassadorship before the papers ever got to the Capitol. Ambassador Sullivan did a fantastic job in Ireland.

He won the Senate seat, and 2 years later I ran for the Senate and serve. He is one of the few Wyoming residents who ever served both in the House and in the Senate. It has not been a tradition in Wyoming to move from the House to the Senate. I was elected and then got a chance to work with him again. He was a remarkable man of vision on how to make Wyoming and our country better places to live. He spent a good deal of his time traveling Wyoming. He was one of the most ardent travelers we have ever had in the Senate, going back virtually every weekend, traveling to a different part of the State, talking to people and trying to get their vision for the future.

One of his efforts on that was called Vision 2020. He challenged the people of Wyoming. He stretched the people's imagination on what our State ought to be like in the year 2020. That was in 1998, but we are getting a lot closer to 2020, and I think the State is moving toward the vision that he predicted at that time. It was a goal he cherished and fought for. Many of the things he envisioned, or the people of Wyoming envisioned, have been achieved through his efforts on the Senate floor.

CRAIG THOMAS will long be remembered as one of Wyoming's toughest and fiercest advocates. CRAIG knew that much of our work gets done in committees, so he pursued those committees that would help him fight for Wyoming in the Senate. He served on the critical Finance Committee. He was a staunch fiscal conservative, and he believed very strongly that people in Wyoming and across the Nation know better how to spend their hard-earned money than does the Federal Government. He used his position on the committee to lighten the tax burden and to make our Tax Code more fair.

He was the ranking member on the Indian Affairs Committee. He served as chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee where he was a tireless advocate for our park system. I think he visited most of the parks. Earlier, when our Republican leader was talking about horseback, it was even possible sometimes to see him with the park policemen on horseback taking a look at the parks of the Capitol.

I would mention also that usually when you saw him on horseback you also saw his wife Susan on horseback. She was a tireless traveler and an outstanding campaigner and another person who searches for the visions of Wyoming. In parades, they always rode horses. They had special saddle blankets that helped to say who they were—as if people in Wyoming wouldn't know who they were. I would mention that she was thrown from a horse a couple of times, too. Bands and horses don't always go well in hand. But, as CRAIG always said, she was the real campaigner in the family. She actually liked it. She does a marvelous job for our State, as well as did CRAIG.

CRAIG was very active on all of the agricultural issues and international trade, particularly country-of-origin labeling. He supported our cattlemen with grazing rights and responsible environmental quality incentive programs for runoff issues. He has worked tirelessly to get changes in the Endangered Species Act. He realized that was a national program with national goals and it should not punish individuals or counties or even the States, and that there ought to be responsibility at the Federal level.

With energy, he was the lead sponsor of our soda ash royalty relief bill. He was the lead sponsor on the recreational fee demonstration program that allowed the national parks to keep a higher percentage of the receipts that were received on public lands where they were collected, and he specifically made efforts to include section 413 of the Energy Policy Act, which authorizes Federal cost-share for the building of a coal gasification project above 4,000 feet. That would help get a clean coal plant built in Wyoming, which would prove the technology with Wyoming coal at high altitude. We have huge resources of coal. We ship over one-third of the Nation's coal—over 1 million tons a day.

The reason we ship so much coal is because it is very low sulfur. He was providing a mechanism to be able to have some assurance that coal gasification of this clean coal would be included in projects that we did in the United States. It would help to prove the technology at high altitude and show its viability and would make a difference for all the United States in all their energy in the future.

He was also instrumental in writing the electricity title of EPAct. Recently, his efforts to get a coal-to-liquids section of whatever Energy bill we will be debating, although unsuccessful thus far, advanced the debate to the furthest point it had moved.

During the last FAA reauthorization, CRAIG was very instrumental in radar upgrades for the Jackson airport, which was imperative for the growth of the city and airport, especially related to tourism. I think Jackson is the only city in Wyoming that has long distance direct flights. Most of them come through Salt Lake or Denver or Minneapolis. But Jackson actually has flights that come from Houston and Atlanta direct.

He also did a lot for Wyoming with two big transportation authorization bills to ensure that the large land area, low-population States, received a fair amount of highway funding. As I mentioned, on fiscal issues he was a staunch conservative who believed the people knew how to spend their money better than the Federal Government.

A few months ago, CRAIG shared his medical situation with us. He was in for another difficult fight, but he was used to them. He has been a battler all his life. He took the fierce determination that he learned as a marine and brought it to this latest battle against leukemia. Unfortunately, it was a battle this great fighter was not to win.

Although that last battle of his life was lost, there were so many victories in his life that we will long remember. CRAIG died as he lived, with his spurs on, fighting for Wyoming to the very end. I am sure we all have our favorite instant replay memories of CRAIG and his unique style.

I have always believed you can get a lot done if you don't care who gets the credit. That was CRAIG—never one to seek the limelight or to draw attention to himself. He was the one working in committee to assure that the voices of the Wyoming people and America were heard and heard clearly.

For me, I will always remember CRAIG's spirit, for his spirit in life was a great illustration of the spirit of Wyoming. His life became a living portrait of the American West. He saw the world from the saddle of his horse and from under the brim of his cowboy hat. He was proud of Wyoming and Wyoming was proud to be represented by him.

CRAIG was my senior Senator. He was my confidant and mentor. But most of

all, he was a very good friend. Diana and I will always feel appreciation for the fact that CRAIG and Susan made us part of their family. Our prayers are with Susan and their family during these difficult times.

I will miss him. But because he was such a special presence in my life and the lives of so many others, I have a long list of instant replay memories I will always cherish of him: the times we were out on the campaign trail, the legislation we worked on together and, more importantly, the impact he had on my life personally, as he had on so many others.

Wyoming is a different place today because of this great loss of ours. There is great sadness in the State and also great joy as we celebrate the life of one of our special citizens. He was with us for all too short a time, but he will never be forgotten.

I received a book called ''give me Mountains for my Horses,'' by Tom Reed. But what I always ask for is that they give us men to match our mountains and our horses—and that would be CRAIG.

I want to share just a little piece of this because I know that CRAIG is already riding in a far better place. It says:

There is a taste to this place, this time. Nothing is behind you. Everything is ahead. But you don't really think about what is ahead, you only think of now, for this partnership you have entered into is one of the moment, of now. Now has you in a saddle on a bay horse, heading up a trail of pines and spruce and mountain, of stream and meadow.

Behind you, connected by only your hand and a lead rope but carrying everything important to you, is another bay horse, an almost identical match to the one you are riding. You call them nicknames as if they were human compadres, drinking buddies. You cluck and coo and talk to them as if they give a damn about what you have to say. You think they do and maybe, just maybe [they do].

Right now they are stepping out, heads nodding, down the trail and through the stream and all you have to do is ride. So you ride.

That evening as dusk brings the mosquitoes out of the willows—the same dusk that put the horse flies to bed—you choose a camp. It is a good place, save for the bugs, with room for the horses in the broad, deep green meadow and camp back against the lodgepoles and your kitchen down a ways. So you ease off the bay's back and stretch your muscles with that stiff-good, worked-hard feeling, and you begin to unload the packhorse, talking to him, thanking him. In a while he has on his hobbles and is out there with his buddy, snorting contentedly in the tall grass and swishing a long, coal-black tail at the mosquitoes.

It goes like this for days, the ride, the squeak of the saddle leather, the smell of dust, the taste of it on your tongue. The smell of horse sweat and your own and the soft muzzles nuzzling you after a long day. Good camp after good camp. Muscles turning hard. Eyes becoming sharp for wildlife. And riding, always riding.

One evening a big sow grizzly and her cub cross a broad meadow far out there. A tough gal, rambling, giving you and your horses a wide berth. But still the binoculars sweat in your hands and your mouth is dry.

''Boy, what a beautiful animal.''

The next morning a moose walks the same path. You have not seen another human in days but there's a jet contrail reminding you that yes, this is the modern world. You ride.

CRAIG loved the modern world. He worked hard in this body. He would have liked to have been out there in those mountains on those horses enjoying the smell and the sounds. Now he is riding. Ride on my friend, ride on.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business up until the time of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak up to 15 minutes each.

Who seeks recognition. The Senator from Oklahoma.

REMEMBERING SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I got a very early phone call from my daughter in Italy. Of course, their time is 6 hours ahead of ours, and they heard about CRAIG before we did.

I have listened to some of my colleagues talking about CRAIG. You know, there are some people you have more in common with than others. I can recall CRAIG and I both came to the House of Representatives about the same time. Then we both decided we would run for the Senate in 1994. That was a decision we made. We talked to each other and we decided that that would be the best thing for us to do and perhaps we would be able to articulate our concerns a little bit more.

He was a marine, I was in the Army. We had a lot in common. I think it was MITCH MCCONNELL or perhaps HARRY REID this morning who talked about his calm toughness, his way of expressing himself. I have always been very envious. I would come down, and I would watch CRAIG THOMAS on the floor. He would say things as antagonistically, as offensively as I would, except people loved him when he said it and they hated me when I said it. I was never able to master that. I watched him day after day, month after month, and year after year being able to do that.

I think MIKE ENZI is right when he said CRAIG THOMAS was the voice of the Senate. Let me correct Senator MCCONNELL on one thing he said. I chaired the Environment and Public Works Committee when CRAIG THOMAS was on that committee. This morning MITCH MCCONNELL said he was as much at home on a horse as he was in a committee meeting. Well, let me correct you because he was much more at home on a horse than he would be in that committee meeting. I can remember seeing him staring off, and then I would go over and visit while some people were testifying, perhaps on the other side, and he would tell me his stories. He was a real cowboy. A lot of us ride horses in parades; he was a real cowboy and such a great guy.

Many years ago, I was mayor of Tulsa. We had our annual meeting in Ketchum, ID. I was flying a plane up there, when we were weathered in in Saratoga, WY. Saratoga, WY, is a town that Lewis & Clark came through at the bend of the river. I fell in love with that town. For the next 7 years that I served in the capacity of being mayor, I always purposefully stayed in Saratoga, WY.

I went up to him in the House of Representatives in the 1980s, and I said: CRAIG, you know when I was in—when I would stop, make my stop in Saratoga, WY, and stay at the Wolf Hotel—I might add, I would stay at the Wolf Hotel in the presidential suite; it was the only one with a bathroom in it. I told him almost everyone I would run into on the streets of Saratoga, WY, reminded me of CRAIG THOMAS. These are salt-of-the-earth people, wonderful people, people I learned to dearly love.

Kay told me this morning, when we heard about CRAIG, she said: You probably forgot this, but when you were in voting on the day that we had the spouses dinner, that was 2 weeks ago today, on Tuesday, I saw him walking across the parking lot while I was waiting for you to vote, and he was walking a little slower than usual. I said: Hey, handsome. And his whole face lit up. And he came over and he embraced Kay. That is the way that he was to a lot of people. So let me say this to Peter, Paul, Patrick and Lexie and Susan. Susan, you have some people you have heard from this morning who dearly love you and would love to have some way of comforting you. We know how difficult it is. We will pray for you, for your kids. I have to say this also, I do not think it has been said yet about CRAIG.

CRAIG THOMAS was probably the most consistent Member of the Senate prayer breakfast because he was always there. MIKE ENZI knows this because he is the chairman now. He was always there. I give the Scripture at this thing. So we knew that if we did not see CRAIG THOMAS anyplace else during the week, we would see him at the Senate Prayer Breakfast.

The Senate Prayer Breakfast is similar to a lot of these things. It is based on Acts 2:42. Acts 2:42 is the genesis of these meetings you do on a regular basis. You get together and you do four things: eat together, pray together, fellowship together, and talk about the precepts of Jesus together. We talked about the precepts of Jesus together every Wednesday morning.

That is the comfort I had with CRAIG THOMAS. Some people, you wonder if they are going to be there. But THOMAS

you didn't wonder, you knew. So, CRAIG, all I can say is, this is not goodbye, this is, ''We will see you later.''

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, it was with great sadness that Catherine and I learned of Senator CRAIG THOMAS' passing last night. The people of Wyoming have lost a tireless advocate and a skilled leader. Those of us in the Senate have lost a true friend and a genuine inspiration.

CRAIG and I remained close throughout our time as colleagues. I visited with him on matters pertaining to resource development and ranches probably more than any other Member of the Senate. These weren't visits concerning legislation, but simply to share experiences and to get advice.

Although CRAIG came to the Senate much after I did, he possessed a wealth of knowledge, particularly about the West. I had the privilege of marrying into a family with small ranches in Arizona. CRAIG and I talked often about horses, the problems facing ranches and cowboys, and how they can endure in today's economy.

In each of the past several years, CRAIG has introduced a resolution designating a National Day of the American Cowboy. More than any other member of this body, CRAIG recognized there is more to cowboys than roping, riding, and branding. From the Wild West to the Last Frontier, cowboys have long symbolized the spirit and determination which makes our Nation great. It was my pleasure to help sponsor CRAIG's resolutions, and this year, on July 28, we will pay special tribute to a man who truly embodied the American cowboy.

CRAIG was always mindful of the best interests of other Western States. As a Senator from Wyoming, he represented a State with a great many problems in common with those of us from Alaska. CRAIG was renowned for his legislative efforts regarding national parks. His efforts to improve rural health care greatly benefitted his constituents and continue to serve as a model for our Nation.

Above all, I remember working with CRAIG on resource issues related to coal, oil, and land management. He was steadfast in his efforts to increase domestic energy production. He fought to secure funding for a coal gasification plant in his home State, and he also supported exploration and development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

To deal with CRAIG THOMAS was to deal with a gentleman, a person who had absolute knowledge of the topics he spoke on. You couldn't talk to him without becoming aware you were talking to a marine. As far as I am concerned, marines have something special about them—an absolute steadfastness, honesty, and integrity. CRAIG exemplified these qualities.

It is hard for me to realize he is now gone. Just before I left to go home this past recess, I stopped CRAIG and told him we are praying for him and to hang in there. Our great friend Susan Butcher also died of leukemia. She went through the same process CRAIG did. He told me he was going to stick with it. He thought he was going to be able to beat it. Everyone who met with CRAIG in the period after he was diagnosed with leukemia had to admire his courage, his absolute courage.

CRAIG's concept of life impressed me most. He lived life to the fullest. He had a wonderful family, four wonderful children, and a wonderful wife in Susan. He was also the essence of a Westerner. I have known many Westerners in my day, but never one who was as consummate a Westerner as CRAIG Thomas. The people of Wyoming were blessed to have him representing their interests. Whenever he went home, CRAIG traveled throughout his State, from one small community to the next. We compared notes about how Wyoming residents faced problems similar to those of the people of Alaska.

With CRAIG's passing, the Senate has lost a great leader in terms of Western values. But we have also lost a man who was a friend. He had the qualities everyone cherishes in a friend. And as the Senator from Oklahoma has said, he was very devout. You couldn't talk to CRAIG without realizing he had tremendous faith in our Maker. He was guided by this faith, and it kept him going during the past few months.

It is also hard to understand that leukemia is such a violent disease. This year alone, more than 44,000 Americans will be diagnosed with leukemia. The type of cancer which afflicted CRAIG, acute myeloid leukemia, has a 5-year survival rate of just 21 percent.

If there is anything I would add to what is going to be said today, it is that we must do more. We must do more to prevent this disease. We must learn as much as possible, and apply as much research as possible, because very few people survive their tremendous battle with leukemia. Of all people, I really believed CRAIG might. When I left for the Memorial Day recess, I had a good feeling—CRAIG was going to make it. He told me he would soon start another round of chemotherapy, but because of his strong faith, he had no fear of what lay ahead.

I hope the Senate takes a lesson from CRAIG THOMAS' attitude as he faced this adversity. After being diagnosed with leukemia, CRAIG faced trials and tribulations we can hardly imagine, and we will remember him as an example of a man with great moral strength and great faith in God. In honor of his memory, it is my hope we will join together and find a way to apply more funds to research leukemia, whose devastating impact has now taken a good friend from our Senate family.

This morning, the Casper Star-Tribune published several individuals' recollections of CRAIG. One of his former staff members, Liz Brimmer, said, ''In unassuming and generous ways, he did more for Wyoming, more for Wyoming people, than most people knew. His positive spirit permeated every interaction. Fiercely loyal and generous of spirit, CRAIG was funny and tenacious all in the same moment . . . He loved people and loved to make a difference. What better mark of a man?'' I wish I could find words as eloquent and as fitting to describe this extraordinary Senator.

We all mourn his death, and we send our love and best wishes to his family. Susan had a husband, and his children had a father, without equal. CRAIG THOMAS was a family man through and through, and I am deeply saddened by his passing.

When I thought about him this morning, who he was and what he meant to the Senate, a few words came to mind. In a place of great debate and heightened political excitement, CRAIG THOMAS was always a gentleman. That says something. It certainly is something we will remember. In a time and place where we often raise our voices in anger and emotion, CRAIG THOMAS was always soft spoken, but he was always heard. In a time when many of us fail even our own standards in terms of integrity, he was a man of high integrity, honorable and humble. In a place where many show weakness, he always showed strength, that quiet strength of a Wyoming cowboy.

I thought about his last battle with cancer. You could tell, when you saw him on the floor or passed him in the hallway, the therapy had taken its toll on him personally. Yet there was always a smile on his face, a determination to overcome the odds, and a very optimistic and positive word when you asked him how he was doing. Those are the things I remember about CRAIG THOMAS.

We serve with many people. They come and go. The annals of history do not record them all as great, but each one of us is lucky to be here and lucky to develop the friendships and relationships we do. Politically, CRAIG THOMAS and I were worlds apart. There might not be any starker contrast in voting records than CRAIG THOMAS and mine, but it didn't make much difference when it came to his friendship and his personal relationship. I am going to miss him. I am going to miss that Wyoming cowboy who had the Remington bronzes in his office that I walked by and looked at every time I came down the corridor. I will miss his smile and his courage. But I am going to be reminded by his example of how we can all be a little bit better in what we do here in the Senate.

I extend my sympathies to his wife Susan, his family, his staff, and all of his friends. He was truly a great Senator. I was honored to count him as a friend.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. In the third chapter of the book of Ecclesiastes, the Bible teaches us that there is a time for everything; a time to live and a time to die, a time to reap and a time to sow. Last night became the time that CRAIG THOMAS left us. For that we are all sorry and extend our sympathy to Susan and all his family and the people of Wyoming. But for all of us today and for years to come, it will be a time for us to reap the benefits of having known CRAIG THOMAS, having benefited from his service as a colleague in the Senate, but for the people of Wyoming as a great servant to that State. I don't know if there are two finer people who ever served the Senate than MIKE ENZI and CRAIG THOMAS. To have a matched set of rock-solid, quiet but humble, and strong men to serve a State is quite a unique privilege for that State and a unique privilege for all of us who serve.

On this sad occasion of the passing of a great Senator and a great friend, I know I will benefit and reap for years to come from the service, the passion, and the integrity of CRAIG THOMAS.

I honor his life.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam President, I rise to address the Senate in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I am saddened by the passing of a good friend, Senator THOMAS. I express my condolences to his family, the people of Wyoming, Senator ENZI, and to all of us who knew him and loved him. I have not served long with Senator THOMAS. It was a joy to hear this morning how he was described by Senator ENZI, who has known him for a long time. My memories of him are as someone who always was kind, always friendly, offered me a helping hand on my first days in the Senate. I know he has been described as an authentic cowboy. I certainly always viewed him as that. He seemed to be the real deal, the real McCoy.

I remember speaking before the break with the Senator, telling him how good he looked. Of course, he already knew he was headed back to another bout of chemo, but he didn't dwell on that. He was telling me that he was feeling good, and he did look good. He looked a lot better than he had been, and we were all encouraged. He certainly believed in that assessment as well.

In the last few months, he has been ''down the road'' from us, and he has been responsible for the candy drawer, a little Senate tradition. As we were talking before the break, standing there, he was commenting on his pride in the Wyoming taffy candy he had introduced to the candy drawer. He was a Wyoming promoter to the very end.

I relish the good memories. I know we are all sad today at this incredible loss. My heart goes out to the members of his family. We will do all we can to support all those who loved him.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I rise to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, on behalf of Kathy and myself, we send our deepest condolences and expressions of sympathy to Susan and her family on CRAIG's passing. Susan and CRAIG were good friends of ours. Susan is and CRAIG still is. They are special people. They are people whom you like to call friends, the type of people who are there. And they had a special relationship. I don't know how many votes we cast together. It was a lot. CRAIG arrived 2 years after I had. We would walk out of this Chamber together very often, and Susan, because she was here in Washington, would almost always be right out there, right outside the door, with a great smile to greet us, even though we probably just lost the vote.

CRAIG was special because, as has been mentioned and said so well by his partner Senator ENZI and his colleagues, Senator MCCONNELL, Senator INHOFE, Senator STEVENS, Senator ISAKSON, Senator MARTINEZ, and the Democratic leader, Senator REID, and Senator DURBIN, everybody respected him. You may not have agreed with him, but you could not help but respect him. He was quiet but accomplished and understood the issues. He was a man of inordinate common sense. When he would look at an issue, he would cut through all the puffery, all the theater, of which there is a fair amount around here, and he would get to the essence of the question. Then he would bring common sense to the question. Yes, it was common sense born out of a philosophy, which is our side of the aisle, which is conservative, but it was a common sense that cut across ideology most often because it was usually so obvious what the conclusion would be as presented by CRAIG.

I had the great good fortune—I don't know how it happened, but it was good fortune for me—to end up spending almost every Tuesday lunch, where we do policy, and almost every Wednesday lunch, where we do steering and get together as Members of the Republican Senate to discuss whatever is happening, to sit beside CRAIG. We sort of gravitated to each other. That is sort of ironic, me being from New England and him from Wyoming, but I think there is a certain, hopefully, identity of our approaches to events. I am certainly proud to say that. The great fun about sitting beside CRAIG was that not only did he have this wonderful common sense, but he had an extraordinary sense of humor. He would listen to statements made, often by our leadership—I do not wish to be disparaging here; I am simply being kind—and he would make some smiling, thoughtful comment that was usually fairly humorous and a touch irreverent about comments made by our leadership as to what we should be doing. You couldn't help but laugh because he was a person who had a sense of self, a sense of humor, a focus on what was right and what was wrong and what life should be about.

This disease attacked him, but honestly, you couldn't convince him that it attacked him. You would ask him how he was doing. He would say: I am OK. Even though you knew he was going through extraordinary pain, you would never, ever—at least I never, ever—hear him complain. He was a genuine marine in that sense.

He will obviously be missed around here. He was a low-key person who had a high-level impact. I will certainly miss him. I will miss him at those lunches and I will miss seeing Susan outside the door.

To Susan and his family, Kathy and I say: He was a great friend, and we will miss him.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLARD. I rise to honor my friend CRAIG THOMAS, the Senator from Wyoming who passed away last night, and to express my sympathy to Susan, his wife, and to his family and to the people of Wyoming. Joan and I and my staff feel we have had a very special relationship with CRAIG and Susan and his staff.

Two weeks ago the Senate passed S. Res. 130 declaring July 28 as National Day of the American Cowboy. This was the last piece of legislation Senator THOMAS pushed through the Senate. It is so true to his spirit. Senator THOMAS was himself a cowboy, a roper. He understood that as a symbol of the American West, cowboys represent much more than men on horses. They stand for courage, determination, hard work, and respect for nature. They stand for the West itself and for those who wish to protect and preserve it.

His work on the Energy and Environment Committees was a testament as well to his belief that the land we have been blessed with needs stewardship and care, and that those who live on and work with the land are often the best at doing so. CRAIG tried to take care of the land, especially the Wyoming he loved so much. This connection with the West, his concern for land management, and the way of life of those who lived on the land, should be his legacy. CRAIG rode forward into the end of his life so bravely that most of us never knew how bad his health was. He told us he was seeking treatment, but the end came quickly and, for him, stoically.

It was always a pleasure serving with Senator THOMAS—first in the House of Representatives, then in the Senate, where we collaborated on a whole range of issues. The proximity of our home States and our shared interest and passion for natural resources and energy issues provided many opportunities to partner on legislative efforts.

During the 2001 anthrax attack on the Hart Senate Office Building that pushed several Senators out of their offices, I was happy to offer Senator THOMAS and his staff space in my office for several months until his office was deemed safe again. During that time I was able to get to know him and his staff even better.

I offer my condolences now to his staff. He was the type of man who was not just a boss but a friend as well. I know they are hurting. He will be remembered for being the quintessential Wyoming cowboy, a gentleman with quick wit and humility of spirit that endeared him to his colleagues and made him a joy to us all.

Any man who can list cowboy, United States marine, husband, and father on his life's accomplishments lived life well. The Senate has lost a gentle giant who served his State and Nation with honor and distinction. Joan and I are keeping Susan and the family in our thoughts and prayers. I will miss my friend, CRAIG THOMAS.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I first note the presence on the floor of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI. I note also present in the Senate is a beautiful bouquet of flowers on the desk that was occupied by the other Senator from Wyoming, Mr. CRAIG THOMAS.

I want to say to Senator ENZI, first, we will all have an opportunity in the next few days and weeks to speak about the Senator who was your colleague who left us last night, and we all will have an opportunity to speak with you and see you on more occasions than this to express to you our heartfelt sorrow for the loss of your colleague.

You will suffer a lot of things that will be downers during your life in the Senate—and because we all live our lives, things happen, go up and go down—but I am quite sure you will not have an opportunity to suffer any more severe a loss than the loss of your colleague who was at the same time a cowboy, a marine, a Senator, a father, and, clearly, a husband.

He had a wife named Susan. Everybody who knows her loves her. My wife loves her. I called my wife early this morning, after I heard, and I was so pleased she answered the phone herself because I thought: Where will I get her? We may get caught up in the maze of today and maybe I will not be able to talk to her until tomorrow, or maybe Nancy will not be able to talk to me. But, sure enough, it was at 8:30 this morning I was able to talk to her.

Her first words, after knowing who I was, were words coming out of her mouth saying: He did a good job for Wyoming, didn't he? I said: You bet. Then: I am sure, not knowing the rest of his life, he must have done a good job in a lot of other areas. Probably he was a good husband—to which there was no answer because that was not intended as a question. He obviously was a wonderful man. Quiet, sort of unassuming, but he was a very involved Senator, especially when it came to Wyoming.

Very early on, as he worked his way from the House, where he replaced DICK CHENEY, over to the Senate, where he had been elected, he decided he would work for his State. You did not hear of him a lot on national news because he was busy doing what he thought was best for him as a Senator, and that was, representing that great State of Wyoming. What a State that is, and what a Senator they had.

From my standpoint, I served with him on two committees. The one I know the most and remember the most is the one we served the longest on: Energy and Natural Resources, which the occupant of the chair has served on with us. But when it came to this man, he frequently worked with Democrats on serious issues because he wanted to get things done.

If there is one thing I noticed as we worked together, shoulder to shoulder on this committee, it was that he was impatient because he did not understand when we wasted time and he did not understand why we were doing some certain things. He would ask: Why don't we get on with what we are supposed to do? What are we talking about this for? This is not policy. We are talking about a bunch of little things we ought not be involved in. I think I remember that more than anything else: Can't we get on with it?

I remember he was burdened with the fact there is a substance in his State called trona. The other Senator from Wyoming might know about it. He must know about it. Apparently, they were having competition in the world, and he thought the royalties were too high. I don't know. Anybody who served on the committee must have heard the word ''trona'' because he was all over that issue, wanting to get somebody to listen to him about the unfairness of it and to help solve it.

I did not get to serve with him on the Finance Committee and other committees he served on, but it would be my guess he was the same way on all of them, that he showed up when he should and did his job as best he could, and that when the chips were down, you could count on him. When the chips were down, he did what he said. He voted the way he would tell you. He worked the way a dedicated person works.

For me and my wife, on this day, shortly after his death, I want to say in the Senate that Wyoming sent us a true man. I do not know whether it was the marines who made him a man or what it was, but he was truly different. He was tough minded. He was quiet. But he was impatient, and he wanted to get good things done.

I am positive his relatives and his great State will never forget him. He will be remembered by them, just as we remember him. He will leave them, and they will have a big void, without a question, because a giant part of their lives leaves. That goes for Wyoming, and that goes for his wife Susan and their children. I think there are four of them. I did not get to meet them. But if they are like their mother and father, they could not help but be great.

With that, I say goodbye to the Senator, and I extend my sorrows to his wonderful wife, and, hopefully, I will be part of whatever ceremony there is for us to send him on his way.

May God bless his family and him, and may whatever he aspired to get done, get done by others who follow him because he set such a wonderful basis to get those things completed for his State.

I thank the Senate and I thank the junior Senator from Wyoming for the kind man he is. I will be seeing him, and I say to the Senator, if I can help you during these times, please call on me. I am available.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, the thoughts and prayers of my wife Charlene and myself are with Susan today and their four children, as we think about CRAIG THOMAS, our dear friend, our colleague, a man who has been such a wonderful presence in our lives in the Senate.

Much has been said, and quite correctly so, about Senator THOMAS as a cowboy, and certainly he was, and his rich heritage of experience in the Marine Corps, as he volunteered to serve his country after college. But I want to stress two or three things that perhaps have not come to the attention of Senators in the same way this morning, one of which is that CRAIG THOMAS was a person who was vitally interested in the Far East. He served for a period of time on the Foreign Relations Committee, and during that period of time, as I recall, was either the subcommittee chairman or heavily involved in hearings and in working with our Ambassadors to countries in Asia.

For a variety of reasons, because CRAIG always sought opportunities to serve Wyoming in whatever committee assignments seemed most appropriate at the time, his service on the Foreign Relations Committee was not a long one, but he continued that service by holding breakfasts in his office. I was privileged to be invited to those breakfasts in which famous people from abroad, especially the Far East, were his guests. These are ladies and gentlemen he had met during his foreign travels or during his work in Wyoming in which they might have been of value to his State.

It was an extraordinary set of experiences. I stress ''experiences'' because there were many of these breakfasts. I encouraged him to continue on. I enjoyed the fellowship of the people he brought together as well as Senators he brought into an orbit of understanding about the Far East, through his own ministry in this case.

I have been impressed in addition—speaking of breakfasts and the fact that Senator THOMAS was a regular at the Aspen Institute breakfasts that are held right here in the Capitol on Wednesdays and Thursdays frequently throughout the legislative year. I am advised as many as 24 of these breakfasts are held on the subjects which the Aspen Institute Congressional group is focusing.

Among the things on which the group has been focusing in recent years has been problems with Russia and the Balkans and developments in Eastern Europe, the problems certainly in education generally as a subject for our schoolchildren in this country, problems in Latin America, the problems of the environment and energy, and, appropriately, problems in Asia and especially China in the Far East.

I noticed CRAIG THOMAS, when it came to these breakfasts, usually was there on time and listened to the lecture or the paper that was being given by the speaker, and that he frequently proceeded on, perhaps, to another breakfast or another appointment without severely questioning either other Members of Congress or the speaker at the time, but was intensely interested. Because we frequently saw and listened to the same people, this led to many rich conversations which I was privileged to have with him. I would ask him: What did you think? What were your impressions of that speaker today? He always had some very concise impressions.

But a third thing I simply want to mention, in addition to these breakfasts, is the sense of good humor with which those impressions were cast. He had his own unique sense of humor, and yet it was clearly there and very much a part of the personal association each one of us enjoyed with the Senator.

Likewise, that sense of humor was shared by Susan, appropriately. I can remember so many times outside the door to this Chamber Susan would be standing there at about 6:30 at night or some such time. It was obvious she and the Senator were going to dinner or had some activity. But one of the delightful things was that so many of us had been visiting with Susan over the years. We had a lot to say to her and she to us, always with a wonderful sense of humor, with a sense of the work we are about, how unusual to some this schedule seems, how absurd it may be to others, someone who had her own vocation as a very remarkable teacher and someone who understood the needs of children.

It is not surprising that CRAIG would attend the Aspen Education Conferences in addition to his far-flung interests in Asia and most importantly, obviously, the land use issues and the remarkable ability of people to make a living off the land in his home State. It was finally in that capacity that I enjoyed the best conversations with CRAIG THOMAS because he was deeply interested in agriculture, as I am. We come from very different kinds of agriculture, yet there was a profound understanding of the challenges and the joys of people who make their living from the soil; likewise, from the husbandry of animals and the combination of forestry, and even the mineral uses of lands—much more abundant, I must say, in the State of Wyoming than in Indiana. But we both understood the nature of that income, the nature of the challenge, and the importance of State and Federal legislation as it pertained to those farmers. So I will miss those conversations especially because that is a heritage of land in which both of us have been involved in our families, and I suspect his will continue.

Our thoughts are with the family today. We are never prepared for such a day. That is why many of us perhaps are rambling on occasion in our thoughts as we collect them about this outstanding Senator and wonderful friend. But it truly is a privilege to have this opportunity on the floor of the Senate to pay tribute to my dear friend CRAIG THOMAS.

I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. Madam President, this is a sad day for all of us. Wyoming and the Senate have lost CRAIG THOMAS. He was a neighbor. He was a friend. He was an individual whose life was committed to his country and his State.

Often, when he would refer to my State of Nebraska, he would say: Oh, yes, that State of Nebraska; that is where Wyoming sends all of its wind. He said other things as well. Many times, he and Senator ENZI were responsible for stealing Nebraska's water. Other than those obvious flaws, CRAIG THOMAS was one of those unique individuals whom we have heard his colleagues speak of this morning. None have exaggerated in their descriptions of this remarkable man. He, as has been noted, was a marine. He was a straight shooter. He was born and raised on a ranch in Wyoming. When you add all of that up, what else could he be but a straight shooter?

He worked hard, as has been noted here this morning. Chairman LUGAR outlined some of the participation of CRAIG THOMAS on the Foreign Relations Committee where I, too, had an opportunity to serve with him. No one was ever better prepared when he spoke, more knowledgeable of the subject matter, and more a joy to be around because he never lost the most important element of each of us; that is, a humanness, the human dynamic. He had a special humanity that is not always easy to retain in this town and in this business. But that is what CRAIG THOMAS was, and I think that is what most of us admired most about him.

If service to America is one of America's highest and most important values, then CRAIG THOMAS's legacy speaks volumes because that was his life. Lilibet and I offer our sympathy and our prayers to Susan and to the family. He served with great distinction and always put others first.

One last comment about a memory of CRAIG THOMAS for me. In 1996, when I was campaigning for my first elective office to the U.S. Senate and when there was a very legitimate question of whether I was worthy of election and whether I could win, CRAIG THOMAS flew over from Wyoming to central Nebraska and spent a day campaigning with me in 1996. CRAIG was the first U.S. Senator to help me, to come into my State, and that day I spent with him talking about water issues, agricultural issues, the Marine Corps, and service to our country inspired all who were around him. I noted that those ranchers and those water resource specialists and others whom we visited on that campaign tour that day responded to him in a way that was rather special. I later learned through my almost 11 years in the Senate why people responded to him in such a special way.

We will miss him. He leaves our institution, his State, and his country better than he found them.

Thank you.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, we will miss CRAIG THOMAS. CRAIG THOMAS would want it to be said that he was a conservative. He enjoyed expressing conservative views on this floor. He enjoyed expressing conservative views in our Energy Committee on which we served together, and the Senator from Louisiana and I served with Senator THOMAS. He kept his feet firmly planted on the ground in Wyoming from which his conservatism came. He obviously well represented the people of Wyoming because he barely noticed there was an election last year. When CRAIG THOMAS ran, he was elected by an overwhelming margin.

CRAIG THOMAS was a conservationist. He was chairman of the National Parks

Subcommittee during the time I served on the Energy Committee, and he enjoyed that very much. I am not a bit surprised because he took great pride in the fact that Yellowstone, a great, premier park—I can say that even though we have the Great Smokies in Tennessee—but Yellowstone, which has such a special place in the hearts of all Americans, CRAIG THOMAS took special pride in his jurisdiction of that responsibility. He was honored by the National Parks Association a couple of years ago. CRAIG THOMAS was awarded the singular honor of the National Parks Association for his stewardship of our national parks.

CRAIG THOMAS was no-nonsense. That came from several places, I suspect. One was, as the Senator from Nebraska noted, he was a marine. One was that he was a cowboy, a real cowboy. I saw Senator INHOFE talking about him in that respect. Another reason is he came from Wyoming. I see that Senator ENZI from Wyoming is here. Wyoming citizens, I have noticed, don't waste words. They think about them before they say them, and they often don't say them. They don't feel a need to fill every vacuum with a string of words, which is an unusual characteristic on the floor of the U.S. Senate, but CRAIG THOMAS was such a person. I think, in fact, he grew up in Wyoming, came from Wyoming, lived in Wyoming, kept his feet planted in Wyoming, and helped contribute to that nonsense approach to life he had which enriched the Senate.

CRAIG THOMAS was also interested in working across party lines. Earlier this year, Senator LIEBERMAN and I and others began a breakfast on Tuesday morning at 8 o'clock for those Senators who had time to come, not for the purpose of passing legislation but for the purpose of getting to know each other better across party lines so that we could perhaps come to solutions more quickly in other areas. It was interesting to see who came to that breakfast. We all are busy. We all have tremendous demands on our time. We started off with 40 Senators of both parties. Sometimes it got to be 10 or 12 or 14. But almost every Tuesday morning at the bipartisan Senators' breakfast, CRAIG THOMAS was there, and he always had a contribution to make. He was there 2 weeks ago, in the week before our recess, which is why it was such a surprise to learn that he died yesterday, because when he was there, he sat quietly, but you could tell he had something to say, and he finally said it before he left. The subject was immigration. He had some questions, and he had some comments. He looked the perfect picture of health. He looked as if he would last forever. That was the last I saw of CRAIG THOMAS.

We are a family here in the Senate. We say that often to one another, but it is true. We have breakfast together, as we did this morning at the bipartisan breakfast or as we will tomorrow morning at the Prayer Breakfast where we will remember CRAIG THOMAS. We have lunch together, which we are about to do, Republicans on one side and Democrats on the other. We have committee hearings and meetings all day long and little visits, and then in the evenings, if that weren't enough, why, we get together and we go to receptions for each other. That is how we live our lives here. So it is a surprise to us to suddenly find ourselves without CRAIG THOMAS, whom we saw at breakfast, whom we saw at lunch, whom we saw at committee meetings, and whom we saw in the evenings. We will miss him, but we greatly respect his presence here in the Senate for such a long period of time.

When he got sick last year, we heard that he was soon doing fingertip pushups again. So all of us thought—at least I thought—well, CRAIG is going to be fine. He is going to be fine. But, as will be the case with each of us, in the end, his life has come to a conclusion. It has been a life of public service, one I greatly respect.

To Susan and to his family, Honey and I offer our sympathy and our respect for his life. We will be thinking and praying for them, and we will be remembering how much joy our friend CRAIG THOMAS brought to the U.S. Senate.

Thank you, Madam President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words about CRAIG THOMAS. He was a friend of mine and of all of us in the Senate. His death is a shock to this institution and to all of us. I heard the news this morning on the radio, as many of us did, I believe, and I was genuinely shocked to hear that he had died. My last encounter with him was the week before we had our recess where I had the chance to be with him in the Energy Committee, and he was there and very much participating in that committee hearing. He had a great deal to say, as he usually did, and an interest in what was going on.

I think the first thing that comes to my mind about CRAIG is that he was an example of courage in the face of adversity. I have seen several interviews recently where I was very admiring of Elizabeth Edwards and the tremendous example she is presenting for the entire country about carrying on in the face of adversity after having been diagnosed, as she has been. I think the American people appreciate that, and understandably. I appreciate it, and I am sure everyone who is aware of her circumstance appreciates it greatly.

The same can be said about CRAIG THOMAS. CRAIG was diagnosed with leukemia shortly before his reelection this last fall, and I think everybody had to know that this was not a minor illness that was easily overcome. CRAIG took it in stride. He was here working in the Senate. He went through the chemotherapy and he was back, regaining his strength, and all of us admired that. All of us admired the way he faced that adversity, and he did all that he could, all that was humanly possible, to overcome that adversity.

I had the good fortune to serve with CRAIG on two committees, including the Energy Committee, where he was chair of the National Park Subcommittee. He took a great interest in issues affecting not only national parks but our public lands generally and, of course, our energy issues as well. I also had the good fortune to serve with him on the Finance Committee. The chairman of the Finance Committee this year appointed a new Subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resource Tax Issues. I was fortunate to be named chair of that, and CRAIG was named as the ranking member. So he and I spent a lot of time together, both in the Energy Committee and in the Finance Committee, sitting in hearings and talking about the agenda of the committees and generally interacting.

I had the other great good fortune of taking a trip last year that Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN sponsored—a trip to Iraq and Afghanistan, in April of 2006, with CRAIG THOMAS. CRAIG and I were both invited to be on that trip. So I spent time with him and interacted with him in Afghanistan and in Turkey, where we made a short stop, and also in London, where we met with some British defense officials.

Three things came through to me that I think are my recollection of CRAIG THOMAS: First, his decency as a human being. When you are with a person for a substantial period of time, you get a sense of their decency as a human being. I have spent a lot of time with CRAIG THOMAS in this Senate and on that trip to which I just alluded. I can vouch for his basic decency. He was always considerate, always civil, always concerned about the feelings of others and the reaction of others.

The second characteristic I would allude to is his ability to ask tough questions. CRAIG liked to think of himself as a conservative. I would characterize him, as much as anything, as sort of a skeptic. Whenever the experts were telling us what the solution to a problem was, or what their analysis of a problem was, he was one who would stand back and say: Wait a minute, let's question some of that expert advice and expert analysis that you are giving us. That is very much needed by people in public office. You need people who will ask the tough questions, and CRAIG THOMAS asked the tough questions.

Third is the characteristic that others have spoken of here—that he was a straight shooter; he was straightforward in his view of the issues. You didn't have to guess what CRAIG thought about an issue. He would tell you, and it was a heartfelt view that he was expressing. So this is a very great loss to this Senate, to the people of Wyoming, and to the country. I consider him to have been a superb public

servant. The people of Wyoming were extremely well served by him, the country was well served by him, and this Senate was well served by having him as one of our distinguished members.

I extend my condolences to Susan and the family and, of course, to all of the people who are friends of his in his home State. He will be fondly remembered in this Senate.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise this morning with a very heavy heart, like all the rest of my colleagues, about the loss of our dear friend CRAIG THOMAS. CRAIG was such an inspiration in such a quiet way to all of us, a guy from the true Wild West, the great State of Wyoming. He had such an easy manner about him that is so indicative of a lot of people who come from that part of the country. It was indeed a privilege and a pleasure to have the opportunity to serve with him.

I had a number of interests in common with CRAIG. First of all, we served on the Agriculture Committee together. In the past 2 years, as chairman of the Agriculture Committee, CRAIG was one of those guys I called on from time to time to seek his advice and counsel because in the area of Wyoming and in the western part of the country, they grow different kinds of crops than what we grow in the Southeast. CRAIG was always willing to give his time to talk to me about the thoughts of farmers and ranchers in his part of the country and what we needed to do from a policy perspective on the Agriculture Committee relative to his farmers and ranchers that would also be beneficial to my farmers and ranchers. I cannot overemphasize the value of that kind of relationship with a Member of this body.

I grew up in my law practice and in the rural electrification business. CRAIG was a strong advocate of rural electrification and the REA program and had been involved with it in Wyoming for decades. We had the opportunity to talk about this issue and long-term policy relative to providing electricity and other assets to people in rural America, and whether it was rural Wyoming or rural Georgia made no difference. CRAIG was an advocate of making sure that people in rural America all across our great country had the opportunities that folks in the urban parts of America have. I had a special opportunity to work with CRAIG.

Earlier, I heard folks talk about CRAIG's love for the country and his love for the land. We were both outdoorsmen. He used to ride a horse a lot, and I like to shoot a shotgun at quail, pheasant, and a few other things that I have been blessed to be able to do over the years. We talked about our enjoyment of the outdoors on any number of different occasions.

CRAIG was the chairman of a major committee during the last Congress. He was in charge of an issue that has been very near and dear to my State, an issue of designating property with a heritage designation in Georgia. I worked on this for about 6 years. We got right up to the brink last year, and all of a sudden we ran into a roadblock. CRAIG, as chairman, said, ''Saxby, here is the problem.'' Then he went through it and explained the very complex side of the issue that I had never thought of before.

What it made me realize about CRAIG was that he was a lover of the land of America, irrespective of whether it was in Wyoming, Georgia, or the State of New York. He wanted to make sure future generations had the same opportunity to enjoy lands as our generation and previous generations have had the opportunity to do. Once he explained his position to me, we again worked through the issue. It took us a little longer than I wanted it to, but I had to be patient because CRAIG was very thoughtful. I knew his thinking was the right way of thinking on any issue like this, particularly with the designation of heritage areas, because there are other connotations to it than just saying we are going to leave this land for future generations.

CRAIG was such a great ally in this process. At the end of the day, I remember when he gave his consent through a unanimous consent resolution. He and I sat right here near one another. He used to sit right there, and he moved behind me here. We sat across the aisle, and we had a long conversation that night about this particular piece of property for which he had now come to have a great appreciation. It is something that Georgians and America are going to enjoy for generations to come, and it simply would not have happened without CRAIG THOMAS.

Lastly, the desk that is right behind my desk is one of the more notable desks on this side of the aisle in this great institution because it is our candy drawer. His desk is our candy drawer. Of course, Rick Santorum from Pennsylvania had that desk in the two previous Congresses, and he kept it full of candy. CRAIG could not wait to get that desk when Rick left the Senate. Now, when a lot of us walk into the Senate door, the first thing we do is open that desk drawer to see what kind of candy CRAIG has put in there for us. He has never failed us. It was always a delight of his to be able to make folks happy, and this was a simple and easy way to encourage and get a smile on the faces of Senators as we walked in the door.

CRAIG's wife Susan is such a great lady. I don't know his sons, but Susan is such a wonderful person. Again, as this body is such a small body, we all become friends regardless of our political differences. At the end of the day, we are a family, and we truly do have Susan and all of her other family in our thoughts and prayers as they go through what we know is a very difficult time.

CRAIG and I also had in common the fact that we were both cancer survivors. I went through a process about 3 years ago, and CRAIG was one of the first ones to come to me and give me his thoughts and encouragement, which I really respected and greatly appreciated. That is the kind of family thought process that we go through here.

So as we reach this day when CRAIG has lost that last battle—and, boy, did he ever fight good ones through the years. He fought this one very well, too. But as we think about him today, knowing his love of the outdoors in our conversations about his riding horses—even riding horses with the Capitol Police on the grounds of the Capitol—I am always going to have those very fond memories of CRAIG THOMAS as a great friend, a great Member of this institution, and a truly great American. We know he is riding off into the sunset for a better life even as we speak today.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I had the great privilege of presiding this morning. I got to listen to my colleagues come to the floor to pay tribute to our friend, an outstanding Senator and a wonderful man, CRAIG THOMAS from Wyoming.

So many things were said this morning, but I wanted to add a few more. First of all, as I sat in the chair to listen to the tributes, I want to give a compliment to the Senator from Wyoming, who spoke on behalf of his colleague. I have heard many tributes in the 10 years I have been in the Senate but, to me, it was one of the most beautiful tributes that a partner and colleague has made for another. Senator ENZI will continue to carry on the great traditions of the State, and I am sure he, as we all have, will be inspired by his friend that we lost. It was evident in his heartfelt and beautifully executed remarks this morning.

I wanted to rise as a Member who served with Senator THOMAS on the Energy Committee, someone who worked fairly closely with him, although we are not of the same political party, to reiterate just a few things about his character.

This life we choose to live in public life is not the easiest life to live, and sometimes it is harder on our families than it is on us individually. It is a life that we choose because we want to serve our constituents. We believe we can do that job.

I heard so many of our colleagues rise to pay tribute to the Senator but

mention Susan, his wife, that I wanted to restate for the record how inspirational their relationship has been to me and to many of us. Not only did Susan wait for him, many times outside of this door, to greet him always with a smile or encouragement, they often were able to travel together as a couple, to share both the joys and the burdens of this life. I think it is a tribute to both of them and particularly to CRAIG THOMAS, who shared his life in such a special way with his spouse, which stands as an inspiration to us all, and Susan to him.

I also wanted to say what a strong and steady voice, an unflinching champion for Wyoming he was, in fact, even in the twilight of his life, within the last few weeks, as was mentioned by some of us who were with him at the Prayer Breakfast, some of us who were with him at the bipartisan conference, and some of us who were with him in one of his last Energy Committee meetings. I recall the memory of his voice, although weak in body, strong in spirit, fighting for Wyoming, talking about coal, talking about a new energy policy, talking about how the country depended so much on the resources of Wyoming and how he was determined to continue to fight and provide that point of view on our committee. So on the Energy Committee we will miss him, always there, always on time, always steady, always strong, and never forgetting the State he came to represent and did so, so completely and so consistently.

Finally, some of us have mentioned the inspiration he has been to us in terms of his quiet and gentle spirit, knowing that he was facing a very difficult time, with his time perhaps not that long to be here. As many of our colleagues have said, however, he never complained. He always said how well he was feeling and how much better and how thankful he was for his doctors, for his family's support, and he was always thanking us for being there when we could.

I wish to mention the strength of his spirit in having come to terms and making peace in his life, that God was his friend. He had a great faith in God Almighty. It was evident by the way he walked, not agitated and not nervous, not anxious and not afraid, but basically the quiet confidence of a person who was at peace with God and with whatever God would have in store for him. I think those of us in the Senate family, for all we remember of him—as a cowboy, as a marine, as a Senator—we will always remember the last few weeks of that quiet confidence of a man who knew why he was born and where he was going. That was our good friend CRAIG THOMAS.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to join my colleagues in tribute to the memory of a wonderful friend, Senator CRAIG THOMAS from Wyoming. For me, CRAIG THOMAS was not only a member of the Senate family, he was a neighbor to the north. Because of the similarities between Wyoming and Colorado in terms of the rural nature of our States, Senator THOMAS and I had the opportunity to work on many matters during the time we both served in the Senate. I wish to comment on two or three of those issues which were very important to us as we worked on them together.

I always saw Senator CRAIG THOMAS as someone who was truly a fighter for the land, water, and people of this Nation, and the people of the State of Wyoming. I remember very clearly the debate we had in the Senate Energy Committee and the National Parks Subcommittee, which he chaired, about whether we were going to abandon the hundred-year principle that had guided the conservation philosophy of our national parks. It was Senator CRAIG THOMAS who, at the point of the spear, made sure that the conservation doctrine of our national parks' policy remained intact.

I also remember the leadership role Senator THOMAS took in the last several years when there were efforts to try to sell off our public lands in order to make that part of the deficit reduction for our Nation. While he was a true fiscal conservative, he also understood the importance of the legacy of our public lands, protecting our public lands, and making sure those public lands were not used simply for deficit reduction. It was through his leadership that we were able to turn back the efforts of those who wanted to sell off the public lands of our Nation.

I wish to also comment with respect to Senator THOMAS's efforts for rural America.

There are some significant differences between the Senate family and the House family. I think the House of Representatives, because of the makeup of that body—many of them come only from metropolitan and urban areas. Here in our Chamber, many of our Senators represent States that are very rural in nature, and there are very few States that are as rural as that great State of Wyoming. So it was natural for Senator THOMAS to be a champion for rural America, and it was my honor to join with him in working on a number of other things where we stood together and said that the America that had been forgotten by so many, rural America, was never going to be forgotten on the floor of the Senate. It was in that vein that Senator THOMAS took a leadership role, along with our good friend, Senator LARRY CRAIG from Idaho, to make sure we were doing right with payment in lieu of taxes so that those rural communities in the West, which are so dependent upon payment in lieu of taxes because so much of our land is owned by the Federal Government, that we would be providing them with the kind of compensation needed to keep them afloat.

It was also in that regard that I had the honor of joining Senator THOMAS last year and Senator CRAIG in moving forward with the creation of the Office of Rural Veterans Affairs. That is because Senator THOMAS understood that there was a great disparity in how veterans were being treated in the urban-suburban areas of our society and those in rural communities. The fact is that the VA had done a study that demonstrated the great disparity in health care services that were forthcoming from the VA to those veterans who lived in the urban communities as opposed to those who lived in rural communities. So it was his effort and his leadership that helped us lead to the creation of the Office of Rural Veterans Affairs.

Finally, his work on the Agriculture Committee. When I think about Wyoming, a State that I often travel, a State where I have often worked, I think about its natural resources and I think about its people, but I also think about its agricultural base. Certainly, Senator CRAIG THOMAS will always be remembered for his great advocacy for agriculture and making sure we have sustainable agriculture here in our Nation.

I would like to thank Senator THOMAS for the contributions he made to my State, even though I am a very new Senator here in this body. We worked on a number of different issues. It was through his leadership that we were able to hold hearings and move forward on legislation that created the Sangre De Cristo National Heritage Area, the Clark County National Heritage Act legislation, the Rocky Mountain National Park Wilderness Act, and the Betty Dick Resident Protection Act, and I could go on and on listing a whole host of other matters that were moved forward because of the advocacy of Senator THOMAS.

Lastly, I would say this: We get to know each other in a number of different ways here on the floor of the Senate and while working together. I fondly remember traveling with Senator REID and with Senator THOMAS to Iraq and spending 8 or 9 days with him in that troubled part of the world. I remember the conversations about his yearning for a more peaceful and stronger world, where we would create a legacy for our children that was a legacy of peace for the world.

I was honored to often go to the Prayer Breakfast on Wednesday mornings and listen to the speakers. I knew CRAIG THOMAS was a man of faith and that he was doing the duty of the people of this country and the duty of the people of Wyoming.

So from his neighbor to the south, I conclude by simply saying that I am proud of that cowboy. I am proud of CRAIG THOMAS, and I am proud of the contributions he made not only to the State of Wyoming but the contributions he made to this Nation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. McCASKILL). The Senator from Wyoming.

I am sorry, the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, today I take that comment with respect and honor because I am here, like many of my colleagues, to join in speaking about the loss of Senator CRAIG THOMAS, a friend from the neighboring State of Wyoming.

Over the course of years in working with CRAIG on the floor of the House and here in the Senate, I must tell you that notice of his death late yesterday evening was a real loss to me and my wife Suzanne. And I say to his wife Susan and their four children that we stand in quiet prayer for strength for you through this difficult time in the loss of a truly marvelous American.

The Senator from Colorado just mentioned the word ''cowboy,'' and I oftentimes, when at a gathering with CRAIG, if the opportunity arose where we were both speakers and I was to introduce him—and that happened on several occasions—I would say: And now, ladies and gentlemen, let me introduce the cowboy from Wyoming. And he would stand with a big smile on his face because he viewed that as a statement of respect. I think we westerners, who work closely together on issues that are uniquely western, appreciate and understand that expression.

CRAIG came to the House in 1989, just as I was leaving the House, so I got to know him then. And, of course, when he came to the Senate and came to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, where we both grew in seniority, we began to work very closely together on so many issues that were important to the West but also issues that were important to the Nation.

CQ, Congressional Quarterly, in its Political Profiles of American Politicians, said this about CRAIG, and I think it is so typical of the man. They said:

> While Thomas pursues his State's interests, he does it in a quiet, methodical way that has made him remarkably few enemies after nearly two decades in Congress. Known for his courtesy and diplomacy, even on bitterly contested issues, he is no pushover.

That is the CRAIG THOMAS whom we all got to know. He could be tough in his position. He knew exactly where he was on almost all issues, and he very seldom gave ground. But he would give ground when he knew it would bring the issue to resolution. Now, I say that is the art of a talented policymaker, and CRAIG THOMAS, representing his State of Wyoming and the Nation, was truly that.

He filled big shoes. When he came to the House, he filled the shoes of the departing DICK CHENEY, and, of course, when he came over here, he filled the shoes of Malcolm Wallop, who was well known here as a very clear conservative and often very partisan Member of the Senate. But in filling those shoes—and more importantly, he brought his own boots—he made his own mark for his State and for the Nation. So whether it was park issues, whether it was natural resource issues, whether it was differences between that boundary line that sometimes is fairly indistinguishable out West between Idaho and Wyoming, CRAIG THOMAS served the citizens of his State extremely well.

Oftentimes known as an open, multiple-use advocate, as both he and I are on the utilization of our public lands and their management, when it came to Yellowstone National Park and the Grand Teton National Park, they were something special in CRAIG's mind. Oftentimes I would say: CRAIG, you are siding with the environmentalists on that issue.

He would laugh or smile and say: LARRY, nothing is too good in protecting Yellowstone National Park and the Grand Teton. They are the crown jewels in the Nation and they are a major part of my State.

While we were very seldom in disagreement, there were times when there was a bump-up now and then, as is typical amongst all of us who serve in the Senate, even though on most issues we found great compatibility.

I am one amongst all who will miss CRAIG THOMAS. He was a friend of longstanding, a colleague. His wife Susan and my wife Suzanne had become good friends over the years, as so many of us do while working in the Senate. His life is taken from us and from the citizens of his State and from his family at a time when CRAIG THOMAS was serving his State and his Nation well.

Again, to his wife and children, we are going to miss CRAIG a great deal in the Senate. I, personally, as a friend, will miss CRAIG THOMAS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I, too, rise today to pay tribute to our fallen friend, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. CRAIG THOMAS. My wife Tricia and I were greatly saddened this morning when we rose and found out that CRAIG had lost his battle with this form of leukemia. The four of us have been together many times, socially and in business settings. We have had some great experiences together in other parts of the world. We were so sad to learn he had passed away. It was heightened by the fact that he seemed to have done so well after his first round of treatment. It was a great pleasure to come on the floor over the last couple months and see him looking better every day. He seemed to feel good. So I was personally excited that he was going to whip this thing. That was his attitude, as a true marine. He was fighting a battle to win.

He brought to the Senate a special down-to-Earth Wyoming wisdom, reflective of the unique part of the country he represented so well. Cody, WY, where he was born, is a special place. CRAIG was the epitome of the people in that part of our great country. In a legislative body of sometimes showboats, lightning rods and mavericks, CRAIG was an engine of the Senate. He was not flamboyant. He didn't try to be. He kept plodding along, trying to find a way to get the right results and help the Senate do its job.

I have learned over the years there are some people in life, and some Members of the Senate, who are tried and true, who can be depended on no matter what the issue is. CRAIG THOMAS was one of those. He kept the Senate on point when we strayed from the big picture—with his goodness, his common sense, and his affable manner. It is very easy to get fired up and lash out at an institution where we all come from so many different backgrounds and are so passionate sometimes about issues. But CRAIG kept it cool, kept a level head, and kept moving forward. When we drifted off message, when we were too much into the weeds with our competing agendas, he didn't complain or rail or make demands to fix it, he rounded up several of his colleagues, came to the floor, and before long he had a way of helping us get back on track.

His resilience and self-reliance were emblematic of the open range country in which he was born. He was Wyoming to me, in all its rugged zest for community, Nation, and faith.

I was particularly interested in hearing our colleague, Senator LARRY CRAIG, from Idaho, talk about his love of the outdoors, of Yellowstone, and his effort to preserve and improve that great national park. It was one of the things he truly did love. He didn't talk about himself very much, but he spoke eloquently about the quality-of-life issues of his mostly rural West neighbors. He was, after all, a farmer. That is what he got his degree in, in college—agriculture.

Of course, he served his country for 4 years in the Marines. That was kind of how he approached his job in the Senate. He came to get things done, to get results for Wyoming, and the Nation. He was on the right committees to do that. He was on the Energy Committee, and I tangled with him, one time in particular I remember, on the Energy Committee. I came away knowing that, when you get in a tussle with CRAIG THOMAS, you better bring your lunch because it will not be quick. It will take a long time to work it out. But work it out we did.

He also served on the Finance Committee, where I had the pleasure of serving with him. He provided, again, good, solid, calm counsel and participation. It was that self-reliance, that selflessness that diverted our attention from the tragedy his family was facing over recent months. But that is how he wanted it. He was riding the Senate range, keeping us on the trail, and helping us to stay with the big picture, to improve the quality of life of all those we represent.

Tricia and I extend our love, our thoughts, and our prayers to Susan,

their children, and CRAIG's loyal staff. We have lost a solid statesman, and we will dedicate ourselves to keeping his spirit of goodness alive in the Senate for all of those to come.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, this is a sad time for the Senate. As we continue with the important business of the Nation, we pause for a few moments to think about our common loss of one of our kindest, most dedicated, and most thoughtful colleagues, Senator CRAIG THOMAS of Wyoming. All of us have our own private memories of our relationship with CRAIG. Mine is of him as a kind of silent leader, kind of an atypical character, if you will, in the Senate.

When I got here 4½ years ago, someone alleged—and this is a broad characterization—someone said: Welcome to the Senate, a place that has 100 large egos and 200 sharp elbows.

I think what that person forgot to do was account for somebody such as CRAIG THOMAS, who was never jockeying for the headlines and spotlight but always focused on his work and quietly, every day, made a difference.

I learned firsthand in recent months, as I began working with a number of Senators on this side of the aisle, trying to encourage their active participation in the floor debates, CRAIG understood it is open debate and discussion in this, the world's greatest deliberative body, that protects and extends democracy. Indeed, every week as we met, Senator THOMAS would simply ask: What can I do, JOHN? It is that fundamental desire to serve the public, the most basic and fundamental question of all that best characterized Senator CRAIG THOMAS: What can I do?

He was a defender of American values. From his service in the Marine Corps to his time in the House and the Senate, he served with courage and integrity. Nowhere was that more apparent than in the way he served and handled his final illness. You never would have known that he had been through chemotherapy or that he was not feeling well. The only way you would know is because his hair had fallen out as a result of the chemotherapy. It was almost back in its original form. But you never would know from his attitude, which was always upbeat, always positive, never looking for sympathy but simply, day in and day out, doing his dead level best to represent the people of Wyoming in the Senate.

He was known as one of the people's most staunch advocates, leading the charge against Government waste and always fighting higher taxes.

In many ways, Senator THOMAS was an example to all of us. In an environment that can sometimes turn too nasty, his friendly demeanor and his dedication to his country was always a reminder that public service is more than a duty, it is a privilege. It can be conducted in a way that does not turn political adversaries into personal enemies. It can be done without bitterness, without anger, and with dignity.

I know CRAIG was honored to be able to represent the State of Wyoming and that the State of Wyoming was privileged to be served by such a man. Wyoming and the Nation now mourn the loss of this great Senator, this great patriot, this fine husband and father, and this good man. He left an indelible mark on the Halls of the Senate and America in general. He will be missed.

For Susan and all the Thomas family, Sandy and I say to you, you are in our thoughts and prayers, as I know you are in the thoughts and prayers of countless millions of people all across this great land. In these trying times, we are all comforted by the strong faith in God that CRAIG exemplified, as well as the enduring legacy he left and his positive impact upon the Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I listened to my colleague from Texas. I come to the floor to add a word about my friend whom we have lost, Senator CRAIG THOMAS. CRAIG was from the State of Wyoming. He was from the northern Great Plains. Last evening, when I heard he had died, I spent a lot of time thinking about CRAIG and about this place.

Most Americans see the partisanship. This is actually a political body, so it is not unusual there would be some partisanship. What most Americans never have the opportunity to see is the friendship. This is a small community of 100 Members of the Senate, men and women who come from every part of our country who are elected to serve. There is a great deal of friendship that exists in this Chamber, even in the middle of all of the politics that exists in our political system.

Senator CRAIG THOMAS was an interesting and a wonderful man. I have had, especially the last 6 months, an opportunity to work very closely with him. I knew him as a Member of the House of Representatives. I knew him as a Member of the Senate and a colleague in both the House and the Senate. But the last 6 months we worked together, I as chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee and CRAIG THOMAS as vice chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee. We sat next to each other, hour after hour, hearing after hearing, and I got to know a lot about CRAIG THOMAS that I had not previously known.

His word was his bond. He was quick with a smile. A quiet man in many ways, he cared deeply about his home State of Wyoming and cared deeply about the future of his country.

CRAIG was a proud son of the American West who never, ever forgot about the people he represented. His commitment to American Indians, and especially and particularly to those living on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, was evident as I worked side by side with him on the Indian Affairs Committee, as was his strong support for Indian health care and for all of the other services to Native Americans.

I was pleased to have the opportunity to work with him and to get to know him and to admire his work. In recent months, of course, Senator THOMAS faced some very challenging health care issues with a very challenging illness. He met those challenges with courage and with grace. He never complained. I never heard him complain. In fact, it was just about 3 weeks ago at a hearing that I turned to him and said: You look great. You really look terrific. He said: I feel good. I feel great.

He was a person with that kind of attitude. What a wonderful contribution to the Senate. I think all of us here will miss a terrific friend.

Let me end as I started by saying this is a political body. I know most Americans see the evidence of that politics, so they see sometimes the politics and the partisanship. What most Americans never have the opportunity to see is the friendship that exists on the floor of the Senate. Yes, even between those who from time to time are adversaries in debate but who understand each other and are friends with each other.

I had the privilege of working with Senator THOMAS for many years in the House and in the Senate, and particularly in the last 6 months as chairman and vice chairman of the committee. I will miss him dearly. I considered Senator CRAIG THOMAS a friend. My thoughts and prayers today are with his wonderful family as well.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend and colleague, Senator CRAIG THOMAS. I always said if I got into a tough situation—using the allegory, a gunfight on Front Street in my hometown of Dodge City, KS—I would want CRAIG THOMAS by my side. I also knew that he would be there.

In that regard, it was only 2 weeks ago that he and Susan, his wife, corralled a group of supporters for me and we talked about his personal battle. He was confident. As Senator DORGAN has indicated, he looked good. And we joked with him of no longer being a member of the folliclely challenged caucus.

His turn for the worse and sudden passing comes as a great shock to all of us. We served together in the House where, as in this body, he was always a voice of reason, a man of trust, decency, and commitment. Just this morning he was described by a fellow colleague as a ''lovely man,'' a description that does not quite jibe with

CRAIG, a rough-hewn rancher with a gentle, quiet Wyoming demeanor, but it is a term that is true to the man.

I do not know of anyone who did not like or respect CRAIG THOMAS. In this day of rough and tumble public service and the Congress overflowing, it seems, in a cauldron of partisan discontent, CRAIG transcended all of that.

In the end, the only thing any of us who have the privilege of public trust has going for us is our word. CRAIG THOMAS set the gold standard in keeping his word and our trust and our admiration.

The Senate, Wyoming, and our Nation have lost a steady hand and a man who did much for his special State. He was dependable in the finest sense of the word. He never sought the center ring or the spotlight; that was not his style. He was the epitome of a workhorse, not a show horse.

I remember and I treasure our times together, especially when I first came to the Senate. We both agreed the length of a conversation does not tell anything about the size of the intellect. We also agreed that no matter who says what, you should not believe it if it does not make sense. CRAIG made sense. He did not need decorated words to make his meaning clear. He spoke Wyoming, and Kansas for that matter.

CRAIG would take the floor during morning business, and in his calm, reasonable manner then discuss an issue of the day. And you sort of had to sit on the edge of your seat and lean forward, and as they say in his beloved Marine Corps, listen up. He talked softly, he talked low, he talked slowly, and he said a whole lot without saying too much.

To some of us in this body he was, and is, a fellow marine. In this case, Semper Fidelis, always faithful, is most appropriate. As I said, if anyone faced trouble in their life, the one person you would want by your side would be CRAIG THOMAS. I shall miss him greatly as a personal friend, confidant, and supporter.

Both of the offices I have occupied in the Senate were previously occupied by CRAIG. I just thought if they were good enough for CRAIG, I would fit right in. There is a short book by Bix Bender called, ''A Cowboy's Guide to Life.'' In it, he describes the code of the West and urges men of this common background to write it in hearts, to stand by the code, and that it would stand by you. Ask no more and give no less than honesty, courage, loyalty, generosity, and fairness.

Madam President, CRAIG THOMAS embodied that code. Now, while our minds are full of sorrow and our hearts certainly heavy with his loss, CRAIG would not want that. In this regard, the words of Helen Steiner Rice come to mind as our thoughts and prayers are with his supporter, friend, and his wife Susan; his sons, Patrick and Greg; and his daughter Lexie.

When I must leave you
for a little while,
Please go on bravely
with a gallant smile
And for my sake and in my name,
Live on and do all things the same.
Spend not your life in empty days,
But fill each waking hour
in useful ways.
Reach out your hand
in comfort and in cheer,
And I in turn will comfort you
and hold you near.

Bless CRAIG THOMAS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, we did not think, coming back to the Chamber a week after we had all gone our separate ways back to our States, that we would come back with one of our Members not here. There is a drape over CRAIG THOMAS's chair and a beautiful flower arrangement.

But all of us who go through the day-to-day workings of the Senate, working with our constituents at home, the pressures which we all know we feel being 24/7 in a job that we love, but we all know the stresses and strains and therefore we bond because of the similarity of experience. So when we all said goodbye at the end of last week, we did not expect to come back and have one fewer Member. So I want to rise today to express my sadness for the passing of Senator CRAIG THOMAS and to express my deepest sympathy for his wife Susan, their family, and the people of Wyoming.

Senator THOMAS served in Congress for 18 years, 6 years in the House and 12 years in the Senate. He had just been reelected to his third term. But his service to the United States did not begin when he came to the nation's capital. It began in the Marine Corps, where he served from 1955 to 1959. Then he went back to Wyoming to work at the Wyoming Farm Bureau and then the Rural Electric Association. Later, he began a career in public service, winning an election to the Wyoming House of Representatives. Five years later he won a special election to succeed then-Congressman DICK CHENEY as a Member of the U.S. House, and 5 years after that in 1994, then-Congressman THOMAS won election to the Senate.

CRAIG THOMAS used his real-life, rural background to champion a positive agenda for America's rural community. As a former chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee, CRAIG THOMAS authored legislation to provide funding and management reforms to protect America's national parks in the 21st century.

He was honored by the National Parks and Conservation Association with their William Penn Mott, Jr. Park Leadership Award. As a senior member of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator THOMAS was instrumental in vital issues such as Social Security, trade, and tax reform. He was co-chair of the Senate Rural Health Caucus.

These are impressive accomplishments, but Senator CRAIG THOMAS, the man, was just as impressive. Every time I called CRAIG to fill in for me when I was vice chairman of the Republican Conference, he was there. He was on the executive committee as the vice chairman of the conference. CRAIG was the one I turned to the most to chair a meeting if I could not be there. He would talk on the Senate floor about the specific issues that we were wanting to focus on at the time.

He was so well liked by everyone in this Chamber. I cannot imagine anyone ever saying they did not like CRAIG THOMAS. His wife Susan is a very special lady as well. She works with children who have disabilities. She has made that her life-long mission. She is so loved and respected in the teaching community for the great work that she has done.

So when all of us learned about CRAIG THOMAS's illness late last year, we all thought: Gosh, he is going to be a fighter. He is going to do so well. And he did. He did do well. He fought it with immediate chemotherapy. He came back with less hair than he started with in the month of November, but we knew, as we were watching him progress, that he was looking better and better and his color was getting better and better. Then when we all left last week, some knew he was going back for another round of chemo. Many of us did not know. But no one in our body realized how serious it was.

Yesterday, God did call him home. At the moment that he was called, his wife Susan; his sons, Patrick and Greg; and his daughter, Lexie, were all there with him. So our prayers shift now from recovery to comfort, and we hope his family knows and the people of Wyoming know what a mark he made on this body. He will be remembered, and he certainly is where the angels are because of his good nature and his good deeds. We wish Susan and the family our condolences and our best wishes, and we hope all of us will be able to have the good memories when time begins to heal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, I join my colleagues in expressing my heartfelt condolences to Susan, the entire Thomas family, and the people of Wyoming over the passing of our dear friend Senator CRAIG THOMAS. We have lost one of the truly great statesmen from this body who always had a kind word and a smile for me in the hallway or here in the well or in this body and anyone else he came across during the day. He had a wonderful way of calming people down and making people feel at home. I personally felt a kinship with Senator THOMAS. Our offices were not merely located in the same corner of the third floor of the

Dirksen building, we were neighbors in every sense of the word. We also had the distinction of serving together on both the Senate Finance and Energy committees. Not a day would go by that we didn't share a ride in the elevator or cross pathways in the hall or stand and visit with our staffs together.

We also both came from rural States with similar needs, and we worked together to address many of the same issues the citizens of Wyoming and Arkansas face. As one of the cochairs of the Senate rural health care caucus, Senator THOMAS was a true leader and a fighter, consistently fighting to improve access to health care for rural communities, especially for seniors. We worked on several issues together to make sure our rural constituents had a voice on health care and many other important issues. Senator THOMAS and I also were delighted to work together to improve tax fairness for the numerous disabled veterans who served our country with dignity and honor and call Arkansas and Wyoming their home.

Senator THOMAS was a tireless advocate for Wyoming and fought to ensure that the interests of his State were always protected throughout the legislative process. I can't tell you how many times I saw different constituent groups from Wyoming lined up in the hallway to visit with their very respected Senator. He was always accessible and always made time for folks who traveled so far to see him. But he also made time to visit with those who were there in the hallway, oftentimes my constituents or staff members. He was never in too big of a hurry that he couldn't stop and take the time to visit with someone, to share with them a kind word or listen to what was on their mind or in their busy schedule.

He has a tremendous staff. They all reflect the Senator's good nature. Working with his staff so closely in the neighborhood of the third floor of Dirksen, they exemplify the courage and kindness of this incredible Senator they have served.

He was a tremendous public servant, and he served our Nation courageously as a United States marine. He was a true gentleman and one of the kindest and most genuine people you would ever meet.

I am truly saddened by the loss of my friend, and my thoughts and prayers are with his dear wife Susan and the entire Thomas family. This Senate body, the State of Wyoming, and the American people have been truly blessed by his life and his service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask unanimous consent to speak about the passing of our colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I was deeply saddened to learn last night that Senator THOMAS had lost his courageous battle against leukemia. Over the years, CRAIG and his wife Susan have become very good friends to both me and my wife Lucy. I will greatly miss him in this Chamber and, more than that, as a friend.

Senator THOMAS and I cochaired the rural health caucus. We have worked closely, along with our staffs, on rural health care issues. You couldn't find a more decent and honorable person than CRAIG THOMAS. He is from Wyoming; I am from North Dakota. We didn't always agree politically, but we always got along. I always felt I had a friend in CRAIG THOMAS.

On health care, he and I partnered over several years to produce comprehensive legislation to improve reimbursement levels for health care providers in rural areas. During the legislation that passed on comprehensive drug legislation, there were provisions included to, for the first time in many years, improve reimbursement for rural providers. It is not well known in the country or perhaps even in this Chamber that rural institutions often get one-half as much to provide the same treatment as more urban institutions. Senator THOMAS and I focused on those issues in the Finance Committee. Much of the legislation that was included in the comprehensive drug legislation to for the first time address that unfairness in reimbursement was legislation Senator THOMAS and I had offered.

We spent hours and hours together agreeing on the elements of these legislative packages. Our staffs worked closely together. They became friends.

This week we were planning to introduce together the latest version of our comprehensive rural health care legislation. This week will be a poignant one for me and my staff as we consider what might have been.

In the Senate Finance Committee, CRAIG and I worked closely together on other issues that are important to our States. We had a shared interest in the impact of trade on U.S. agriculture, whether it was unfairly subsidized foreign sugar or the Japanese and Koreans unfairly blocking exports of American beef. We also shared a deep interest on energy policy because Wyoming is an energy State, as is North Dakota. We worked together to boost transmission capacity and to support clean coal technologies and to develop coal to liquid fuel technologies.

I can tell you CRAIG THOMAS was a determined and principled Member of this body. He had real convictions. They were never far from his heart. CRAIG THOMAS was somebody who cared deeply about the people of Wyoming and the people of this country. He also was someone who could understand that others might have a different point of view. While CRAIG THOMAS might not agree with you, he was willing to listen. He was always willing to debate, but to do it in a gentlemanly way. I knew many times when CRAIG and I were debating legislation we were going to introduce, there were simply places he wasn't going to go. He was not going to go against certain deeply held principles. But he was willing to have a discussion about how we might accomplish the goal. That is something I admired deeply about CRAIG THOMAS.

He was a tenacious advocate for improving health care for the many rural communities in his State and across the country. He was a fierce fighter for the people of Wyoming. Nobody could ever doubt that. He brought that same strength and tenacity to his fight with leukemia. Although he must have been in pain in the last several weeks, he never let it show. In fact, one of the last conversations I had with him was right here in the corner of this Chamber. I asked him how he was doing. He was upbeat and positive. I sensed he was on the mend. So it was a real shock to me to find out last night that we lost him. He continued to the very end to pursue his goals with courage and strength and as a true gentleman. We will miss CRAIG THOMAS as a friend and a colleague. We will miss that wry sense of humor. We will miss his ability to find amusement in the daily workings of this body.

Most of all, we will miss his quiet smile and that twinkle in his eye, because all of us know that is the CRAIG THOMAS who became our very good friend.

Lucy and I express our deepest condolences to Susan and to his four children and to the larger THOMAS family. We also take this moment to express our condolences to his very dedicated, loyal, and highly competent staff. CRAIG THOMAS had around him people with the same qualities he demonstrated, people of quiet dignity and people of real competence who worked very hard for the people of Wyoming and this country.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer for allowing me to come over at this point in time. I shall take but a few minutes to address the Senate and the American public about the passing of a dearly beloved colleague with whom I and other Members of this great Senate have shared a friendship through the many years.

Each of us is deeply saddened at the passing yesterday evening of this valued friend and colleague. I first came to know him in 1995, when he took the seat of Malcolm Wallop. I had known Malcolm Wallop very well, still know him quite well. He was a very strong-minded, able, tough U.S. Senator, tough in the sense that he was a man of resolute convictions.

We wondered who would take his place. CRAIG THOMAS took Senator Wallop's place, and I think even Senator Wallop, were he here today to address the Senate, would agree he has followed in the footsteps of many great Senators who have come from the great State of Wyoming.

He also served as a Marine officer from 1955 to 1959. He entered as a private and was released as a captain. I say, with a sense of humility, I entered the Marine Corps as a private and parted, many years later, as a captain. Therefore, we had a special bond.

But he was able, through the years, to carry on I think one of the great attributes of the Corps—taught to all of us—and where I failed, he succeeded. I used to have a nickname for him. I called him: Ramrod. He did not have to say ''I was a marine'' because you could tell by the way he walked, the way he carried himself, and the way he had his chin always projecting. That is the way we were taught in the Marines. It fell by the wayside with this humble Senator, but it never left the posture of that great marine and great Senator.

As marines served over the past 5 years on the tip of the spear around the world, all of our marines, particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan of recent, it was helpful for the Senate to have Senator THOMAS's perspective in looking out for our marines in a very special way.

He was very active in the Marine Caucus, meeting for breakfast at 0800 in the morning, getting together, talking about years past, years present, and years in the future. Each year, the Commandant of the Marine Corps would come over, and, quite understandably, the job fell to Senator THOMAS, which he loved, to introduce the Commandant of the Marines.

I refer then to our Marine Corps Hymn, which all of us sing. And I quote one stanza:

Our flags unfurl'd to every breeze,
From dawn to setting sun.

The Sun has set on this great marine, and that is how I shall always remember him. Whatever the challenges facing us in the Senate, he was steadfast, unruffled, and committed to the task at hand, like the marine he was and always will be in our memories.

It is interesting, another characteristic of marines—our good friend, Conrad Burns, being one, and to some extent myself—we tend to be rather gregarious, somewhat undisciplined and rough and ready. But Senator THOMAS was a very quiet man, very introspective in his thinking, with a smile on his face. But he could project his persona without some of the other attributes we marines pride ourselves in.

He chaired the Senate Rural Health Caucus. I am a member of that caucus, and I stop to think—I do not know how many are members of it—it was an effective caucus. We got together particularly on issues of medical care and how, through the past decades, that care has shrunk in the rural areas because of the lack of young men and young women going in and practicing medicine and accepting the hardships and indeed the less pay the rural areas have. But he left his hallmark trying to encourage better medical care in those regions, which are in every State of our Union.

We both loved fishing. How many times we talked about trout fishing. He always said to me: John, I have a very special stream, almost untouched, largely unknown, but I will take you there someday, and you will experience a trip you will never forget. I have missed that trip.

His constituents, his loving family, and, above all, his wife Susan are in our thoughts and prayers. I ask colleagues to stop and think on those evenings when we got our evening engagements and we were, fortunately, going to be accompanied by our wives, that Susan would stand watch at the door of the Senate. I can see that spot. As you approach the Chamber, it is on the left, right there next to the column. I would always see her and wave a ''hello.''

So I say to her and her family, thank you for sharing in our lives the richness of the life of your CRAIG THOMAS.

From one marine to another, I simply say: Fair Winds and Following Seas to you, sir. Semper Fi.

Mr. AKAKA. Madam President, I am deeply saddened at the passing of my dear friend, Wyoming's senior Member, Senator CRAIG THOMAS. We have lost a truly dear and courageous Member of this body, whose absence will be felt. I had the pleasure of serving with Senator THOMAS for many years, both in the U.S. House of Representatives and here in the Senate since his election in 1994. I found him to be a true statesman, of great character, with a passion for serving others.

He grew up on a ranch in Cody, WY, and never forgot his roots, as he continuously advocated for rural communities and our natural resources. He graduated from the University of Wyoming with a degree in agriculture, and served our country proudly for 4 years in the Marines.

During his tenure in Congress, he forged a distinguished legislative record on issues as diverse as public land management, agriculture, fiscal responsibility and rural health care. It was a great pleasure and honor to serve with Senator THOMAS on the Senate Subcommittee on National Parks, both when he was chairman and I was the ranking member, and most recently, when our roles were reversed this Congress. Working with Senator THOMAS was a joy and privilege due to his positive and optimistic attitude. We were able to accomplish many notable things during our tenure together, as we always worked in a bipartisan manner, putting the needs and challenges of the parks and public lands before all else.

I also had the privilege of working with Senator THOMAS on the Indian Affairs Committee. As the ranking member of the committee, he took seriously his responsibility to address the needs of our country's indigenous people. Knowing of the challenges faced by our Native communities throughout the country, he worked tirelessly to improve their quality of life.

I extend my heartfelt condolences and deepest aloha to Senator THOMAS's wife Susan and their four children. They should be proud that he lived a full and purposeful life, and had a positive impact on the lives of so many. He will be sorely missed. Our prayers and support are with them as they walk down this difficult path.

Mr. BUNNING. Madam President, words cannot express how sad I am that my good friend CRAIG THOMAS passed away last night. We will all truly miss his tenacious advocacy on issues, his incredible sense of humor, and his upstanding character and integrity. The Senate will not be the same without him.

I have known CRAIG for almost 20 years. I first became friends with him when we both served in the House of Representatives. We continued our friendship in the Senate, where I had the great fortune of serving with him on both the Senate Finance and Senate Energy Committees.

CRAIG was a tireless advocate for Wyoming issues. He was an effective leader in energy, public lands, tax, trade, health, and rural community issues. We stood side by side on many issues, and I always felt we could accomplish any project because I had CRAIG by my side.

He and I worked closely on energy issues in both committees. CRAIG was skilled at keeping his eyes on the details that mattered to the people back home in Wyoming. Recently, we worked together on a small issue in the landmark Energy Policy Act of 2005 that he helped craft. We learned that western coals, because of their naturally low sulfur content, would be excluded from certain clean coal programs for failing to remove the high percentage mandated by the bill. This was one of those little things that slipped by many people but not CRAIG. We have already fixed the problem in the Tax Code and are now working to do the same in the Energy Committee. It was the little things he did for the people of Wyoming that made him such a great Senator for his State.

CRAIG also pushed to make sure that both his State and the Nation had an effective energy policy. Just a couple of weeks ago, CRAIG and I sponsored an amendment during markup of the Energy Committee biofuels bill to attempt to push coal-to-liquids technology into reality. THOMAS believed this would help both the people of Wyoming by providing more jobs and cheaper energy costs and would help the Nation by reducing our reliance on Middle East oil. And although this amendment failed in committee, his dogged determination showed through

because he planned to continue fighting this issue on the Senate floor.

My thoughts and prayers go out to his wife Susan and his children, Lexie, Greg, Patrick, and Peter. They have shown incredible courage and strength the past few months.

I am honored to have known Senator THOMAS. He impacted all of our lives and will be sorely missed.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I appreciate this consideration. I realize we must move to the legislation before us, the issue of immigration, but I wanted to take just a few minutes this afternoon to stand in tribute to my friend, to our friend and colleague, Senator CRAIG THOMAS.

I think it is fair to say that this is very difficult for all of us here in the Senate. It has been described that we are a family. We are friends. My neighbor Senator THOMAS and I have sat on this back row together for this past year. I sit next to him in the Energy Committee. I sit next to him in the Indian Affairs Committee. He is a friend and a man whom I will miss very deeply. To learn this morning of his passing leaves me truly with a hole in my heart. I can't imagine the depth of loss the family and his wife Susan are feeling at this point.

We recognize that we were privileged to serve with a truly incredible man. I haven't served with him as long as many of my Senate colleagues. I came to know him really from a very personal perspective. I was fascinated with the fact that he is a true cowboy. I have always kind of thought that cowboys never die. He was claimed by a very terrible disease, a very terrible cancer, leukemia. Alaska mourned the loss of a young woman just last year who was claimed by leukemia. She was a world-famous dog musher. In Alaska, we say dog mushers, real famous dog mushers never die, either. So, again, my heart is very heavy.

When I got up this morning and saw on my BlackBerry the news of Senator THOMAS, there was a second BlackBerry that came to me from one of the pages who served here in the Senate just last fall. She was one of the winter pages. I was very touched by the note she sent to the head of the page program, and she forwarded me a copy of it as well. I want to read just a paragraph from her e-mail to me because I think it reflects how Senator THOMAS touched the lives of so many—not just his colleagues and not just the people of Wyoming but a young 16-year-old page from Alaska. She wrote:

> My class and I witnessed some of the stages of Senator Thomas' sickness, but we never witnessed him getting upset or angry because he was feeling down and overtired due to his symptoms and treatments.
>
> Senator Thomas was a cheerful man, always smiling and personable, even when he was not being approached. He did not have to address us at all; we were pages, mere peons in the infrastructure of what we know as the Senate. Yet, every time he entered the Senate, he warmed the room with his smile and a warm glow that protruded gently from his kind eyes. When he would speak to us, he did so with the utmost respect and thoughtfulness, truly treating us as equals. He never looked down on us, and I believe that is why his memory has stayed with me and will continue to do so in the future.
>
> What made Senator Thomas remarkable, aside from all this, was that at the end of the day when we were at our lowest point and we felt so tired we couldn't help but frown, he was the one that no one ever caught frowning. He was a great Senator, and from what I have had the chance to witness firsthand, a great man. I am deeply sorry for this loss, and I hope that this e-mail will attest to that. His actions and his kindness were not lost on us.

This was signed:

> With utmost respect and deepest sincerity,
> Former U.S. Senate Page, Lily George
> From Anchorage, AK.

I thought it important to share that e-mail with my colleagues because, again, Senator THOMAS was one who generated warmth with everybody he reached out to, whether they were pages or Senators or people in the airport. We will miss him very deeply here in the Senate.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, today we pay tribute to Senator CRAIG THOMAS, whom we unfortunately lost to cancer last night.

Our thoughts, prayers, and sympathy go out to his wife Susan and their children during this difficult time.

I had the opportunity to work closely with Senator THOMAS on the Environment and Public Works Committee.

He was a leader in the energy, agriculture, water resources and agricultural issues that affected his State.

I highly respected his low-key, behind-the-scenes manner of getting things done.

He was forward looking: he believed that ''clean technologies'' were a solution both to environmental pollution and to our dependence on foreign oil.

On the Finance Committee, he was a dependable vote for fiscal sanity, tax simplification and cutting spending.

It is said around here that there are ''work horses'' and ''show horses.'' By that measure Senator THOMAS was certainly a work horse. He did not aggressively seek the limelight. Instead he worked quietly and diligently, with integrity, to get things done for Wyoming.

We will miss his knowledge, competence, and his friendship.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I am deeply saddened by the death of my friend, Senator CRAIG THOMAS of Wyoming.

CRAIG THOMAS was a popular figure in his hoe State of Wyoming, winning a third term last November with 70 percent of the vote. He was known both at home and in Washington as honest, hard-working, decent, and effective.

He came to the Senate in 1989 through a special election to fill the vacancy left by DICK CHENEY, who had been named Secretary of Defense. He won that race with 52 percent of the vote. By the year 2000, Senator THOMAS's popularity had soared, and he won reelection with 74 percent of the vote—one of the largest margins of victory in Wyoming history.

Senator THOMAS's record of public service reaches back well before his tenure in the U.S. Senate. Prior to his election to the Senate, he served 5 years in the Wyoming Legislature, and four years in the U.S. Marine Corps.

His positions on the Finance Committee, Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and Environment and Public Works Committee allowed him to be an advocate for issues such as conservation and fiscal conservatism. He was a champion of issues of concern to rural America such as affordability and access to quality health care services.

Senator THOMAS's home State of Wyoming is not unlike my State of Mississippi, and we often worked side-by-side on issues that face our States. He fought to improve the quality of life for the people of Wyoming and was a strong advocate for the agricultural sector of our economy. He was tireless in urging the importance of public land management and conservation of our natural resources.

CRAIG THOMAS will truly be missed in the U.S. Senate. He reflected great credit on this body. It is my hope that the spirit of fairness and decency he represented will continue to be mighty valued in the Senate as a mark of our continued appreciation of him and his exemplary service to our Nation.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Mr. OBAMA. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear colleague and a tireless advocate for the people of Wyoming, Senator CRAIG THOMAS.

Muhammad Ali once said, ''Service to others is the rent you pay for your room here on Earth.'' Senator THOMAS paid his rent in full.

No truer to his State could a man be than CRAIG THOMAS was. Born and raised on a ranch outside of Cody, WY, he grew up in the Wyoming public school system, attended the University of Wyoming, served as president of the Wyoming Farm Bureau, general manager of the Wyoming Rural Electric Association. He served in both the House and Senate and returned to his State every weekend, visiting hometowns and parks, never losing sight of his constituents and their needs.

His commitment to this country led him to serve with great distinction in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1955 to 1959. Before being elected to the U.S. Congress, he held office for 5 years in the Wyoming State Legislature, where he got his start in politics. And throughout his distinguished political career, CRAIG THOMAS became known for his leadership on issues so critical to the well-being of Wyoming, issues like rural health care access, fiscal responsibility, and the protection of our Nation's park lands. As cochair of the Senate Rural Health Caucus, he urged Congress to continue its support for rural health programs like the Community Health Centers Program, which provides services to over 16 million

people living in underserved areas. This is only one of the many legacies he leaves behind.

I am sorry I could have not served longer with Senator THOMAS. My memories of him are as a kind, quiet, and humble man. He commanded enormous respect from us all, and had a clarity of vision that did not go unnoticed. In the face of a life-threatening illness, he returned to work this year with the conviction of a cowboy who knows that if you get thrown from a horse, you have to get up and get back on. His courage throughout this tremendous battle will continue to inspire those of us who follow him.

On this sad occasion of his passing, Michelle and I extend our deepest condolences to the members of his family, especially his wife Susan and his four children, to his staff, and to the people of Wyoming. I join my colleagues and fellow Americans who are praying for them and mourning their loss during this time of grief.●

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President. I rise to honor the memory of Senator CRAIG THOMAS, who passed away last night, Monday, June 4, at National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, MD.

I knew Senator THOMAS—as we all did—as a quiet gentleman, and a dedicated advocate for the people of Wyoming.

My heart goes out to his wife Susan and to their four children.

Senator THOMAS died of acute myeloid leukemia, which he had been fighting for several months.

All of us are familiar with Senator THOMAS' courage, because we saw it here, in the Capitol, and on the floor of the Senate.

He came here to do his duty, even though he was fighting a disease that would ultimately take his life. That is the mark of true courage—not at all surprising, coming from this son of the American West.

Senator THOMAS was raised on a ranch near Cody, WY. He attended public schools, and graduated from the University of Wyoming at Laramie, earning a degree in agriculture.

After college, he served 4 years in the Marine Corps. Then he went on to become vice president of the Wyoming Farm Bureau, and general manager of the Wyoming Rural Electric Association.

He served 5 years in the Wyoming State Legislature. In 1989, he was elected to the House of Representatives in a special election to replace DICK CHENEY, who had been named Secretary of Defense. He was elected to his first term in the Senate in 1994.

Senator THOMAS was reelected to his third term last year, with 70 percent of the vote.

Here, Senator THOMAS was a strong voice for the people of his home State.

This included working to improve health care opportunities for rural families, work he pursued as a senior member of the Senate Finance Committee, and as cochair of the Senate Rural Health Caucus.

Senator THOMAS served as chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee, and his work was recognized many times by the National Parks Conservation Association.

The organization honored him with its William Penn Mott Jr. Leadership Award, and with the National Parks Achievement Award.

I had the distinct pleasure of working with Senator THOMAS on some issues close to my heart.

Earlier this year, he was part of a bipartisan coalition that joined with me, and with Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, to extend the sale of the breast cancer research stamp, which has raised $54.9 million for breast cancer research.

Last year, Senator THOMAS joined with me to cosponsor legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to His Holiness, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, in recognition of his message of compassion and peace.

And Senator THOMAS and I collaborated on a plan to use Wyoming Powder River Coal to produce cleaner electricity, which would be sold to Western States, including California.

Senator THOMAS served Wyoming and the Nation well. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute and bid farewell to my colleague and friend, my neighbor from the great State of Wyoming, Senator CRAIG THOMAS.

CRAIG brought a quiet dignity to this august Chamber. He was a Senator with the heart of a cowboy. We all knew that he would rather have been on horseback in the Wyoming prairie than in Washington, DC, but this was where the people of Wyoming needed him to be. Indeed, all citizens of America benefitted greatly from his presence in Washington, DC.

CRAIG was the champion of rural America. He quietly but tirelessly fought for the hard-working people of rural America, the people who provide us with food and energy, the woolgrowers, the cattlemen, and the farmers. If ever there were a question on agriculture, CRAIG was the man to see. During his tenure in the U.S. Senate, we all relied heavily on Senator THOMAS's expertise and leadership on agriculture, rural development, and many other important topics debated by this body.

We served together on the Senate Finance Committee where he would often entertain us with his stories and experiences. I truly enjoyed listening to him and hearing about his great State of Wyoming. CRAIG had a way of dealing with the complex issues facing the Finance Committee that was very direct and meaningful. He had a way of distilling the complex tax, trade, and health care issues down to their core and ensuring that real people, with real concerns were addressed by the policies created in the Finance Committee.

I have had the distinct privilege of sitting next to CRAIG in committee meetings, in briefings, in lunches, on the floor, and in several other settings, and I can tell you he was always a gentlemen. He was always a caring legislator, and he was always a true and loyal friend.

CRAIG earned great stature and prestige in the time he spent as a leader in the U.S. Marine Corps, the Wyoming Farm Bureau, the Wyoming State Legislature, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the U.S. Senate. I am honored to have served beside him for so many years in the Senate, and I will miss my friend dearly.

I join with my colleagues in offering my condolences to Senator THOMAS's family, especially his widow, Susan. My thoughts and prayers are with them on this day as we mourn the loss of a great Senator but celebrate the life of our great and dear man. The people of Wyoming will certainly thank Susan and the rest of the THOMAS family for sharing their beloved CRAIG with them, and I believe the entire Nation would join with me in thanking Susan for sharing her great husband with us. He represented the good people of Wyoming in such a capable and dignified manner, and I know they are going to miss him. In fact, the entire Nation is going to miss him.

In this instance, I believe it is appropriate to quote the beloved cowboy song and say to CRAIG, ''Happy trails to you, till we meet again.''

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I was deeply saddened to hear of the sudden passing of my colleague from Wyoming, Senator CRAIG THOMAS. The loss we all feel at his passing is tempered by the happy memories I have of working with him on so many issues of mutual interest. His efforts and his leadership on the panels on which we served together the Senate Finance Committee, Senate Agriculture Committee, and Senate Environment and Public Works Committee—will remain foremost in my memory. I particularly admired his staunch advocacy for the needs of rural communities and farmers. CRAIG brought a special passion and expertise to issues affecting ranching families. His focus on their unique needs spanned the trade, economic, environmental, and public lands management issues of rural communities.

CRAIG brought to Congress his vision for the needs of Wyoming and rural States, and he became a strong advocate of effective resource and energy policies. I am pleased to have partnered with him in applying technologies to improving our Nation's energy generation. Although he lived his life modestly, he became a leader in national park stewardship, and the American people owe him a debt of gratitude for his promotion of the underserved National Park System. I also appreciated his long and thoughtful counsel on ways to update the Endangered Species Act.

In recent months, CRAIG took a prime role on the Finance Committee in working to simplify the Federal Tax

Code and improve entitlement and health care assistance to the least fortunate. As one who took to heart the importance of protecting the taxpayers' dollars, CRAIG was a strong proponent of restoring the sustainability of our Nation's welfare system. And CRAIG understood that economic development in rural States like Wyoming was inextricably linked to trade promotion that ensured open and fair markets abroad. I will miss his stalwart and consistent advocacy for farming communities as the Senate considered trade legislation.

As a man who represented a small State in population, CRAIG towered large over the landscape of thoughtful conservative Members of Congress. I think a fitting tribute and legacy to our late friend would be to adopt his resolution making July 28 National Day of the Cowboy. My thoughts and prayers are with CRAIG's family and friends. I will miss my good friend and colleague.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, last night, the State of Wyoming lost a fine statesman and a true gentleman with the passing of Senator CRAIG THOMAS. Senator THOMAS was a strong advocate for his State and its interests. He fought hard for his priorities, and I especially admired his tireless advocacy for our Nation's beautiful parks and wilderness. He also worked hard for the priorities of rural Wyoming and indeed all of rural America, fighting hard to improve health care infrastructure.

Senator THOMAS dedicated his life to serving his country and his State. After graduating from the University of Wyoming, he joined the Marines and began his long career of service. Even when faced with his final battle with cancer, he continued to fight on for Wyoming and serve with distinction.

But the Senate lost not only an outstanding advocate but a wonderful person. More than anything, I will remember Senator THOMAS as a man who carried himself with dignity and who treated all of his colleagues with respect, despite party differences. More than any debate, committee hearing or piece of legislation, it is his warm smile that I will remember most. I know he did a fantastic job representing the State of Wyoming, and I am honored to have known and worked with him.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends during this difficult time.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President:

I saw the sun sink in the golden west
No angry cloud obscured its latest ray.
Around the couch on which it sank to rest
Shone all the splendor of a summer day.
And long though lost to view, that radiant light
Reflected from the skies, delayed the night.
Thus, when a good man's life draws to a close,
No doubts arise to cloud his soul with gloom,
But faith triumphant on each feature glows,
While benedictions fill the sacred room;
And long, long do men his virtues wide proclaim
And generations rise to praise his name.

It is with deep sorrow—deep sorrow—that I note the passing of our colleague Senator CRAIG THOMAS of Wyoming. He was my friend. He always passed here and I would say: How are you doing today, Cowboy?

First elected to the Senate in 1994, Senator THOMAS was twice reelected to the Senate by some of the widest margins in his State's history, one time reaching 75 percent of the vote. It is hard to beat that.

As has already been mentioned today, he was one of the very few people from Wyoming to have represented his State in both houses of the Congress, over there and over here. Here in the Senate, I found him to be a most considerate and patient colleague. He was always willing to step aside for another Senator who sought recognition. He was a nice man, a very quiet man with a radiant smile, staying out of the spotlight, working behind the scenes, always ready to cooperate and work with others for the good of our country. He was a good, decent human being.

Yes, we represented different political parties. Yes, we sometimes held different political views, and we came from vastly different parts of the country, but we shared important common interests and objectives. With his State of Wyoming being the No. 1 coal-producing State in the Nation and my State of West Virginia being No. 2, I always appreciated his support for clean coal technologies and legislation that promoted the use of coal. I always appreciated his interest in and support of our country's beautiful and magnificent national parks. As chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, he sponsored legislation that both protected and promoted these national treasures.

Just as this former marine dedicated his life to his country, he dedicated his career in the Senate to improving the quality of life for rural America. As cochairman of the Senate rural health caucus, he worked tirelessly to improve the quality of rural health care. He was truly a fine Member of this institution and a great American who will be missed by his colleagues, certainly by me, and by the people of Wyoming.

I express my sincere condolences to his wife Susan, to his sons and other members of his family, to his staff, and to the people of Wyoming. All of us will miss Senator THOMAS. But we will always retain our very fond memories of him, CRAIG THOMAS. Bless his soul. May God bless him.

I repeat these few verses in his memory:

Let Fate do her worst,
There are relics of joy,
Bright dreams of the past,
Which she cannot destroy;
Which come, in the night-time
Of sorrow and care,
And bring back the features
That joy used to wear.
Long, long be my heart
With such memories filled,
Like the vase in which roses
Have once been distilled;
You may break, you may shatter
The vase, if you will,
But the scent of the roses
Will hang round it still.

Goodbye, CRAIG. I will miss you. But we will meet again on that far shore where the roses never wither and the flowers never fade.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I am going to have a statement printed in the RECORD, but I did wish to say something this evening before the evening is over about our colleague, CRAIG THOMAS. CRAIG was a wonderful friend of all of us. In my case, being a fellow Westerner, I had a special affinity for CRAIG. He was a fellow I could talk to—without talk. Particularly a cowboy such as CRAIG can communicate with you in a real Western way that doesn't require a whole lot of ''jibber-jabber,'' as he would say.

CRAIG was a man of the earth. He really was a cowboy, and a good one at that. He took that kind of set of Western values, of not talking a whole lot but meaning what he says and saying what he means, into the political life. When he came to the Senate, I think everyone appreciated that quality in him.

By the way, I would say he reminds me of my colleague, the Senator from Alabama, in that regard. You never have any doubt about where the Senator from Alabama stands and you never had any doubt about where Senator CRAIG THOMAS stood. That is a quality we need in our public officials today.

CRAIG's wife Susan is a wonderful friend of mine and of my wife Carol. Our hearts go out to her and their family tonight. But she does have, at least, I think, the solace in knowing that people all over this country—not just from their home State of Wyoming—have tremendous respect for the achievements of her husband CRAIG and the way in which he handled himself as a Member of the Senate, never letting an ego take over what he understood to be his primary responsibilities.

He was quiet and he was humble. He was serious and he was very hard working. He stood up for the interests of the people of his State. He was a great patriot for the United States of America. But he never took himself so seriously that he gave even a hint of pomposity or being someone who didn't understand where he was grounded.

We will miss CRAIG THOMAS immensely. We will never forget him as a loyal friend, a patriot, and someone who was quintessential in the way he represented his area of the United States and, in particular, his constituents in the State of Wyoming.

I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank Senator KYL for his good remarks. I thought perhaps tomorrow I would have the ability to focus on our

loss, but I will attempt tonight to say a few words about our colleague, CRAIG THOMAS. I loved CRAIG THOMAS. He was a person who came from the West. He understood where he came from. He understood the values with which he was raised, and he reflected those daily in his work in the Senate without ever bragging about it or talking about it. People just knew it. He was a man of character and integrity, a man who, as Senator KYL indicated, never allowed personal ego to interfere with his commitment to serve his constituents and his Nation.

We had a visit to Iraq together not too long ago. Things had not been going well. He would ask penetrating questions. He would ask: When are the Iraqis stepping up and how much are they doing so? How long do we continue to put our troops at risk if they are not carrying their load?

He did it in a way that was sincere and raised fundamental questions of great importance.

CRAIG liked issues. He believed in a series of principles that made America great. He cared about those principles. For a time, he volunteered to come to the floor and be a part of a message team for the Republican Senate Members and spent a good bit of time at it—over a year or two. During that time he would articulate the basic premises and values that I think are foundational for the Republican Party and for most Americans.

I would say to our wonderful friend Susan, our prayers and our sympathies are with you. We can only imagine the loss you have sustained. We have watched in these past months the courage that CRAIG had displayed as he suffered from the terrible disease that he had. We saw the strength that he had, his refusal to stay at home but his determination to be at work. I had several examples of it in which I talked to him, and I said it is not necessary for you, you need to rest up. He knew he was susceptible to infection. But he was determined to fulfill his responsibilities as a Senator and he did so in a way that all could be proud.

He ran the race and he fought the fight. He served his country with great skill and ability. Our respect and love is extended to the family and our prayers are with him and the family.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I am aware of the hour of the recess, and I will be very brief. But I wished to come and express my condolences to the family of Senator THOMAS and to share for them, spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the fact that a faithful member of the weekly Senators Prayer Breakfast was Senator THOMAS.

The gathering is private, Senators only. All Senators check their egos and check their partisanship at the door and join together as friends in a spiritual setting.

What a delight it was for this Senator to share that collegiality with Senator THOMAS on a weekly basis in the proceedings of the Senate. For that friendship, that collegiality, I am especially grateful.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:52 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). Morning business is closed.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1348, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1348) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Kennedy/Specter) amendment No. 1150, in the nature of a substitute.

Cornyn modified amendment No. 1184 (to amendment No. 1150), to establish a permanent bar for gang members, terrorists, and other criminals.

Dodd/Menendez amendment No. 1199 (to amendment No. 1150), to increase the number of green cards for parents of U.S. citizens, to extend the duration of the new parent visitor visa, and to make penalties imposed on individuals who overstay such visas applicable only to such individuals.

Menendez amendment No. 1194 (to amendment No. 1150), to modify the deadline for the family backlog reduction.

McConnell amendment No. 1170 (to amendment No. 1150), to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require individuals voting in person to present photo identification.

Feingold amendment No. 1176 (to amendment No. 1150), to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II.

Durbin/Grassley amendment No. 1231 (to amendment No. 1150), to ensure that employers make efforts to recruit American workers.

Sessions amendment No. 1234 (to amendment No. 1150), to save American taxpayers up to $24 billion in the 10 years after passage of this act by preventing the earned-income tax credit—which is, according to the Congressional Research Service, the largest antipoverty entitlement program of the Federal Government—from being claimed by Y temporary workers or illegal aliens given status by this act until they adjust to legal permanent resident status.

Sessions amendment No. 1235 (to amendment No. 1150), to save American taxpayers up to $24 billion in the 10 years after passage of this act by preventing the earned-income tax credit—which is, according to the Congressional Research Service, the largest antipoverty entitlement program of the Federal Government—from being claimed by Y temporary workers or illegal aliens given status by this act until they adjust to legal permanent resident status.

Lieberman amendment No. 1191 (to amendment No. 1150), to provide safeguards against faulty asylum procedures and to improve conditions of detention.

Cornyn (for Allard) amendment No. 1189 (to amendment No. 1150), to eliminate the preference given to people who entered the United States illegally over people seeking to enter the country legally in the merit-based evaluation system for visas.

Cornyn amendment No. 1250 (to amendment No. 1150), to address documentation of employment and to make an amendment with respect to mandatory disclosure of information.

Salazar (for Clinton) modified amendment No. 1183 (to amendment No. 1150), to reclassify the spouses and minor children of lawful permanent residents as immediate relatives.

Salazar (for Obama/Menendez) amendment No. 1202 (to amendment No. 1150), to provide a date on which the authority of the section relating to the increasing of American competitiveness through a merit-based evaluation system for immigrants shall be terminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:30 this afternoon shall be for debate with respect to amendment No. 1189, offered by the Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLARD, and amendment No. 1231, offered by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, with the time equally divided between the managers and the amendments' proponents.

Who yields time? The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I see Senator ALLARD on the floor to move forward with his amendment, and we will be using the time between now and 3:30, obviously, for debate on the subjects.

I understand the Senator from Alaska wishes to take—how long would the Senator like?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Three minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

(The remarks of Ms. MURKOWSKI are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1189

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise in support of amendment No. 1189 which strikes the supplemental schedule for Zs. We are scheduled, I understand, to vote on it around 3:30 or so. So I wish to take a few moments to talk about my amendment, which I think addresses a great inequity in the bill, one that rewards lawbreakers over law abiders. Ironically, this inequity is in the same section of the bill that rewards would-be immigrants based on merit. To be clear, I strongly support ending chain migration. I think the bill moves us in that direction, and I think that is

great, and then moving us to a system of merit-based immigration. However, I believe all applicants under the merit-based system should be on a level playing field.

By now, I believe most of us are familiar with the bill's merit-based system which awards points to immigrants based on criteria such as employment, education, and knowledge of the English language. What many of us may not know is the enormous advantage the bill's point system gives to people who have violated our immigration laws relative to people who are seeking to enter this country legally. I am referring to this so-called supplemental schedule for Zs which my amendment strikes. This separate schedule awards up to 50 bonus points—points that are unavailable to people who have never broken our immigration laws—to holders of Z visas seeking permanent status.

Holders of Z visas are defined as lawbreakers in the bill. In fact, this bill specifically requires that an alien prove that he or she broke the law in order to even be eligible for the Z visa. In effect, this supplemental schedule rewards people who enter the country illegally. Worse yet, it disadvantages other qualified people who seek to enter this country legally.

The bill's stated purpose of adopting a merit-based system is that the United States benefits from a workforce that has diverse skills, experience, and training, and I happen to agree. I am simply not convinced that a history of breaking the law contributes to this goal more than education and actual experience on the job. So my amendment simply strikes the special schedule that makes people who have violated our immigration laws eligible for 50 percent more points than anyone else. Z visa holders would, however, still be eligible for up to 100 points under the regular schedule—the exact same number as anybody else. We should not reward those who have broken the law, and we certainly should not punish those who have abided by the law.

Now, an argument that has been made against this amendment is that somehow or other it will strike at the heart of the AgJOB provisions. My amendment does nothing to limit the number of agricultural workers. The number of H–2A agricultural visas remains uncapped. Under current law and under the bill, there is no numerical limitation on agricultural visas. Even though it is unlimited, only about 35,000 H–2As are issued each year. If this bill passes, anywhere from 12 million to 20 million illegal aliens will instantly gain legal status. The question is: Are those people not able to fill these agricultural jobs? Of course they are.

My amendment addresses people who are applying for citizenship, not work, under the new merit-based system. It puts applicants for citizenship on a level playing field whether they worked in agriculture, whether they worked in construction, whether they worked in tourism, or whether they worked in any other industry. On the one hand, you say you want a merit-based system in the bill, and on the other hand, you say you want to give preferences to certain classes of people. My argument is simply that you can't have it both ways, and my amendment simply levels the playing field.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to level the playing field under the merit-based evaluation system, which I think is a good idea. I would urge my colleagues to vote for the Allard amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for his amendment and for his analysis. I understand the reasoning and the point behind what he is seeking to do.

The preference, which is contained in the proposed legislation, was structured in an elaborate arrangement with what has been accurately called the very fractional coalition. In order to get certain other concessions in the bill, it was deemed necessary to give this preference to the agricultural workers. You can justifiably raise an issue as to why give a preference to agricultural workers, and the answer, although not very satisfactory, is because it is part of an interwoven accommodation on many provisions of the bill. That is why, as one of the managers of the bill, I am constrained to object and to urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I understand and appreciate the ranking member's position on this particular piece of legislation. This part of the bill is not well drafted, and I hope we can get this amendment passed and then send a message to the conference committee that this part of the bill needs to be worked on so that we don't allow people who are here illegally an opportunity to step ahead of those citizens who have come here legally. If we can adopt my amendment, then I think the will of the Senate gets clearly expressed to the conference committee, and hopefully the problem with the drafting that has occurred with this section of the bill can be straightened out and preserve the compromise that the ranking Republican from Pennsylvania is striving to hold on to.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on the issue as to the contention by the Senator from Colorado that they are moving ahead of people who are here legally, factually I believe that is not so. The bill is structured to clear up the backlog of all of those people who are waiting now, and they will have their status resolved in an 8-year period—those who are following the procedures which are legal at the present time.

It is after that occurs that the 12 million undocumented immigrants will come in, and then there will be points preference for those among the illegals who are here, who are the farm workers. I do not believe we are putting anybody who is here illegally ahead of those who are here legally.

Mr. ALLARD. If I may respond, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLARD. This is where the issue comes up. It is not exactly clear in this paragraph where it provides supplemental points for citizenship, or when in time it begins to apply. If it gets applied in one way in the bill, then the argument my colleagues make is probably valid. But if it gets put in another place in the bill, my arguments apply. This is where we have a drafting problem within the bill.

My hope is that with the adoption of my amendment we will call this to the attention of the conference committee, and this can be rectified when we go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this is the seventh day that we have been on this legislation. We voted on 17 amendments. There are 13 others pending to the bill. We will be voting on those very soon.

Over the past week, as the Senate has been in recess for Memorial Day, we witnessed a healthy debate across the country as Americans across the political spectrum have expressed their views on this legislation. Some support our legislation, others oppose it. With all of the editorials and newspaper articles and phone calls from the constituents, one theme occurs loud and strong: Americans know our immigration system is broken and they want us to fix it. This week we have a chance to meet that challenge for the good of the Nation.

We have a bipartisan bill before us. It has the support of the President. I believe when we complete the debate in the Senate we will adopt it. It enforces our borders; it cracks down in the workplace by going after employers who hire illegal workers; it brings the 12 million families who are here out of the shadows; it speeds up the reunion of families waiting legally in line who otherwise may never make it here; it sets up an immigration for the future that continues to reunite families, while stressing our Nation's economic needs. That is our program. It is strong, practical, and it is fair.

I know the Senator from Illinois is looking to address the Senate. First, I want to speak briefly on the Allard amendment.

The Allard amendment seeks to strike a blow at one of the central pillars of comprehensive immigration reform, which is the earned legalization program for undocumented people who are working and contributing in the United States. Virtually every demographic snapshot of the American public supports a practical solution for

bringing the undocumented population into the light of day. The tough and practical solution contained in the bill requires undocumented workers to pay hefty fines and penalties, undergo background checks, clear up back taxes, learn English, continue working for a period of years in a probationary status, and go to the back of the line. Only after 8 years, after getting right with the law and proving their commitment to becoming Americans, are these workers provided an opportunity at legal permanent residence.

The Allard amendment seeks to nullify that shot at the American dream. It does so by eliminating the separate point schedule included in the bill for Z visa holders and the agricultural job applicants. The point schedule for Z visa holders and AgJOB applicants is designed to determine when they can apply for permanent residence, not whether they can apply. Eligibility to apply for permanent residence is earned by complying with tough requirements. I just mentioned them—paying fines, working hard, learning English, going to the back of the current line, and reentering the country legally.

The intent of the Allard amendment is to require undocumented immigrants to compete with other future intending immigrants under the new merit-based system. There are two different merit systems, one for the temporary and one for agriculture. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado eliminates the one designed for agricultural workers. But given the merit-based system and the strong preference for the highly educated, this amendment is an attempt to keep the undocumented workers from ever obtaining permanent residence.

The educational profile of the undocumented workforce is such that these workers will never, ever be able to compete in a meaningful way for the pool of merit-based green cards. As such, if it were to pass, the amendment would create a permanent underclass of lower skilled workers living here in legal limbo indefinitely without the rights or opportunities afforded to legal permanent residents.

Similar situations are played out in other countries, resulting in highly problematic, even disastrous consequences. That is not the American way. I hope people will vote no on the amendment.

Mr. President, the aspect of this legislation that deals with the agricultural workers is called the AgJOBS bill. Senators CRAIG and FEINSTEIN are two of the principal sponsors. I have been a long-time sponsor. We are talking about agribusiness primarily in California but also in other parts of the Nation. We are talking about an agreement that was worked out between the farm workers and the agribusiness. These are two groups of people who have been at each other's throats for years. I was here when we abolished the Bracero Program, basically the exploitation of workers in the United States. It was a shame and a stain on the American workforce ethic. Then we had, over a long period of time, with the leadership of Cesar Chavez, an attempt to get justice for probably about 900,000 agricultural workers, who do some of the toughest work that is done in this country. No question, half of them are undocumented—probably 600,000 or 700,000 is the best estimate we have. They have been able to work out an agreement between agribusiness and these farm workers, which we basically included in this bill.

What we were saying, basically, under the earlier provisions is that they would be able to gain the opportunity for getting a green card in 5 years. Under this legislation, it is 8 years they have to wait. They have to demonstrate that they have worked hard in the agricultural sector. They have to demonstrate that they paid their taxes and that they are attempting to learn English, and they have to meet all of the other requirements. At the end of that time, this legislation says to those people who have been a part of our system that they will have some opportunity to get a good deal of credit for working in agriculture in America.

The amendment of the Senator from Colorado strikes that provision. So these individuals who will be competing with the other provisions that have been put into this legislation for the more skilled—there are provisions in there for lower skilled, but it is basically for the higher skills. This undermines the core part of this kind of agreement that was made. There are a number of provisions in this legislation we have spelled out. There is border security and the local law enforcement, which are important; and there is AgJOBS, the DREAM Act, which the Senator from Illinois has fought for and made sure was important. There are other very important features in this legislation.

What we would basically do with the Allard amendment is say we are going to change the mix, change the system. We have worked out a system saying agricultural workers are important. They have been able to work out their agreement. There were 67 Members of the Senate who signed on, Republicans and Democrats. We basically incorporated that, although we have extended the time for those workers. The effect of the Allard amendment, as I read it, is that we are saying that is not an agreement that we are going to continue to be committed to. We are going to say those undocumented workers are going to have to compete with those who are more highly skilled.

This legislation is a balance between the AgJOBS, the DREAM Act, and the fact that we are going to permit those 12½ million people who are undocumented now to live here without fear of deportation and continue their jobs and give them, if they meet these other requirements after 8 years, in the next 5 years the possibility of getting a green card, and 5 years later be able to get citizenship with a long time in between, with heavy fines. The Allard amendment would undermine this understanding and agreement in a way that will disadvantage in a significant way the agricultural workers and other low-skilled individuals in this whole process.

I think in that sense, as the Senator from Pennsylvania pointed out, it would be unwise and unfair from a policy point of view.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Agriculture Coalition for Immigration Reform saying:

We write to urge your opposition to the Allard amendment . . .

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE COALITION FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM,
June 5, 2007.

DEAR SENATOR: we write to urge your opposition to the Allard amendment #1189, scheduled to be voted on late this morning.

By striking the merit point schedule for Z-visa workers, the amendment would have the practical effect of eliminating incentives for all workers subject to the merit system, including farm workers, from providing the work necessary to sustain our economy in the future. Retaining the experienced agricultural labor force is essential to stabilizing the farm labor crisis while consular capacity and farmworker housing are built over a period of several years to allow agriculture to rely more heavily on a reformed H–2A program.

This amendment directly undermines the merit point system, which is critical to the successful implementation. of Title VI. Title VI is essential to American agriculture in ensuring a stable and legal agricultural workforce.

ACIR urges that you oppose this amendment. We also have letters from Colorado agricultural groups opposing this amendment.

Thank you for your support for fixing America's broken immigration system and solving the worsening farm labor crisis.

Sincerely,

LUAWANNA HALLSTROM,
ACIR Co-Chair, Harry Singh & Sons, CA.
CRAIG J. REGELBRUGGE,
ACIR Co-Chair, American Nursery & Landscape Assn., DC.
JOHN YOUNG,
ACIR Co-Chair, New England Apple Council, NH.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Illinois. I will take a moment, if we have time, to go through this excellent letter that expresses reservations and opposition to the Allard amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that I have been allocated 18 minutes to speak on behalf of amendment No. 1231.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like the Chair to notify me when I have spoken for 8

minutes, and I will reserve time for Senator GRASSLEY who will also come to the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1231

This immigration bill is long overdue. Our immigration laws in America have failed us. Since 1986, when President Reagan issued amnesty, we thought for a long time we had laws on the books that would stop the inflow of workers from overseas. We were wrong. Up to 800,000 come into our country each year. Three-fourths of them stay. When you do the math over a 20-year period of time, you realize how we ended up with 12 million undocumented workers in America.

Our immigration system has failed. Let me salute Senators KENNEDY, SPECTER, and all those who worked on trying to rewrite these laws.

You can turn on the television any afternoon or evening and hear the screamers on the cable channels telling you how terrible it is that we are considering this law. Think for a moment. Those people screaming about this effort are endorsing what we currently have—a broken down, failed system that is unfair to the workers of America, unfair to our Nation, and unfair to those who were here working as part of our economy.

What Senators KENNEDY and SPECTER are trying to do is fashion a way through this madness to a law that will work. Are we sure it is going to succeed? Of course not. We cannot be sure. This is just the best of a human effort. But what they have tried to do is build into this concept basic principles. One of those principles that I think should be the bedrock of our discussion is this: Under this bill, we will have hundreds of thousands of new people coming into the United States each year to work. The arguments are made that we need them to pick crops that Americans don't want to pick. I think that is a fact. Also, we need them to fill jobs that many Americans don't want to take. Go to any packinghouse, whether it is a meat or poultry house in America—I know a little bit about that; that is the way I worked my way through college. Those are tough, dirty, hot jobs—and you will find many undocumented workers there because, frankly, people don't absolutely want to work in these places. We need to bring in these workers to fill jobs that Americans are not going to take.

Then there is another level of workers, those who have skills that we need in this country. When Bill Gates of Microsoft says: I need the opportunity to bring in software engineers so Microsoft can expand its production operations in America, and if you don't give me that chance to bring in foreign engineers, I am going to have to put a production facility overseas where I can find the same engineering talents, well, I want those jobs in America. I want those production facilities in America. I am willing to listen to his request for H–1B visas.

Whether we are talking about AgJOBS, jobs in these packing houses or jobs in Silicon Valley, we should have one guiding principle, and the guiding principle is this: Hire Americans first. Hire Americans first.

Under this bill we are considering, the guest workers who come in are subject to that requirement. Someone cannot ask for a guest worker to take a job if there is an American that will take that job first. But there is a glaring loophole. The loophole says: If the Secretary of the Department of Labor announces there is a labor shortage in an area, then they waive the requirement to look for American workers first. But we, in this bill, fail to define what a labor shortage is. What does it mean? It means a lot of employers will be off the hook. They will be able to bring in guest workers and never ask an American to take the job. I don't think that is right.

Senator GRASSLEY and I have introduced this amendment. It eliminates this loophole, eliminates this labor shortage exception, and makes it the hard-and-fast rule when it comes to guest workers that we must hire Americans first. I hope my colleagues will take a look at this and consider it.

Let me say a few words about the H–1B visa. Senator GRASSLEY and I took a look at these H–1B visas. These are special visas with specialty talents to come in because there are not enough Americans with those talents. We took a look at those H–1B visas and, unfortunately, there are some companies that are gaming the system. There have been exposes across America where these so-called H–1B brokerage houses have been created. These are not high-tech companies looking for people with H–1B visas. These are companies, by and large in India, that try to bring in Indian engineers to fill jobs in the United States.

The H–1B visa job lasts for 3 years and can be renewed for 3 years. What happens to those workers after that? Well, they could stay. It is possible. But these new companies out of India have a much better idea for making money. They send the engineers from India to America to fill spots—and get money to do it—and then after the 3 to 6 years, they bring them back to India to work for the companies that are competing with American companies. They call it their outsourcing visa. They are sending their talented engineers to learn how Americans do business and then bring them back and compete with those American companies. Is that what we have in mind here? Is that our goal, to create more opportunities for people to create businesses around the world to compete with us? I think not.

Senator GRASSLEY and I are trying to tighten up the H–1B visa. We wish to make sure that only those who are absolutely necessary are brought in, and, first and foremost, that we fill job vacancies with Americans who are out of work and Americans who are graduating from schools and developing the skills that are needed. Our first responsibility, whether it is in guest workers or H–1B visas, is to hire Americans first.

The amendment the Senate will consider in a short period of time, No. 1231, which Senator GRASSLEY and I have offered, applies to the guest worker program. But it comes down to this basic concept, and I hope my colleagues will support me: Shouldn't this new guest worker program include the same protections for American workers? I think they should. Otherwise, in the future, we are going to see companies advertising that no Americans need apply for these jobs. We don't want that to occur. We wish to make it perfectly clear that companies doing business in the United States must first give priority to American workers; that they are bound by law to do that.

Plain and simple, that is what the Durbin-Grassley amendment will do. This amendment is supported by the labor community, including the AFL–CIO, the Laborers' Union, the Teamsters, and the Building Trades.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the AFL–CIO supporting the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, May 24, 2007.

Sen. RICHARD J. DURBIN,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN: On behalf of the AFL–CIO, I write to offer strong support for your ''Recruit Americans First'' amendment to the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act (S. 1348). Your amendment would prevent employers from avoiding compliance with the bill's domestic worker recruitment requirement.

S. 1348 would require employers to recruit workers from the domestic workforce before hiring guest workers under the new Y guest worker program. However, this recruitment requirement would be waived if the Secretary of Labor determined that there is a labor shortage in the occupation and geographic area in which the employer seeks guest workers. The bill does not specify any standards to be employed in making this determination, which would be left solely to the discretion of the Secretary. The Durbin amendment would strike this waiver so that all employers petitioning for Y guest workers would be required to recruit workers from the domestic workforce before hiring Y guest workers.

Thank you for your continued efforts to improve the pending immigration reform bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director,
Department of Legislation.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve any time remaining for Senator GRASSLEY, who will be coming to the floor shortly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 7 minutes 25 seconds.

Mr. DURBIN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the quorum time be equally divided between opposing sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Illinois, is unnecessary because American workers are fully protected under existing law. This amendment would simply slow down the process, have a 90-day delay, require advertising, which is unnecessary, and would thwart the efforts of people undertaking important activities to get necessary workers.

The current statute and regulations provide that:

> The Secretary of Labor must determine that there is a shortage of U.S. workers and that the hiring of foreign workers will not adversely affect the wages or working conditions of U.S. workers similarly employed in the following occupations: physical therapists, registered nurses, and aliens of exceptional ability in the sciences or art.

Now, there can hardly be any doubt, as it is a matter of common knowledge, about the shortage of registered nurses. That is illustrative of the kinds of jobs which can be filled not to the detriment of American workers because there has been a determination made that in these categories there are no workers available. With regard to the category of aliens of exceptional ability in the sciences or art, the regulations specify the following:

> Include college and university teachers who have been practicing their science or art during the period of their immigrant petition and who intend to stay in the same occupation in the United States.

Another category provided under the regulation:

> Applicant with exceptional ability is one who possesses a level of expertise above that which would normally be encountered in the field.

Now, while that is a generalization, it can certainly be sensibly applied. The regulation further provides that:

> Applicant would need to provide evidence of the applicant's widespread acclaim and international recognition by recognized experts in the alien's field, such as the Nobel prize.

What we have in effect at the present time is a system which is adequate to protect the American workers. The Senator from Illinois is no more concerned about the protection of the American workers than the Senator from Pennsylvania, but the question is how we get there. What this amendment essentially does is to delay the process. The nurse example is perhaps the best. It is well-known that we have an insufficient supply of nurses in this country. If we have somebody who is not an American citizen, an alien, who is qualified to be a nurse, why not make that nurse available to a hospital which needs a nurse? Why not make that nurse available to a nursing home which needs a nurse, rather than have a delay and have advertising?

If the system offered by the Senator from Illinois works, they do no better than what the Secretary of Labor has undertaken to do. The Secretary of Labor can be trusted to be interested in protecting American workers, but there is a determination that there is a shortage. So this amendment is not only unnecessary, it would be counterproductive.

Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand I have 8 minutes; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is now 7 minutes, due to the quorum call.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Chair will notify me when I have 3½ minutes, I would appreciate it.

Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois. I think it makes a needed change in the legislation, one that will help provide additional protection for American workers, and I thank him for calling the issue to our attention.

The amendment is very simple. It would require every employer who wants to bring guest workers into the country to advertise for and recruit American workers first. This is a general principle that has been agreed to, certainly by me and my colleagues, and one that I am sure most Members of the Senate would support.

Senator DURBIN's language ensures this principle is implemented fairly and effectively with respect to all employers who are looking for more workers. Specifically, it eliminates an exception in those areas where the Department of Labor has determined there is a shortage of U.S. workers in the occupation and area of intended employment.

The shortage occupation idea relies on an exception in existing law which applies to green cards but not in the temporary worker context. So I agree with Senator DURBIN that in the context of ensuring that temporary workers do not unfairly compete with Americans, we do need an exception to this rule. This legislation is based upon the principle that guest workers should only be brought in if Americans cannot be found to fill these jobs, and what better way to ensure this is the case than to require all employers advertise these positions broadly.

I know there are some Members who might say that since this exception only applies when the Department of Labor says there is a shortage of workers to fill these jobs, that we shouldn't require employers to advertise. I would argue the opposite: Because we know employers are seeking more American workers, they should easily be able to meet the requirements under these laws.

I mean, the fact remains you might have a shortage in a particular area or region designated by the Department of Labor, but there may be hospitals in those areas that have more than they need; with other hospitals having less. If those other health facilities are looking, they are probably investing in trying to find additional workers and are probably advertising in any event. This makes sure they are going to give the first opportunity—and there are other requirements in the legislation that give the first opportunity to Americans to be protected.

It doesn't seem to me this would be onerous or more costly. It may be, for example, that elsewhere in the country there are Americans who are willing to fill these jobs. Maybe there are groups of Americans who have traditionally been overlooked or discriminated against who will want to know of these opportunities so that they can have a fair chance. For all these reasons, I support the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well. I think it makes a good deal of sense, and I would hope that it would be accepted.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 3½ minutes.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I wish to speak on the bill for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to discuss amendment No. 1231. I cosponsored this amendment with the senior Senator from Illinois to protect American workers. The amendment would require employers who intend to hire foreign workers to first recruit and find Americans to do the job.

The bill before us creates a new guestworker program, known as the ''Y'' visa program. I support this guestworker program. In fact, I voted to keep this program in the bill when the Senator from North Dakota offered an amendment to strike it.

I have consistently said that I support new and expanded avenues for willing workers to enter the United States and work for employers who need them.

Our country's employers want to hire legal immigrants. They need a better program, and one that allows nonseasonal or nonagricultural workers to come here.

We have programs—such as the H–2A and H–2B visas—to bring in willing workers. But, there are some jobs that

don't fit these categories. For example, in Iowa, we have meatpacking and egg processing facilities that require low-skilled workers. Yet they do not have a legal channel to bring in workers. Our existing visa categories don't help them. The ''Y'' visa program will.

But, the bill is flawed in that it doesn't require these employers to first recruit Americans. Companies who use the ''Y'' visa program should try to find U.S. workers first.

How can anyone argue against that? Why not offer the job to U.S. citizens before bringing in more foreign laborers?

Under the bill, employers who use the ''Y'' visa program may be required to recruit U.S. workers through their State agencies, job sites, and trade publications.

Some employers will be required to ''first offer the job with, at a minimum, the same wages, benefits and working conditions, to any eligible United States worker who applies, is qualified for the job and is available at the time of need.''

But, as throughout this entire immigration bill, there are waivers, exceptions, and ways of ducking out of such requirements. The authors of this bill make it seem as though Americans will be recruited first. However, these requirements are at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary can decide who has to fulfill these requirements.

The Durbin-Grassley amendment will ensure that all employers who use the ''Y'' visa program are looking first at U.S. citizens before looking abroad. I think that is what we all want. We should agree to this amendment for the sake of American workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Since nobody is seeking the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that time be charged against all sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, we are drawing to a close here. I have most of the time, I believe. I want to make a few comments on my amendment and then yield 1½ minutes to Senator KENNEDY. I think he needs that to wrap up arguments on his time. I will be glad to yield him that time.

My amendment strikes the supplemental schedule for Zs. Basically this section of the bill provides an advantage for those who came in illegally in applying for citizenship, as opposed to those who came legally.

This is a question of basic fairness. I know there is debate related to one part of the workforce as to another part of the workforce. I am not concerned about that. I am concerned about this as a basic fairness issue. I believe this supplemental schedule for Zs rewards those who came here illegally, and could disadvantage those who came legally. I am here to ask that the Members of the Senate support my amendment, because the bill's stated purpose of adopting a merit-based system is that the United States will benefit from a workforce that has diverse skills, experience, and training.

I happen to agree with that. However, I am simply not convinced that a history of breaking the law should contribute to this goal more than education or even experience. So my amendment simply strikes the special schedule for Z visas that allows people who have violated immigration laws eligible an additional 50 points. Z visa holders would, however, still be eligible for up to 100 points under the regular system, the exact same number as anybody else.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Allard amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his graciousness in yielding a minute and a half.

I am opposed to the Allard amendment. We have in this legislation very important commitments to, one, the AgJOB workers, and we have also said for the 12 million: If you pay the fines, you go to the back of the line, you work hard, you demonstrate you are going to be good citizens for the 8 years until all of the line is cleared up, and we have a way for dealing with these individuals to permit them at least to get on the path for a green card and eventually citizenship.

The Allard amendment changes all of that framework. Under the Allard amendment, we were basically saying to those who are working in agriculture, because as his amendment shows, they get a big chunk of points on this kind of thing, that that would be eliminated, and that agricultural worker who has been playing by the rules, who is a part of the AgJOB's bill, will lose out in any kind of competition in terms of green cards and the opportunity to move on into citizenship, because the other one will have the skills, will have the points, and those agriculture workers and the other lower skilled workers will not have the opportunity to do so. It will change the framework of the bill in a very important way. I know he is looking for equity in terms of all workers here to be able to start a new day. We have worked long and hard in terms of the ag workers in terms of how we are going to treat the undocumented, how we are going to treat newer workers. We have worked that out.

It seems to me that is the fairer way. We can look to the future with the new merit system, but we ought to be able to meet our commitments, which this bill does, to those who have been a part of this system and are playing by the rules, and to whom we have made a commitment.

I hope his amendment would not be accepted.

I think the time has about expired, Mr. President.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, on amendment No. 1189, I would ask for the yeas and nays, and yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

All time has been yielded. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 62, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 182 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Alexander	Dole	Nelson (NE)
Allard	Dorgan	Pryor
Bond	Ensign	Roberts
Bunning	Enzi	Rockefeller
Burr	Grassley	Sessions
Byrd	Gregg	Shelby
Coburn	Hutchison	Sununu
Conrad	Inhofe	Thune
Corker	Landrieu	Vitter
Cornyn	McCaskill	
DeMint	McConnell	

NAYS—62

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Murkowski
Bayh	Graham	Murray
Bennett	Hagel	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Harkin	Reed
Bingaman	Hatch	Reid
Boxer	Inouye	Salazar
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Kennedy	Schumer
Cardin	Kerry	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Snowe
Casey	Kohl	Specter
Chambliss	Kyl	Stabenow
Clinton	Lautenberg	Stevens
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Coleman	Levin	Voinovich
Collins	Lincoln	Warner
Craig	Lott	Webb
Crapo	Lugar	Whitehouse
Domenici	Martinez	Wyden
Durbin	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—6

Brownback	Johnson	McCain
Dodd	Lieberman	Obama

The amendment (No. 1189) was rejected.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CRAIG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1231

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2

minutes of debate, equally divided, on the Durbin amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this immigration bill will offer an opportunity for hundreds of thousands of people to come to the United States and go to work. But I believe there should be one guiding principle behind this bill: First offer the jobs to Americans. Those who are unemployed, those who are developing the skills should have the first chance to fill these jobs.

Senator GRASSLEY and I have a bipartisan amendment which eliminates the loophole and makes it a requirement, when it comes to guest workers, that the jobs first be offered to Americans to fill. I think that is a reasonable starting point for any debate on immigration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this amendment would simply delay unnecessarily the hiring of important people, such as registered nurses. We currently have an elaborate system, where the Department of Labor makes a determination that there will not be a loss of American jobs in certain special categories and that it will not depress wages.

This will simply impose a 90-day waiting period. For example, a registered nurse who is needed in a hospital would have to wait 90 days. There would be the expense of advertising.

The purpose of this amendment is already satisfied under existing law to protect American jobs, and the amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 1231, offered by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 183 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Akaka	Boxer	Cantwell
Baucus	Brown	Cardin
Bayh	Bunning	Carper
Biden	Burr	Casey
Bingaman	Byrd	Chambliss
Clinton	Kerry	Reid
Coburn	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Coleman	Kohl	Salazar
Collins	Landrieu	Sanders
Conrad	Lautenberg	Schumer
Corker	Leahy	Sessions
DeMint	Levin	Shelby
Dole	Lincoln	Smith
Dorgan	Lugar	Snowe
Durbin	McCaskill	Stabenow
Ensign	McConnell	Stevens
Feingold	Menendez	Tester
Feinstein	Mikulski	Thune
Grassley	Murkowski	Vitter
Harkin	Murray	Voinovich
Inhofe	Nelson (FL)	Webb
Inouye	Nelson (NE)	Whitehouse
Isakson	Pryor	Wyden
Kennedy	Reed	

NAYS—22

Alexander	Domenici	Lott
Allard	Enzi	Martinez
Bennett	Graham	Roberts
Bond	Gregg	Specter
Cochran	Hagel	Sununu
Cornyn	Hatch	Warner
Craig	Hutchison	
Crapo	Kyl	

NOT VOTING—6

Brownback	Johnson	McCain
Dodd	Lieberman	Obama

The amendment (No. 1231) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to enter a unanimous consent request, but I will wait until Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, arrives.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have spoken to a number of my colleagues today—in fact, within the past hour or so. There has been a concern by the minority that there have not been enough votes on this bill.

Keeping that in mind, I am going to propound a unanimous consent request that would allow 20 votes. I will outline it as follows: I ask unanimous consent that at 5:45 today, the Senate vote in relation to Senator KENNEDY's alternative to Senator CORNYN's amendment No. 1184; that immediately upon the conclusion of that vote, the Senate vote in relation to Senator CORNYN's amendment No. 1184.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I agree in concept with what is being proposed by the majority leader, and that is that we start voting on pending amendments. The amendments mentioned in the unanimous consent request are all amendments that were proposed prior to the recent recess of the Senate. So I am in favor of moving forward and allowing our colleagues votes on the various proposals, many of which have been offered some time back.

I do not agree with the implication that, at that point, we would then be finished with the bill, or that further amendments would be limited. Many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have been patiently waiting to get amendments in the queue. Some have waited on the floor for long periods of time only to be told there would be an objection to their amendments being called up.

I propose to the majority leader that we allow the managers to continue to set up votes on pending amendments. I even encourage Senators on this side of the aisle to keep their remarks quite short in order to process additional amendments.

I think it is premature to file cloture on this bill and cut off debate on amendments. If we can continue to let the managers work in good faith on setting votes on the amendments, we will have given this important national issue an opportunity for the kind of fair process that it deserves. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am going to propound another request. Based upon my distinguished colleague's statement, that we have spent a lot of time on this immigration bill—and every minute of it has been deserved. As Senators will recall, the vehicle that was brought to the floor was the bill that passed the Senate Judiciary Committee last year. It was believed that by spending more time on a bipartisan basis a substitute could be reached, and that was done. We now have before the Senate a substitute amendment that has been bipartisan in nature, with 10 Senators, Democrats and Republicans, having worked this out. Mr. President, we have had a number of votes. Keep in mind the substitute amendment that is now before the Senate is a result of a number of things, not the least of which is all the work that went into the bill that did not go forward last year.

We had numerous votes, and the Democrats and Republicans who put together the substitute took all that into consideration when they came up with the substitute. So we don't need the same number of amendments we had last year.

I think we should have amendments, and I am going to propound a request. This does not limit amendments or limit amendments in the future. As we all know, once cloture is invoked, all germane amendments are subject to votes following that cloture vote during the 30 hours. So we have today, Tuesday, Wednesday, and you will see that we would also have Thursday under one of the proposals I am going to offer. But my concern is, when is enough enough? We have a number of considerations here that are so important to our country. I recognize the importance of immigration, and I am going to do everything I can to make sure people feel they have had an alternative to the substitute that was offered. But there has to be a limit as to the amendments Senators offer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow the Senate vote in relation to Senator SESSIONS' amendment No. 1235; further, that the Senate vote in relation to the Feinstein amendment No. 1176; further, that the Senate vote in relation to the Inhofe amendment No. 1151; further, that the Senate vote in relation to the Cornyn amendment No. 1250; further, that the Senate vote in relation to the Menendez amendment No. 1194; further, that the Senate vote in relation to the Clinton amendment No. 1183; further, the Senate vote in relation to the Sessions amendment No. 1234; further, that the Senate vote in relation to the Dodd amendment No. 1199; further, that the Senate vote in relation to the McConnell amendment No. 1170; further, that the Senate vote in relation to the Lieberman amendment No. 1191; further, that alternative Democratic and Republican amendments be in order in relation to each of the above amendments, and that the time for each vote be set with the concurrence of both leaders and both floor managers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object for the very same reason I just stated a few moments ago, the majority leader indicated that amendments that were germane would be voted on postcloture. Of course, that is only if they are pending. One of the problems we have had is getting an adequate number of amendments pending. The best way to go forward—I remind our colleagues, and certainly my friend the majority leader, that it was I on the day I was chosen Republican leader who said this Congress ought to do big things, and I mentioned two. One was Social Security. It appears to me that we are not getting anywhere on that. The other was immigration. I commend the majority leader for turning to it, but the minority is not going to be shut out.

This is a big, contentious, complex matter. We had well over 20 Republican amendments the last time this issue was before the Senate. The best way to process this bill is not for the majority to try to stuff the majority—that won't happen, I assure you—but, rather, to go through the process in an orderly way. And with this kind of rhetorical back and forth, it continues to waste time that could be used in offering, debating, and voting on the maximum number of amendments, which would allow us to get to the point where we can get cloture on the bill and to final passage. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the reason here is a little unusual. We have 12 amendments pending. After these are voted on, other amendments will be offered and should be offered. There is no reason to cut off what we have talked about here as being the only amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is filed today on the substitute amendment, it not ripen until 6 p.m. Thursday, June 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, would the majority leader restate the consent request?

Mr. REID. I am happy to do that. I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is filed today on the substitute amendment, it not ripen—there not be a vote on it—until 6 p.m. Thursday, June 7, rather than Thursday morning. That would give us another day.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have tried to set up 20 votes in relation to amendments, including Democratic and Republican alternatives. We also tried to vitiate the need for a needless second cloture vote on the bill itself, if the substitute amendment is ever adopted. Lastly, we tried to delay the cloture vote until Thursday evening so Members would have more time to debate and dispose of amendments.

Each effort, I am sad to report, was objected to by our Republican colleagues. So as far as I am concerned, they are in no position to complain that they did not get votes on amendments prior to cloture. We offered them votes.

First of all, in this part of my presentation, I want to express my appreciation to those who have worked so hard on this bill, and I hope they will continue to work on this bill. I made a suggestion, and here it is. If they can come up with something better, more power to them.

I have devoted a lot of the Senate's time to this measure, not only this year but last year when I was working with Senator Frist. It is an important piece of legislation. The immigration system is broken and needs to be fixed. We have an obligation to the American people to do that. Do I think whatever we come up with will be perfect? No. But we have, with the help of the President, the opportunity to take this matter to the House, have them work on it, and then again with the President's assistance get to conference and come up with something that would be better than what we passed out of the Senate.

I hope my Republican colleagues are not going to use this as an excuse that they have not had enough amendments offered. That really is not fair, and it is wrong. I say again that I appreciate the work of the managers. Senator KENNEDY has worked very hard to work his way through this bill, as have Senators KYL, SESSIONS, CORNYN, and people who may not be in support of the bill but at least have tried to improve it.

Mr. President, there is one thing I didn't ask. My staff informed me that I did not ask this: I ask unanimous consent that if the substitute amendment is agreed to, the bill be read the third time, and the Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on final passage of S. 1348, as amended.

I have a premonition that there may be an objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, of course, the way to handle this would be to make sure that the germane amendments that are pending get votes postcloture. The majority leader could agree to a consent that it be in order to call up germane filed amendments postcloture, which would be very comforting on this side of the aisle. I understand the position he is in. He would like to move this bill and, I assume, have his Members exposed to the fewest number of votes they don't want to cast. I have a significant number of Members over here who feel very strongly that before they would allow us to wrap up this bill, these amendments need to be considered.

At the risk of being redundant, the best way to do that is for the managers to keep processing amendments as rapidly as possible, to get consent that it be in order to call up germane filed amendments postcloture, which would be comforting to Members on this side of the aisle. Until we decide to operate in that fashion, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, one person I did not compliment—and it is my negligence—is the Senator from Pennsylvania, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, former chair of the Judiciary Committee, who has worked very hard on this legislation.

Mr. President, what we have heard are buzz words for this bill is going nowhere. I think that is too bad. As the day progresses, I hope people have a change of heart and that we can work on amendments that can be voted on. Certainly, we don't need my approval for whatever amendments should be voted on.

We are going to file cloture on the bill today. There are a number of exigencies present in the Senate, and we have to move on. The Republican leader has been told by some Senators that more amendments would help. Most of the people who want more amendments have no intention of voting for this bill no matter what we do.

I have made my statement. The Republican leader has made his statement. I hope the managers can figure out a way to move on. Before the close of business today, I am filing cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, at the risk of unnecessarily delaying the discussion, the key to finishing the bill is to have votes on an adequate number of amendments. A number of amendments on this side are being offered by people who may well vote for an immigration bill. I certainly would like to vote for an immigration bill in the Senate. I did vote for such a proposal

last time we went through this process in the previous Congress. I would like to be able to do so again. But we are going to insist on fundamental fairness.

This measure may well be the only significant accomplishment of this Congress. Surveys out in the Washington Post today indicate that there is a declining support for the new Congress, which is a considerable implication that the American people have noticed that we are not doing much in this Congress. Let me repeat, it is not my desire for this Congress to have a record of virtually no accomplishment, and a good significant accomplishment would be to get the right kind of immigration bill out of the Senate. It is still my hope that will be achieved. This is only Tuesday afternoon—just Tuesday afternoon. There is plenty of work time left this week, and I think we ought to get about offering, debating, and voting on the essential amendments to this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my counterpart, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, said this is a 2-week bill, and we are in the second week of this bill.

I will also state—and I am not as much of a poll watcher as my caucus would tell me I should be—that the polls also show the Republican Members of Congress are not as well thought of as Democratic Members of Congress.

As far as success, I think we have done pretty well this past 6 months. We now have a bill that has been signed by the President where, for the first time in 10 years, we give a raise to the people who need it worst, the people who rely on the minimum wage. Keep in mind that 60 percent of those who draw a minimum wage are women. For the vast majority of those women, that is the only money they have for themselves and their families.

We have tried for 3 years to get disaster assistance for farmers, and we were able to get that. That is now signed into law. The President has made many trips to the gulf, but in this supplemental bill, which we forced the President to sign, we now have monetary relief for people in the gulf affected by Katrina.

We were able to extend the SCHIP program for children's health care. That is a significant accomplishment. That will take care of things until October. We were also—in the legislation that the President signed, that we forced—able to get more than he gave us in the supplemental appropriations bill. We had more money for the troops in Iraq and Afghanistan—$4 billion more for medicine and veterans' benefits.

We have been trying for years to get money for homeland security. In this bill, we got it, a billion dollars for homeland security that has long been necessary.

Within the next week or two, we are going to have a conference report that will come forward, sending to the President legislation on stem cell research that will give hope to millions.

I worked, in fact, as late as yesterday with the distinguished Republican leader, and I think we are in a position where we can come up with a satisfactory conference report on ethics and lobbying reform.

So I think we should not be denigrating the work of this Congress and the things we have been able to accomplish, which has been done on a bipartisan basis. We have had to push and pull a little, getting motions to proceed on various pieces of legislation that were necessary, but we were able to do that. So I don't think it is time to denigrate or belittle the Congress based on the polls we have seen.

I repeat, let us not get into poll watching, because if you look at the polls, Democratic Congressmen, Democrats generally, are scored much higher than Republicans. But I repeat, I don't follow polls. I think we should be doing a lot more by what we feel is right to do than what polls show.

I hope the immigration matter can move along. I think the two leaders of the Senate have stated how we feel about this, and now we turn it over to the good hands of our experienced managers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we probably shouldn't prolong this any further, because this is keeping us from handling amendments on this bill, which we desperately need to do, but we haven't had a major immigration reform bill in 21 years. So far on this bill we have had nine rollcall votes. By any objective standard that is not nearly enough. Let us proceed to work on the bill, and, hopefully, we can get somewhere during the course of the week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I tried to offer an amendment on May 24, before the week's recess, and I was asked by Senator KENNEDY if I would withhold and he would make every effort to allow me to have a vote on my amendment on Social Security for Z visa holders on the first day back, which is today.

Now, I know there have been intervening circumstances, and I am not saying there is any blame here. However, I am asking that we set a time for the vote on my amendment No. 1302, which has been filed but which I was asked to withhold offering. Now I wish to have a time certain, if possible, where we can have a vote on that amendment.

I have to say I have now seen this body operate. What happens on a bill such as this, that is very complicated and long, and especially when you are writing the bill on the floor rather than taking it through the committee process, there are a lot of amendments which are legitimate amendments, yet the distinguished majority leader said he was going to file cloture on the bill tonight. That would ripen on Thursday.

I have three amendments. One is on Social Security protection for America, from any person who works illegally to get credit on Social Security when they are working illegally; another one on the future flow of Y visa holders; and then I have an amendment for people to return home before they come back and become legal guest workers in our country. So those are three amendments I am giving everyone notice I believe are very important, they are productive, they are positive, and they are an effort to make this a bill that Americans will see is the right approach to handling the chaos we have with illegal immigration in our country. I don't want to be squeezed out by cloture or by time deadlines.

If we take 4 weeks on this bill and it becomes a better bill that all of us can support, those who wish to have comprehensive reform, 4 weeks, with the effect this is going to have in the next 25 years for our country, that is nothing. So I hope I will be able to offer my three amendments and get votes on them at some point.

I want to be able to protect my rights, and I want to ask if I could have a time certain to vote on the first Social Security amendment, No. 1302, if that would be possible.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, one of the things I think the managers should do is see if they can get a list of amendments, germane amendments, the minority wants. We have a few on our side. It is at least worth a try to see if we can come up with a list of germane amendments. I ask Senator KENNEDY and Senator SPECTER to see if they can come up with a list of germane amendments that Members think they want to vote on. We already have, as I said, 12 or so pending, and we will take a look at that. I am not even sure the 12 pending are germane. We don't know that either.

Anyway, they can see if they can come up with a list of germane amendments, whether that is three, four, five, whatever it is, and we will take a look at that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am delighted to deal with the amendment of the Senator from Texas. We have to figure out the order. This is the side of the Republicans now. Senator CORNYN has been waiting, and waiting patiently. The Senator from Texas did mention this. We had contacted the Finance Committee, since it is dealing with Social Security, to see whether they would be able to go, and I hope they will do that and dispose of it very rapidly. The other measures are not in the Finance Committee and we would be glad to deal with those. But dealing

with Social Security is the Finance Committee's jurisdiction, and they had some views on that.

I hope we might be able to do the Cornyn amendment. The leader had asked me if we could do the DeMint amendment after the Cornyn amendment. There may be one on our side dealing with health insurance which we would be prepared to do. It is fine with me. I am here and I am ready to go with these amendments, so I will make every effort to get the Finance Committee, and I will stay here with the Senator from Texas until we are able to get this disposed of this evening. I will give you that, as far as I am concerned.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Let me say I am happy for the Finance Committee looking at it. I wish this whole bill had gone through committee so we would know exactly where we stand. If they are for it, great. If they are against it, let us debate it. But let me ask if I could have at least a unanimous consent to bring up the amendments that are filed, No. 1301 and 1302—those are the two Social Security amendments—and then lay them aside, so that at least they are here and I know they will be disposed of.

Mr. KENNEDY. Absolutely.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. My third one, the one that requires the return home, has not been offered yet but it will be germane. We are still trying to work with Senator KENNEDY, Senator KYL, and all the Senators who are involved in this process to try to get a consensus on that return home amendment. So it has not been filed.

If I could ask unanimous consent to bring up amendments Nos. 1301 and 1302, after which I would be happy to set them aside, to make them pending before cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have given assurance to the Senator from Texas, but I wish to see if we can have a short time. She will retain the right to make that request, but let us see if we can't work out the time now with the Finance Committee. Could we try that before getting consent? Because there has been some question about others who wanted to add a number of amendments on both sides, and we are trying to at least dispose of some of those that are on the list. I will give the assurance that this legislation, at least if I have anything to do with it, is not going to pass or be considered or closed out to the Senator from Texas, because, as she has pointed out, she raised these and we gave assurance she would get them. We were prepared on that Thursday evening, as we were running out of time to do the supplemental and to get the Finance Committee over.

The Senator mentioned, before the majority leader left, that she wanted to offer that, and I regret I had not gotten the Finance Committee members over here. They were marking up I think the CHIP program earlier in the day. That is my only reservation about setting aside now, because there has been objection on both sides to adding more until we start to dispose of some of the underlying amendments.

I will certainly try to get the clearance and work with the Senator and do it within the next few hours, if the Senator would withhold that and give us an opportunity to try to work through that. The Senator is quite correct that we have given her those assurances, and I intend to keep my word to the Senator.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I will attempt to work with the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request withdrawn?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I will withdraw the request, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have been asked, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT, to seek unanimous consent to move to have a time for amendment No. 1197.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the DeMint amendment, No. 1197, to be pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me point out, if I may, that amendment No. 1184, which I filed and called up 13 days ago, has yet to receive a vote on this immigration bill. This amendment would ban felons on the legalization path set forth in the underlying bill. It astounds me this could be in the least bit controversial, but I have been denied an opportunity for an up-or-down vote on that for the last 13 days.

Now that I hear the majority leader intends to file cloture, it is clear what the pattern is, and that is to try to move this bill through without an opportunity for Senators to be given the chance to introduce, call up, debate, and then vote on important amendments. So I will object.

I likewise object to the scheduling of any other votes on the bill until I am given an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on amendment No. 1184. I add that I have offered to my colleagues the possibility we could enter into some sort of time agreement to debate and to vote on the amendment. I am told there is a side-by-side amendment that is being considered. I was told it would be made available to me at 4 o'clock this afternoon. It would have been the second side-by-side amendment that had been proposed. I have yet to see it.

I have tried to be patient, and indeed I have been patient. I have tried to work with my colleagues to let the process move forward, but it is clear to me now, since the majority leader says he intends to file cloture, there is not going to be an opportunity to fully debate and offer amendments to this bill; that the majority leader intends to try to force this bill through, denying Senators an opportunity to have a chance to offer amendments, to have those amendments debated, and have those amendments voted on.

I must employ whatever tools the Senate rules give me to insist upon my rights. I will do that by objecting to this and the schedule of any further votes until such time as we are able to enter into some sort of agreement for the disposition of amendment No. 1184.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I understand the point of the Senator from Texas, and I agree with him. He has been very patient. Some of the rest of us have been patient, too. We are waiting for that side-by-side so we can proceed.

The purpose in the unanimous consent request was not to have a vote on DeMint but just to have it pending so that it would be in line for a vote postcloture since it is germane, so I renew my request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right, I just mentioned to the Senator from Texas that there has been an objection. I would like to go to the Cornyn amendment—we have the side-by-side—get started, debate it, and vote on it tonight. That is what I would like to do. If necessary, we will do something over here in the meantime, come back, and deal with the Senator from Texas. We are ready to go. We have a side-by-side. We can get into general descriptions about that, but why don't we get started on the Cornyn amendment.

I was asked earlier whether we would agree to debate and dispose of the DeMint amendment, and we said fine. But if we are now going to add more and more amendments on this—I agree with those who say let's get to work. Let's do the Cornyn amendment at this time. Respectfully, as I said, we were ready to deal with the DeMint amendment 10 minutes ago. Even now, if we want to debate it and vote on it and dispose of it, we are ready to go. But that isn't it, it is now to just be filed. How can we do that if we object to the Senator from Texas filing?

Why don't we go to the Cornyn amendment, I ask Senator SPECTER. We will be helpful and try to get the amendment of Senator DEMINT up. We are not trying to close him out. We can deal with that later this evening. I am glad to do that later this evening. We are set to go. It deals with health insurance. I am familiar with the issue. I am ready to go on it. We can deal with Cornyn. In the meantime, we can go to the Finance Committee and find out what we want to do with the amendment of the Senator from Texas, and then the leader asked us to try to dispose of DeMint. We were prepared to go

ahead with the Sessions amendment that deals with the ITC that the Senator from Alabama wanted earlier.

It is not our problem with this. We are ready to go. We are ready to debate and vote. I hope we can go ahead with the Cornyn amendment and the Senator will give us a little time to get this worked out about whether we are going to add and stack additional amendments up. I haven't got anything against the DeMint amendment. I saw it. I think it is a legitimate amendment.

Could we ask consent that we go to the Cornyn amendment?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, although it was a long time ago, I believe I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does have the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. I am glad to reassert that. I didn't want to say ''regular order'' and interrupt the Senator from Massachusetts.

I understand there may be an objection. I want to protect Senator DEMINT's rights and ask unanimous consent that his amendment be pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, without unnecessarily repeating myself, I have been waiting 13 days for a vote on my amendment. I am afraid if I consent to this unanimous consent request, it is going to continue the pattern of avoiding my amendment, which would ban felons from getting Z visas under this underlying bill. I think that is something with which the American people, and hopefully the vast majority of the Senate, would agree. This amendment is well taken. It is a good thing. Let's not allow people—those who have had a chance, who defied the law, who thumbed their nose at our courts—to gain the advantages we are otherwise going to confer on people under the Z visa.

I will object. As I indicated, I am willing to offer an alternative unanimous consent request that once I am shown the side-by-side amendment that I am told the majority has in mind, that they would like to offer as an alternative to my amendment No. 1184, I will be willing to enter into a time agreement with 2 hours equally divided to debate and then to vote on my amendment tomorrow. I will not enter into a unanimous consent agreement to debate an amendment side-by-side which I have not seen and which has been 13 days in the making. I think my request is a reasonable one. I am trying to work with my colleagues here but, frankly, I do not feel as if it has been a two-way street. That is my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection was heard.

Mr. KENNEDY. Could the Chair restate? Is it the request of the Senator that we consider the Cornyn amendment? We are making available now the side-by-side. It is basically similar to the other one but in greater detail. Is it the request of the Senator that we go to his amendment now, we have a 2-hour debate on it, and that we vote on the side-by-side? Is that the Senator's request?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the Senator is correct with the exception that I agree we can have the vote tomorrow. If there is no objection to my unanimous consent, I am glad to accommodate Senator DEMINT or other Senators to allow them in the interim to call up other amendments. I would like to have a time locked in for a vote on my amendment—which would then have been pending for a full 2 weeks without a vote—tomorrow morning. I would like to see what the amendment looks like before we leave today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I understand the request of the Senator, he wants to be able to have 2 hours on the Cornyn amendment to be voted on tomorrow morning. Hopefully we can debate this this evening. I am more than glad to make the side-by-side available. I certainly support the request.

If we can have it more precise, is it just sometime in the morning? Are we going to debate this this evening? I would like to try to get it so at least the leadership and Members know. This is a very important amendment. We want to make sure they are aware—what is the desire of the Senator? That we debate it this evening and we let the leaders set the time for the vote tomorrow but we spend at least 2 hours on the Cornyn amendment and the side-by-side and at some time designated by the leadership we vote on it tomorrow morning at an appropriate time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I think, in response to the inquiry, I would like to see the amendment before I begin the debate. What I propose is to see the amendment tonight and be prepared when we come into session tomorrow morning to begin that debate. The chances are we will be able to yield some time back, but I am proposing 2 hours, evenly divided, and then to schedule the vote sometime before noon tomorrow morning at a time agreed upon by the bill managers and the leadership.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we are making that available. I strongly support it and urge it, as I understand the Senator isn't proposing that exactly at this moment but intends to do so, pending the examination of the amendment. I certainly support that process. We will wait. It is not being propounded at this particular time, as I understand it, until he has a chance to look at it, but that would be the intention about the way to proceed. We will make available to him the side-by-side and then hopefully have an opportunity to propose the consent agreement sometime in the very near future. We then would maybe proceed to consider the DeMint amendment, and we will in the meantime get ahold of the Finance Committee to deal with the Senator from Texas, to check with our side to see whether we have an intervening amendment. That is what I would hope. But I hope very much we are going to continue to do the business of the Senate this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I think we are making some progress. I accept the invitation of the Senator from Massachusetts. Let's talk and write this up. Then we can make sure we are all on the same page. The fundamental agreement would be a 2-hour time agreement to debate this tomorrow morning, with a vote no later than noon tomorrow at a time mutually agreed upon by the leadership and the bill managers. I think we can come to some agreement on that basis.

With that, based on that understanding, then, I will be glad to remove my objection. I withdraw my objection to proceeding with the DeMint amendment, and I withdraw my consent request for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. I see the Senator on the floor. I was going to try to see if we could not get Senator DEMINT over to do that in a timely way. It is on health insurance. We will do it in a timely way. In the meantime, we are working with the Finance Committee to try to be able to deal with the Senator from Texas. I would like to try to do that. I was going to suggest the absence of a quorum. I will not do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 1174

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I also have a germane amendment that I have been trying for some time to get called up and get pending. I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 1174 be made pending. I am happy to set that aside or discuss it now. I would like at least to get it in the queue so at some point it could be voted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we have the Hutchison amendment. I have no intention to try to exclude the Senator. We are making a note at this particular time—we have been trying to cooperate. We have been trying to get an amendment up for the last hour or so. But there were others on our side who wanted to offer theirs, and at least our leaders wanted us to try to dispose of the underlying ones before we add one. I will reluctantly object to it, but I give personal assurances we will do everything we can to get it up in a timely way, but at this time I have to object to that consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the amendment I just tried to call up, amendment No. 1174, was objected to, and I hope at some point we can get agreement to allow it to be put into the pending status that will allow it to be voted on at some point. But since we are on the bill, I would like to speak to the amendment.

Amendment No. 1174 is a very straightforward and simple amendment. What it does is it removes a loophole in the underlying bill that allows noncriminal illegal immigrants to obtain immediate legal status before any of the border security measures set out in this bill are deployed and inserts language that prohibits probationary benefits from being issued to an illegal immigrant before the effective date triggers are implemented.

Despite what the proponents of the bill are saying, the immigration proposal before the Senate would give illegal immigrants immediate legal status upon enactment by providing legal immigrants with the opportunity to apply for a probationary Z visa or, as it is labeled in the bill, a ''Probationary Authorization Document.'' Illegal immigrants can obtain immediate legal status because of a huge exception set out in the very first sentence of this very large bill. This exception makes the trigger requirements of beefed-up border security and internal security irrelevant, in my view. It is an exception that I believe swallows up the rule.

This exception completely undermines what is supposed to be a key principle of the bill, and that is that no legalization of the illegal immigrant population in this country can occur until the border security and workplace enforcement provisions in the bill are certified as funded, in place, and in operation.

My amendment simply does away with this section by striking it from the underlying bill and inserting language that prevents any probationary benefit from being issued before the ''effective date triggers'' are implemented.

Not only does this bill provide for immediate legal status for illegal immigrants before any of the border security measures in the bill are deployed, it also provides that illegal immigrants will be able to maintain legal status in this country even if the border security measures in this bill are never deployed.

The very first sentence of the bill says the probationary benefits conferred by section 601(h) are exempt from the trigger requirements of 20,000 Border Patrol officers and 670 miles of vehicle barriers and fencing and other enforcement measures.

Section 601(h) says an illegal immigrant who files an application for a Z visa shall be granted probationary benefits in the form of employment authorization. The provision also says the illegal immigrant may not be detained, nor an unauthorized immigrant.

Once an illegal immigrant applies for the Z visa; provides evidence that they were in the country and employed before January 1, 2007; pays up to $1,500 in processing fees and a $500 State impact assistance fee, as well as a $1,000 penalty, that individual will receive a probationary authorization document if he or she passes all appropriate background checks or the end of the next business day, whichever is sooner. That means the illegal immigrant will legally be in this country before any certification that 20,000 Border Patrol officers have been hired and 670 miles of vehicle barriers and fence have been constructed.

Interestingly, illegal immigrants would not even have to pay the entire initial $1,000 penalty set out under this bill. They would have to immediately pay the $1,500 for a processing fee and a $500 State impact assistance fee, but these are merely fees, not penalties.

Another principle of this legislation is supposed to be that illegal immigrants are justly punished for breaking the law before obtaining legal status. The bill, in section 608, allows illegal immigrants to put 80 percent of the penalty on an installment plan, meaning that an illegal immigrant would only have to pay $200 initially in penalties when they apply for a probationary Z visa.

So an illegal immigrant could pay a paltry $200 penalty when they apply for a probationary Z visa and have immediate legal status conferred upon them by the next business day if nothing turns up in a background check. This does not amount to an adequate consequence for breaking our laws, nor does it put illegal immigrants at the back of the line. To make matters worse, no additional fence or other border security measures have to be deployed before this happens.

Mr. President, what makes matters even worse is that even if the triggers are never met, the probationary legal status never expires. As the bill states clearly on page 291, line 17, all of these things: The immediate legalization, the trigger mechanism being made pointless, and the never-ending probationary legal status occur because of this loophole in the very first sentence of the bill.

I would simply argue that loophole needs to be closed, and that is what my amendment would do. Those who have broken our laws to come here will be given immediate legal status, even before additional security fences are constructed or desperately needed Border Patrol officers are hired. This does not sit well with most of the people I represent in South Dakota from whom I am hearing every day on this issue. They are not happy with this bill as written.

My amendment represents an effort to ensure that the trigger requirements in the bill are met before any legalization occurs by eliminating the exception for ''probationary benefits'' and ensuring that no probationary benefit for illegal immigrants can be issued until the trigger mechanisms in this bill are implemented.

Mr. President, we are a nation of immigrants. We are a nation of laws. We should be rewarding those people who have followed our laws, who have played by the rules, and not putting those who have entered the country illegally in front of them. Before any effort is made to deal with the 12 million illegal immigrants in the country, we first must secure the border.

Despite claims to the contrary, the bill in its current form would give illegal immigrants immediate legal status before any further border security measure is deployed. My amendment would fix this flaw in the bill. I would hope, Mr. President—I would also add that Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa is a cosponsor of this amendment.

I hope we will have an opportunity at some point to debate this, to vote on it, because I think this is a fundamental flaw in the bill that needs to be corrected. It is a loophole which I think completely undermines the whole intention of this bill; that is, to make sure that certain conditions are met before the legalization process is allowed to move forward. This, as I said, is a very straightforward, simple amendment, one that I think is very understandable to people across this country. Certainly I think it makes sense to people I represent in the State of South Dakota.

I hope at some point those who are managing this bill will allow this amendment to be called up, to be made pending, and ultimately to be voted on.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1197 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1150

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DEMINT] proposes an amendment numbered 1197 to amendment No. 1150.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require health care coverage for holders of Z nonimmigrant visas)

At the end of subsection (e) of section 601, add the following:

(9) HEALTH COVERAGE.—The alien shall establish that the alien will maintain a minimum level of health coverage through a qualified health care plan (within the meaning of section 223(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight one of the most important domestic issues this country is facing, and that is rising health care costs. I think it is also important to point out that nearly 10 million noncitizens are uninsured according to the September 2006 U.S. Census report on the uninsured.

Since no hospital can legally deny a person health care because of their immigration status or inability to pay, my amendment would help prevent that cost from being shifted to the American taxpayers in the form of uncompensated care. Since about three-fourths of all uncompensated care costs are paid by taxpayers in the form of national and State programs, it is imperative the Senate pass my amendment that would require Z visa holders to maintain a minimum level of private health coverage.

Under this amendment, minimum health coverage would be defined as a high-deductible health care plan. It is my firm belief these visa holders should take some responsibility for their own health care and avoid burdening American taxpayers when they have medical problems.

By requiring Z visa holders to have a minimum level of private health insurance, it will help keep individuals off public assistance and out of the emergency rooms. According to the Economic Research Initiative of the Uninsured, immigrants as a group are nearly three times more likely to be uninsured than native-born U.S. citizens.

I am almost certain some of my colleagues will say it is not possible for these visa holders to afford a private health insurance plan. In fact, there are plenty of high-deductible policies available on the individual market that are affordable, with an average cost of about $116 a month. Furthermore, these plans have seen only a 2.8-percent increase on an annual basis compared to 8 percent for all other types of health plans. This low rate of increase is another reason high-deductible health plans are affordable to those with lower incomes.

It is also important to point out that by having their own high-deductible health plans, visa holders will be able to keep their policy regardless of their employer. Many employers who want less expensive labor will likely help their employees pay for these high-deductible policies.

Mr. President, it is also important to point out that there is a precedent for this type of action. In 1993, the Department of State issued regulations requiring students entering the United States under exchange visas to have health coverage. This amendment would only extend this policy to Z visa holders.

What is most troubling to me is that this legislation before us does almost nothing to stem the rising costs of uncompensated care. If we do not pass my amendment, the growing cost of uncompensated care currently at $41 billion per year will only be exacerbated.

Supporters of this bill will point to the State Impact Assistant Grant Program that is established in the legislation. This grant program would be funded through fees paid by the immigrant, and it would be administered by the Federal Government to repay States for health and education expenses.

However, even the bill language suggests, through a sense of the Congress, that this will not be enough to solve the problem of illegal immigrants using our health care services at a cost to the American taxpayer.

Our country is spending $2 trillion per year on health care. While my amendment does not address the entire problem, it does address the problem of noncitizens using our resources at a cost to the American taxpayer. In my opinion, there are many problems with this legislation. But I believe this amendment will at least improve upon this extremely flawed bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I can have the attention of the Senator from South Carolina.

His amendment will maintain a minimum level of health coverage through a qualified health plan in the meaning of 223(C) of the Internal Revenue Code. Is that right?

Mr. DEMINT. Right.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is the health savings accounts?

Mr. DEMINT. Generally, high-deductible plans are accompanied by the health savings account.

Mr. KENNEDY. So if they had other kinds of health coverage at all, they still would not be—unless they have this particular coverage, the high deductible, they would not be able to make—adjust their status.

Mr. DEMINT. This is the minimum level as established by the high-deductible policies. Certainly, more comprehensive plans would fit in the context of the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is the Senator aware now that the undocumented or aliens are not eligible for any of the Medicaid proposals at the present time?

Mr. DEMINT. For the first 5 years, that is correct. But that does not mean they cannot access any of our health clinics, emergency room services, and a lot of uncompensated care can be directed at the current group of illegal immigrants in our country.

Mr. KENNEDY. Why did the Senator select just this particular health coverage rather than being able to participate in HMOs or other kinds of programs?

Mr. DEMINT. Well, we are establishing a minimum level, which the minimum would be the high-deductible policies, often accompanied by health savings accounts. This does not prevent an immigrant from having a more comprehensive plan, an HMO. But the point of the amendment is not to mandate a comprehensive plan but to establish a minimum level of coverage, which is more affordable particularly to low-waged workers.

Mr. KENNEDY. What is the estimate that the Senator has for this coverage? What is the estimate that they would have to pay out for this coverage?

Mr. DEMINT. The average of high-deductible plans is $116 a month. I will just say as an aside, I just bought a high-deductible plan for my 22-year-old daughter at $65 a month. This, obviously, leaves some to be paid by the workers themselves. But it avoids the high-risk cost of a worker who may have complicated, very expensive problems, for that whole bill to land on a hospital, which often happens.

Mr. KENNEDY. If there are preexisting conditions—how does this amendment affect preexisting conditions?

Mr. DEMINT. Well, we do not specify. It may be something we want to cover in an additional amendment. But many States, as you know, now have high-risk pools which are available to all workers in the State regardless of immigration status.

This certainly may not cover every possible problem. But if we are going to issue Z visas, I think the point is that they become an asset to our economic environment in this country, and certainly if they are uninsurable that may suggest that they are not a viable worker as well.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, we have 47 million Americans who don't have coverage at the present time. But you want to insist that anyone, these undocumented are going to be mandated individual coverage in order to be able to adjust their status?

Mr. DEMINT. Obviously, the uninsured are a problem, and many of us are working on ways to solve that. It is one thing to ask American taxpayers to help take care of their fellow citizens. It is another thing to ask Americans to help assist those from all over the world. Certainly, our hearts go out to anyone with health problems, but we cannot ask the American taxpayer to subsidize low-wage workers for employers who are using them in this country.

Mr. KENNEDY. Of course, CBO studies which have been released in the last few days show that immigrant workers contribute much more in terms of taxes than they use in terms of services by about $24 billion over the estimate of the length of this plan.

Mr. DEMINT. There is obviously a lot of research that refutes that. The Heritage Foundation has come out with quite an extensive study that suggests the low-wage workers, undereducated

immigrants in this country today, cost an average of $19,000 a year more in taxes than they pay. This group, as a whole, over the next three decades will cost $2.4 trillion to the American taxpayer. So there is a lot of research that suggests that undereducated, low-skilled workers are going to be a net loss to the American taxpayer.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have heard studies quoted. Generally, around here we use Congressional Budget Office figures for actions in the State. They reach a rather dramatically different conclusion than the studies the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. DEMINT. Certainly, the Senator will agree it should not be the obligation of the American taxpayer to subsidize low-wage workers for employers. Frankly, I believe if we ask these immigrants to pay their fair share, employers are more likely to hire American workers in the first place rather than lower wage workers who are actually being subsidized by the taxpayer. This health plan is one idea to ask these immigrants and their employers to carry the fair load and not to dump the cost of health care on other workers in this country.

Mr. KENNEDY. Of course, the workers themselves have to contribute $550 as part of their cost anyway, their contribution to the State. In terms of consideration of covering any of the costs, that was sort of put into the legislation itself, in terms of the additional fees and additional fines as well, that addition to help offset any of the expenses that would be carried in the State itself.

Mr. DEMINT. I think the Senator obviously knows—and the bill language suggests—this is a small token of what the real costs are, not only for health care but education, daycare, and other services that are often used by these immigrants. Again, to ask these immigrants or their employers if they would like to assist in paying $100 or a little more a month to keep them from becoming a burden to the taxpayers is a small thing to ask for someone who is taking advantage of the opportunities in this country.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is important to get health care and health care coverage for all who do not have it. The real issue is the best way to pursue that. That is something we have to take a look at.

I see the Senator from West Virginia is here and wishes to address the Senate on an important matter about our friend and colleague from Wyoming.

I yield the floor and thank the Senator.

Mr. DEMINT. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). The Senator from West Virginia.

(The remarks of Mr. BYRD are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1267, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 1150

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1267 and note that I have a modification of that amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment, as modified.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], for himself and Mr. OBAMA, proposes an amendment numbered 1267, as modified, to amendment No. 1150.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Section 218A(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 402, is amended to read as follows:

''(i) PERIOD OF AUTHORIZED ADMISSION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Aliens admitted to the United States as Y nonimmigrants shall be granted the following periods of admission:

''(A) Y-1 NONIMMIGRANTS.—An alien granted admission as a Y-1 nonimmigrant shall be granted an authorized period of admission of 2 years. Such 2-year period of admission may be extended for 2 additional 2-year periods.

''(B) Y-2 NONIMMIGRANTS.—Aliens granted admission as Y-2 nonimmigrants shall be granted an authorized period of admission of 10 months.

''(2) Y-1 NONIMMIGRANTS WITH Y-3 DEPENDENTS.—A Y-1 nonimmigrant who has accompanying or following-to-join derivative family members in Y-3 nonimmigrant status shall be limited to two 2-year periods of admission. If the family members accompany the Y-1 nonimmigrant during the alien's first period of admission the family members may not accompany or join the Y-1 nonimmigrant during the alien's second period of admission. If the Y-1 nonimmigrant's family members accompany or follow to join the Y-1 nonimmigrant during the alien's second period of admission, but not his first period of admission, then the Y-1 nonimmigrant shall not be granted any additional periods of admission in Y nonimmigrant status. The period of authorized admission of a Y-3 nonimmigrant shall expire on the same date as the period of authorized admission of the principal Y-1 nonimmigrant worker.

''(3) SUPPLEMENTARY PERIODS.—Each period of authorized admission described in paragraph (1) shall be supplemented by a period of not more than 1 week before the beginning of the period of employment for the purpose of travel to the worksite and, except where such period of authorized admission has been terminated under subsection (j), a period of 14 days following the period of employment for the purpose of departure or extension based on a subsequent offer of employment, except that—

''(A) the alien is not authorized to be employed during such 14-day period except in the employment for which the alien was previously authorized; and

''(B) the total period of employment, including such 14-day period, may not exceed the maximum applicable period of admission under paragraph (1).

''(4) LIMITATION ON ADMISSION.—

''(A) Y-2 NONIMMIGRANTS.—An alien who has been admitted to the United States in Y-2 nonimmigrant status may not, after expiration of the alien's period of authorized admission, be readmitted to the United States as a Y-2 nonimmigrant after expiration of the alien's period of authorized admission, regardless of whether the alien was employed or present in the United States for all or only a part of such period, unless the alien has resided and been physically present outside the United States for the immediately preceding 2 months.

''(B) READMISSION WITH NEW EMPLOYMENT.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent a Y nonimmigrant, whose period of authorized admission has not yet expired or been terminated under subsection (j), and who leaves the United States in a timely fashion after completion of the employment described in the petition of the Y nonimmigrant's most recent employer, from reentering the United States as a Y nonimmigrant to work for a new employer, if the alien and the new employer have complied with all applicable requirements of this section and section 218B.

''(5) INTERNATIONAL COMMUTERS.—An alien who maintains actual residence and a place of abode outside the United States and commutes, on days the alien is working, into the United States to work as a Y-1 nonimmigrant, shall be granted an authorized period of admission of 3 years. The limitations described in paragraph (3) shall not apply to commuters described in this paragraph.''.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I wish to briefly describe what this amendment does. I understand there is not a plan to have a vote on this amendment this evening, but I wish to explain briefly what this amendment does.

There are three programs in the underlying bill that are related to so-called temporary workers. One of them is the new guest worker program. That is the program we amended the provision of 2 weeks ago when we reduced the number of people eligible to come into the country under that program each year from a number of 400,000 to 600,000 down to 200,000.

This current amendment, amendment No. 1267, I have called up again deals with that same guest worker program. It tries to make the program more workable. The underlying bill says if a person comes into this country under that program, that person is eligible to get a visa for 2 years to work here, then is required to leave for 1 year, then is eligible to come back again for another 2 years, then is required to leave for another year, then is eligible to come back again for another 2 years, and then is required to leave permanently. So it is what I have come to refer to as the 2–1–2–1–2 structure of this guest worker program.

Frankly, it does not make a lot of sense. It does not make a lot of sense from the point of view of employers or employees—guest worker employees—or American workers who might also want to apply for those jobs or similar jobs.

Let me explain what I have in mind.

As regards an employer, if someone came into my office in the Senate and said: I have a great proposal for you. I would like to work for you for 2 years and then I am going to take off for a year, and then I will come back again

and want my job back for another 2 years, and then I am going to take off for another year, and then I am going to come back and want my job back for another 2 years, I would not hire such a person. It would not make any sense. You need continuity in your workforce. You do not want people coming and leaving for substantial periods of time. So from an employer's perspective, this makes absolutely no sense.

From the employee's perspective, if you are one of the guest workers, what are you supposed to do during the year you are not permitted to stay in this country? You are supposed to go back to your home country. Why would we believe that person would be able to support themself and their family during that year when they are not working here? They have to find a job there. When they leave there, obviously, that employer's employment situation is disrupted. So that does not make sense from the point of view of those guest workers.

It does not make sense from the point of view of American workers who might want these jobs. These are generally thought of as construction jobs. These are not agricultural jobs we are talking about, and they are not seasonable jobs. They are permanent jobs. It is just that by the provisions of this bill, we are suggesting let's take a permanent job and try to make it temporary by kicking people out of the country every 2 years. So that is the only thing temporary about these jobs.

This does not make sense from the point of view of American workers either. American workers who want to work in these construction positions will find there is a constant flow of entry-level workers coming back into this country every year saying: OK, I know I was here before. Now I am back again. I am starting at the bottom of the ladder again. Pay me the entry-level wage, and I will take any job you have.

So the upward pressure on wages in that construction industry is eliminated. There is no upward pressure. You have this very large group of entry-level workers coming back every year. This does not make good sense.

My amendment simply says, let's do what we did last year. We passed a bill last year. We had good bipartisan support for it. Basically, the bill, last year, said: Let's do one 3-year visa, and let it be renewed for a year. What I am proposing in my amendment is, let's do a 2-year visa. Let it be renewed twice. Then the 6 years is up.

So we are not changing a lot of other aspects of the bill. I know there are some in this Senate who think we should change other aspects. In fact, I think we should as well. But I am not trying to do that in this amendment. I am saying let's at least eliminate this 1-year hiatus that is built in between each of these 2-year visas we are providing for in this guest worker program.

To me, this is eminently sensible. It is something we ought to do. Governor Napolitano wrote an op-ed piece in the New York Times on June 1 of this year, and she said the following:

> The proposed notion that temporary workers stay here for two years, return home for a year, then repeat that strange cycle two more times makes no sense. No employer can afford this schedule—hiring and training, only to have a worker who soon will leave. It will only encourage employers and workers to find new ways to break the rules.

What we are doing is setting up a system that will encourage workers to overstay their visas. Much of the illegal immigration problem we have in this country today is not because people have sneaked across the border—although there are many of those—it is because people have come here legally and overstayed their visas, and they are now illegally living in this country.

If you ever wanted to have a system that would generate more people coming here and illegally overstaying their visas, we have designed it in this bill. So my amendment tries to correct that to some extent. It says once they come here and go to work, they are given a 2-year visa. They can renew that two times and work the full 6 years. So it maintains the 6-year limit that the sponsors, the architects of this legislation, have intended, but it makes a lot more sense in the way it works.

Let me mention one other aspect which I think is crucial; that is, we need a system that is workable. We do not have the capacity today—we, the Federal Government—to keep track of people who leave the country. We can keep track of the ones who come in, but if you ask the Immigration Service how many of those who come in are still here, they do not know. We do not have the capacity today to track the people who leave.

So we are setting up a system where we have 200,000 a year coming in. Two years later that 200,000 is supposed to leave. The next year 200,000 more people come. Two years later that group is supposed to leave. We have no way of implementing this system and ensuring it is being complied with. So the whole thing is assuming a capacity and a capability that the Federal Government does not have today.

It would be much simplified if we were to adopt the amendment I have offered. I hope my colleagues will support the amendment. It would improve this bill significantly.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, to give some information to the Members, as I understand, Senator HUTCHISON and the members of the Finance Committee are meeting. As a point of information, the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and staff are meeting with the Finance Committee staff to consider those particular proposals. We have given the assurance to her that the Senate will address those issues at some time, but since it was just dealing with Social Security, although there are provisions in here that deal with Social Security, it is entirely appropriate that we ought to have the Finance Committee work on that.

The Senator from New Mexico has offered an alternative on the temporary worker program that is a serious amendment, and we could, if we are—we will have to find out what the pathway is between voting on one side and voting on the other, to be able to consider that, but that is an important alternative to what is the underlying legislation. I know there is going to be some response to that from Members very shortly.

On the amendment of Senator DEMINT, he had indicated he was going to come to the floor to offer it. We were hopeful we might be able to consider that and have a vote on that later on as well.

At the present time, we are trying to work to see if we cannot find a situation where we can get two votes, one from the Democratic side and one from the Republican side, on measures that have been included on that list that have been talked about earlier, and the Members of the staffs on the Republican and Democratic side are working to see if we can't refine the list of different amendments to see what might be acceptable and then what might be germane and see if we can't refine this list. So that, I know for people outside the Senate, doesn't sound like much of an explanation about what is going on, but it is important and often produces additional motions here in the Senate. So we will have more information on this.

A very brief word on the DeMint amendment. His amendment requires a high deductible health insurance for each undocumented; otherwise, they would not be able to proceed with their earned legalization program which includes payments of the fines, demonstration of the work product, the investigations that show they have not had challenges in terms of the law, and the series of requirements that are out there. He would add to this the additional expenditures which would be necessary for coverage with a high deductible health insurance.

There are several points to mention here. First of all, in the underlying legislation, we have included a payment, some $500, that will be paid by each of the 12.5 million immigrants who are out there, many of whom will adjust their status. If they pay that $500, that is in excess of $1 billion—$1 billion that will be paid to those high-impact States, which is not insignificant, to help offset any of the kinds of utilization of these individuals in terms of the services within these various States. That is not insignificant.

Secondly, all of us are hopeful of trying to get universal coverage for people in this country, but we know we have 47 million who don't, and the ones who don't, it isn't that they don't want to have health insurance, it is because they cannot afford it. When you look at these individuals whom we are talking about, the undocumented and their income, we are talking about individuals who are earning $8,000, $9,000, $10,000 a year. If they have the adjustment of the status, they are going to be part of the whole kind of American system, hopefully, and meeting the other kinds of requirements, and therefore their enhanced opportunities are going to be there so they will be able to afford health care in the future. But making the requirement now will only state to those individuals to keep them in the shadows. It is one more barrier that is going to prohibit them from being involved.

A final point—and I ask unanimous consent to have this material printed in the record—the utilization of these health care facilities as we have seen in the most recent study, particularly in the State of Texas, which shows that, by and large, these are individuals who are younger, have used these health emergency centers very rarely. We have the studies that have been done, particularly the most recent one in Texas.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL REPORT, DECEMBER 2006

UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS IN TEXAS: A FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT TO THE STATE BUDGET AND ECONOMY

* * * to develop an estimate of the fiscal impacts to 14 Texas border counties. In addition to sheriff's offices, they calculated costs to the following offices for each county:

District Attorney
District Court
District Clerk
County Attorney
Court at Law
Justice of the Peace
Indigent Defense
Adult Probation
Juvenile Services

They also included an estimated emergency medical care cost, but their estimate included costs for both offenders and non-offenders who are undocumented immigrants. The Comptroller's report includes a separate calculation estimating Texas health care costs for undocumented immigrants, so these costs were subtracted from the U.S./MBCC estimate.

The U.S./MBCC estimated that the cost to these 14 border counties was approximately $21.5 million. Of that amount, sheriff's offices accounted for approximately 60 percent of expenditures for undocumented immigrants. Applying this ratio to the figure calculated for sheriff's office costs produces an estimate of $81.7 million for costs related for processing and incarcerating undocumented immigrant offenders for the 15 highest SCAAP grant recipients. These 15 counties received 88 percent of the 2005 SCAAP money awarded to Texas counties; $81.7 million divided by 0.88 produces an estimated total cost of $92.9 million.

This figure represents a conservative estimate, as the SCAAP grantees represent 95 of Texas' 254 counties and 87 percent of the state's population. Some of the remaining counties also may incur criminal justice costs related to the processing and incarceration of undocumented offenders. For example, five of the 14 border counties included in the U.S./MBCC study did not submit SCAAP applications in 2005.

Total estimated costs for education, health care and incarceration are detailed in Exhibit 13.

VI. ECONOMIC BENEFITS

This section analyzes two issues: the economic impact of undocumented immigrants in Texas, including their contributions to state employment, wages and revenues over a 20-year period (2005 through 2025); and the contributions of undocumented immigrants on Texas government revenues.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

The Pew Hispanic Center estimates that between 1.4 million and 1.6 million undocumented immigrants resided in Texas in March 2005. To achieve a conservative estimate, this analysis relies on the lower boundary of this range.

Using 2000 Census data for the number of foreign-born residents in Texas counties, it is possible to estimate how many undocumented immigrants reside in each of Texas' 24 Council of Government regions, based on the assumption that immigrants are distributed in the same proportion as the foreign-born. Based on an age profile of foreign-born immigrants into the U.S. from Mexico, it is possible to further disaggregate the estimates into age and gender groups.

These data then can be put into the Comptroller's Regional Economic Model, Inc. (REMI) model to investigate the impact of undocumented immigrants on the Texas economy. This is accomplished by instructing REMI to act as if these immigrants were to suddenly vanish from Texas and then to examine the degree to which the underlying economic forecast for the state and for each region would be affected. The implicit assumption is 1.4 million undocumented immigrants have employment and spending patterns consistent with Hispanics in Texas with similar age and gender profiles.

To gauge the economic impact of undocumented immigrants, one additional change must be made in the REMI model. Because REMI is a general equilibrium model, it tries to compensate for changes in a variety of ways. In the case of workers eliminated from a region, the model assumes new workers will be recruited to make up for their loss.

While this is an expected ''real-world'' result, a true test of the effects of unauthorized immigrants would be seen only if the REMI model were prevented from importing additional workers into the state in compensation.

The model eliminates the impact of all undocumented immigrants on the Texas economy. Some in-migration was allowed, but drawing in new Hispanic in-migrants in numbers disproportionate to their share of the indigenous population in the U.S. was prohibited. Effectively, this shut off return in-migration from Mexico and other Latin-American countries.

Model Results

Probably the easiest way to summarize the contribution of undocumented immigrants to the Texas economy is to consider the percentage changes that might occur in various economic indicators as a result of their removal. (As a yardstick, it should be noted that 1.4 million people account for slightly more than 6 percent of the total Texas population.)

Exhibit 14 and 15 summarize the changes in key economic indicators, and summarize the economic impact. Without the undocumented immigrant population, Texas' work force would decrease by 6.3 percent. This decline is actually somewhat lower than the percentage of the work force actually accounted for by undocumented immigrants, since REMI assumes some additional immigration would occur to replace the workers lost. The most significant economic impact of losing undocumented workers would be a noticeable tightening in labor markets.

This tightening would induce increases in wages, as indicated by a rise in average annual compensation rate. Wage rates would rise by 0.6 percent in the first year and stay above the forecast rate throughout the entire 20-year period.

While pay increases can be viewed as a positive social and economic development, when they rise due to labor shortages they affect economic competitiveness. In this case, it would be expressed as a modest decline in the value of Texas' exports.

The remaining broad economic measures all point to an initial impact of undocumented immigrants of about 2.5 percent in terms of the value of production and wages in the Texas economy. Eliminating 1.4 million immigrants would have resulted in a 2.3 percent decline in employment, a 2.6 percent decline in personal income and a 2.8 percent decline in disposable personal income in 2005. This change also would generate a 2.1 percent decline in the gross state product (GSP), the broadest measure of the value of all goods and services produced in Texas.

While none of these changes are surprising, the one finding that may appear unusual is the persistence of the decline. If no in-migration were possible other than from natives or authorized immigrants, employment would remain 2 percent below the baseline forecast 20 years later. The impact lessens over time, but remains sizable throughout the 20-year forecast period.

The primary adjustment the model makes to compensate for the loss of these undocumented migrants is initially a rise in the wage rate, which would induce some new in-migration into Texas and some additional participation in the labor force from current residents. Moreover, with wages rising relative to capital, there would be some substitution of capital for employees so the need for additional workers is lessened through productivity increases. But the fact that the Texas economy cannot adjust completely to the loss of this labor through these changes and retain its competitiveness ultimately means that relative to the rest of the world the cost of production in Texas is higher, making our goods less competitive in the international marketplace and decreasing the size of the Texas economy.

Regional Distribution

Assuming that the current distribution of unauthorized immigrants is similar to the distribution of the foreign-born population in Texas from Central America and Mexico, as detailed in the 2000 Census, the economic impact of unauthorized immigrants varies substantially across Texas. As detailed in Exhibit 16, the loss of 1.4 million undocumented immigrants from the work force would produce work force declines ranging from 22.7 percent in the South Texas COG region (the Brownsville-McAllen area) to 1.7 percent in Southeast Texas (the Beaumont-Port Arthur area).

Generally, undocumented immigrants have the highest economic and demographic impact in the Border region, but they are a factor in the state's more urbanized areas as well. In all but one case (the Middle Rio Grande COG), Border COGs would see work force declines in excess of 20 percent (the Rio Grande, Lower Rio Grande and South Texas

COGs). Even in the Middle Rio Grande COG (including Laredo), the work force impact of undocumented immigration is more than double that in the Houston-Galveston COG.

Other measures of economic impact are distributed similarly. Estimated population, employment and GSP declines would be highest along the border but also high in large metropolitan areas elsewhere in the state. The least affected regions in Texas would be those along the Louisiana and Oklahoma borders.

By 2025, a good portion of the work force and population changes would lessen, but in all regions the employment and gross regional product declines would remain sizable, indicating that the economic impact of undocumented immigrants is unlikely to be replaced by other economic changes (Exhibit 16).

Revenues

Estimating state government revenue attributable to undocumented immigrants is a difficult undertaking because any calculations must be based both on limited data and a number of significant assumptions about spending behavior. A review of the literature found several studies on undocumented immigrant impacts, but none that could be used as a model for Texas. Primarily, these studies focused on the impact of all immigrants, regardless of legal status, and the analyses focused on federal or state income tax revenue. Since Texas has no income tax, any estimate of state tax revenue must be based on its mix of consumption and business taxes.

Texas state government receives revenue from a wide variety of sources, but these generally can be grouped as tax collections, federal funding, licenses and fees and all other sources of revenue. In fiscal 2005, $29.8 billion of the state's total revenues of $65.8 billion came from tax collections. Federal revenue contributed $22.8 billion and licenses, fees, fines and penalties accounted for almost $6.2 billion. Other sources, such as interest income and lottery proceeds, generated the rest.

For the purposes of this analysis, major tax sources were analyzed to determine if a significant portion of collections could be attributed to consumer spending. Similarly, some major sources of revenue from fees and fines were identified as appropriate to the analysis. Sources of revenue excluded from the analysis include federal revenue and all other sources that could not be attributed directly to consumer behavior. While the state generates revenue from literally hundreds of taxes and fees, this estimate is based solely on revenue sources reflecting spending by undocumented immigrants.

State revenues included in the analysis, can be grouped in five categories: consumption taxes and fees, lottery proceeds, utility taxes, court fees and all other revenue. In addition, local school property tax revenue is estimated. Consumption tax revenue totals are composed primarily of revenue from the sales tax, motor vehicle sales and use tax, gasoline tax, alcoholic beverage taxes, cigarette and tobacco taxes and the hotel tax.

Estimated revenue for each tax is calculated based on information from two sources. The Pew Hispanic Center produces data on average income and demographic characteristics of undocumented immigrants nationwide (again, no detailed demographic data are available at the state level). The estimate of annual average family income used in this analysis is $27,400. In addition, data from the Comptroller's tax incidence model shows the tax impact for households at the estimated average income level.

State utility tax revenue mostly comprises the gas, electric, and water utility tax and this estimate uses the same basic data on average income along with the final incidence impact for this tax. Similarly, local school property tax revenue is based on the same data and the incidence specific to the school property tax.

Estimated lottery revenue is based on a Lottery Commission study of the percent of the population that plays lottery games and the average amount spent by each income level. Court costs and fees were calculated on a per capita basis since they are largely unrelated to income.

''All other revenue'' consists of a number of smaller consumer taxes and fees that may well include some amounts paid by undocumented immigrants, but for which no data exist to base an estimate. The largest of these sources is higher education tuition; other sources include state park fees and the fireworks tax. This estimate assumes that undocumented immigrants contribute to the state through these revenues at the same rate as for the major consumption taxes and fees except for higher education tuition and fees. These contributions were calculated in proportion to higher education student enrollment.

As shown in Exhibit 17, estimated fiscal 2005 revenue to the state from undocumented immigrants in Texas is about $1.0 billion, or about 3.6 percent of the $28 billion in state revenue considered in this analysis. In addition, an estimated $582.1 million in school property tax revenue can be attributed to undocumented immigrants, or about 2.9 percent of the statewide total. Undocumented immigrants, thus, contributed nearly $1.6 billion in estimated revenue as taxpayers in fiscal 2005.

VII. CONCLUSION

The immigration debate has become more heated in 2006. Congressional hearings were held across the U.S. to discuss the impact of undocumented immigrants on the economy and the culture. At the same time, two distinctly different pieces of legislation were voted out of the U.S. House and Senate.

The Comptroller's office estimates the absence of the estimated 1.4 million undocumented immigrants in Texas in fiscal 2005 would have been a loss to our Gross State Product of $17.7 billion. Also, the Comptroller's office estimates that state revenues collected from undocumented immigrants exceed what the state spent on services, with the difference being $424.7 million (Exhibit 18).

The largest cost factor was education, followed by incarceration and healthcare. Consumption taxes and fees, the largest of which is the sales tax, were the largest revenue generators from undocumented immigrants.

While not the focus of this report, some local costs and revenues were estimated. State-paid health care costs are a small percentage of total health care spending for undocumented immigrants. The Comptroller estimates cost to hospitals not reimbursed by state funds totaled $1.3 billion in 2004. Similarly, 2005 local costs for incarceration are estimated to be $141.9 million. The Comptroller estimates that undocumented immigrants paid more than $513 million in fiscal 2005 in local taxes, including city, county and special district sales and property taxes. While state revenues exceed state expenditures for undocumented immigrants, local governments and hospitals experience the opposite, with the estimated difference being $928.9 million for 2005.

Mr. KENNEDY. So at the appropriate time, I hope the DeMint amendment would not be accepted. We might have more time to consider it, if the Senator wants to, when we have more of our colleagues here later, prior to the disposal of it. I was sort of hoping we could see a continued movement on several of these amendments, but we are being told now we have to have this clearance from the leadership on some of these measures, but we are hopeful we will announce to our colleagues very shortly what the plan is for the rest of the evening.

We are prepared to stay here, remain here and go through to dispose of these amendments. We have made important progress in the past. We have some important amendments which are pending. I think Senator SPECTER and I and the others who are interested in this—I see my good friend from Colorado, Senator SALAZAR, and others who are more than willing to have a good discussion about these amendments, and we would welcome the opportunity to have the Senate express itself with votes. That is certainly our desire. We wish to see continued progress on this extremely important legislation.

As one of those with others who has been a part of this process, we want to try. We know it is complicated and difficult. We know there are strong emotions. But I think all of us, after the period of this Memorial Day recess, understand full well the American people are expecting us to take action. They know that failure is not an alternative. They know it is complex. They know there are great emotions. There are a good many who know nothing out there—people who distort, misrepresent, misstate the legislation, and then differ with it, and that has certainly been done with regard to this legislation. We have, at least to date, had good debates and discussions on substantive matters, and the Senate has reached conclusions on a number of these matters. It is certainly our desire to continue that process to work with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I wish to commend those who have worked on the immigration bill. I know their hearts are in the right place and they have attempted to come together to solve a very critical issue for our country and they are to be commended for their efforts.

I understand that if we call up an amendment, it will be objected to, and I think that is unfortunate. As the country sees, if we are going to have an immigration bill, then we need to have a real, full debate on all aspects of that bill and each Senator should have opportunities to offer amendments.

I think the bill has a lot of good in it. I think a lot of positive things have come through. However, there are two or three critical errors I believe that are incorporated in the bill. Quite frankly, one of them is the bill's plan, in terms of guest workers and managing the load of the Z visa holders. There is not the capability out there right now to do that.

I have an amendment which creates a real trigger, and that is what everybody in this country wants.

The reason there is a stir in the country about immigration today comes from the very fact that we have had laws on the books that we haven't enforced. When you have a free society and you have laws on the books that are not enforced, you get all sorts of untoward expectations that come about out of that. The No. 1 expectation that has come out of that is the American people don't trust us when it comes to immigration. I believe we have to earn back that trust. The way we earn back that trust is to secure the border. The way we earn back that trust is to enforce employer verification. The way we earn back that trust is internal enforcement.

The goals, as I said, of those who have worked hard in putting this bill together are admirable. However, the trigger is anything of a trigger, and it is something that would not accomplish its purpose.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that the pending amendment be set aside and amendment No. 1311 be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I was in consultation. Could the Senator restate his request? I apologize to him.

Mr. COBURN. Amendment No. 1311.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator chooses to call up his amendment.

Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what we were attempting to do is, as we have been moving from one side to the other, Republican and Democrat, to have the introduction of amendments on both sides. That is what we would like to do. We have had a flurry right now of amendments. I hope we get an opportunity—I think, quite frankly, there are more amendments on that side than on this side, as a factual matter.

What they have tried to do is match amendment for amendment on both sides. That has been what they have tried to do through the day today. Whether that will be the way it will be in the future, I don't know. As I mentioned, there are more amendments on that side. So, obviously, we are going to have to deal with more. At the present time, they are trying to match one side with the other side in terms of amendments. So I hope that if we have amendments on this side, the Democrats would notify us so we can match them up and propose them together.

I necessarily have to object at the present time. I hope we will not have to object when we get our final list. To try to maintain at least that balance, which was at least the way we were attempting to proceed, I have to do it at the present time. I will do everything in my power to make sure that, having done so, his amendment will certainly be considered in a timely way so it doesn't work to his disadvantage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. COBURN. I trust the Senator's integrity. But it is unfortunate for the American people, and also for the Senate, that we use a ruse that we have to have offsetting amendments be heard, when the fact is we are going to bring this amendment up, and we are not going to debate it tonight. The fact is it is going to be objected to being called up and being in the queue.

That overshadows the fact that I know the Senator would like to have a full and fair debate on this bill, but it seems we cannot get together to allow that. I will come back multiple times tomorrow to offer this same amendment and try to get it up. It is unfortunate that the body has to work this way tonight because we don't want to truly, in fact, allow all of the amendments on this bill.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

NATIONAL HUNGER AWARENESS DAY

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to my colleagues' attention and remind them that today, June 5, 2007, is National Hunger Awareness Day. As a founder of the Senate hunger caucus and an original cosponsor of the legislation, I express my heartfelt belief that this cause deserves our full attention.

We all move very fast in this world on Capitol Hill. We sometimes forget that outside the beltway bubble there are a lot of hard-working families, as well as other families that may not be quite so blessed, in terms of their everyday needs being met.

The resolution that established National Hunger Awareness Day allows for food collection. That is one thing we are doing on Capitol Hill today. We are doing a food collection for the needy, where Members and their staffs can bring food to my office, as well as the offices of the other hunger caucus cochairs, Senator SMITH, Senator DOLE, as well as Senator DURBIN. I appreciate the willingness of my colleagues to participate in such a very important effort.

Our collection drive has been going on for several weeks, and we will soon be providing the food donations to the U.S. Veterans, a charity based in Washington, DC, that assists homeless veterans with food and housing during their recovery. Certainly, as we recognize the diversity in the homeless community and those who suffer from food insecurity, as well as poverty, we must not forget, particularly in this time, the number of veterans in our great Nation, those who served our country so bravely and courageously in a time of need, and what a perfect time right now is to be able to recognize that on National Hunger Awareness Day.

I have worked with my Senate colleagues to draw attention to this issue because hunger and poverty are not just global issues; they are so pervasive that we all have some experience with them in our local communities, whether it is work we may do with our own houses of worship or whether it is something we do with our community-based organizations or community support activities. But we all can find a way where we recognize how pervasive poverty, and particularly hunger, is in this world.

Worldwide, 3 billion people—nearly half the world's population—live on merely $2 per day. In our Nation alone, almost 38 million Americans struggle day in and day out to find adequate nutritional food. More than 13 million are children living in households that are food insecure.

That brings it home to me from several different directions: As a daughter raised in a seventh generation Arkansas farm family, watching my dad take an incredible sense of pride in being able to produce crops he knew would feed his fellow man, taking pride in being efficient and effective with what he produced, and knowing what he could do would help sustain his fellow man. To look out on the crops and those farmlands I grew up on, and to think that 13 million children are living in households that are food insecure, with all of the plenty and the bountiful life we have in this great country, breaks my heart. Then I think of myself as a mother of twin boys who are about to turn 11 years old, and I look up and think to myself how grateful I am to be able to know they will get a nutritious meal; to see them when they come home from soccer practice and look up at me and say, ''Mom, I'm starving,'' and how blessed I am to be able to go to a cupboard and provide a nutritious snack to them; yet to think about other mothers across this globe who are not so fortunate, who have to look into the eyes of their own children and say there is nothing here for you, nothing to eat, nothing to nourish your body or your mind or your soul in the form of food.

We can do better than that. I feel blessed I have never had to experience what it is to suffer from hunger. But I have tried to put myself in the shoes of those mothers who look into the eyes of their children and have to give them that answer.

Now, in conjunction with National Hunger Awareness Day, I have also recently elected to accept the food stamps challenge and live on an average food stamp program payment of $1 per meal. I went to the grocery store the other day, and I went down those aisles looking at what I could find that was economical and nutritious that I could prepare and would have the time to prepare, not just for myself, which I am the only one in my household doing the challenge, but nonetheless, to think of the time that working parents would have to spend to figure out how to put together a nutritious meal for them and for their children on $1 per person per meal. It is my hope that my

participation in this event will not only create awareness in myself but also for others in highlighting the difficulties that millions of Americans living at or near the poverty line face each and every day. In addition, I hope to increase my understanding of the limitations of the Food Stamp Program and the importance it plays in assisting the food insecure and the hungry by experiencing what it is like to live it firsthand, to be looking for those foods and what you can afford on $1 per meal.

We had a woman—a very courageous woman—who came and testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee on the Food Stamp Program. She brought with her her son who is 11 years old, similar to my boys, who sat there. She said: You know, I don't make it a habit of discussing financial issues in front of my young son, but this is so important to me, to point out that I work hard at a full-time job, and I still do not make enough money to provide for my family. I still am able to accept food stamps. She said: But look at what I have to do to manage that.

Then I looked at her testimony and realized that not only was she caring for her own son, she was volunteering with the PTA, the Cub Scouts, and the local library. She was helping her community also, helping raise all those children. Yet she was still subjected to living in food insecurity.

We can do better than that. As a Member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I wish to ensure that we do improve the delivery and maintain the integrity of nutrition programs when we consider the farm bill later this year. I wish to also make sure we maintain the integrity of our ability in this great Nation to produce a safe and abundant and affordable food supply. We pay less per capita than other countries across the globe. Yet we still see that working families are living in food insecurity. Over 60 percent of the farm bill budget pays for important initiatives that directly provide food and nutrition assistance, such as the Food Stamp Program, the fresh fruits and vegetables program for schools; and we are finding now that oftentimes for those children that may be the only access they have to fresh fruits and vegetables; a farmer's market program for low-income seniors, among others, that we are striving so hard to not only eliminate food insecurity but to make sure we are working hard to provide for all Americans, for the needs that exist.

We must continue to fund these important programs, and we must look for new and innovative ways to ensure that Americans do not go hungry. I know that when I worked downtown, there was a man regularly at the front door of the office building I would go into. He would sit there, usually with a cigarette and a bottle and, you know, I felt so driven, both by my faith and simply my human nature, and I knew that in my life on this Earth, I should never, ever want to see another human being going hungry. That is when I decided to start giving out food coupons—not giving out dollars but making sure my fellow man—doing all that I could do, so he and others would not go hungry if I were there.

In the coming weeks and months, I encourage my colleagues to become more aware, more educated, and more informed about the effect of hunger and poverty and to find out what impact you can have in your State and in your community. I encourage all Americans to do that. Think about the difference it makes—those 13 million children living in food insecurity—how much better they could perform in school if they weren't hungry; how less likely they would be to get sick if they were getting nutrition; how much more confident they would be in who they were and who they could become if they knew that their country was there to nurture them in the most basic and essential need: food.

There is no quick solution to this problem. Government alone cannot provide all the answers. We know that. As we look across these strong communities in our country and we see food banks sponsored by our faith-based organizations and the outreach of volunteers that provide Meals on Wheels and all kinds of other programs, we know that Government cannot do it all. But we also know that, as Americans and as an American family, the values we hold dear are values of being a good neighbor. That is a critical part of what this is all about. Together, we must work to reach out to organizations in our communities that are committed to this cause and develop a public-private partnership that provides resources and the manpower to combat food insecurity in this country.

Yes, we must teach our children. We must teach our children to become engaged in recognizing food insecurity, poverty, and hunger where it exists and to recognize that they, too, have a responsibility.

I noticed my son the other day when he came home, and he said: Mom, I am responsible for bringing some lunch meat to school because our student government is going to provide sack lunches to the homeless shelter out here in our community. The student government got together and made the lunches and put them together and then delivered them where they could visit the individuals they were actually helping, assisting, and giving notice.

In closing, I would like to leave my colleagues with just a few thoughts. I know many of you all read the same Scripture I do. First and foremost, I believe my faith calls me, and it calls all of us, regardless of faith, to care for those who are less fortunate; to feed the poor and the hungry. I can tell you I am proud that our current nutrition program works toward that goal, but does it do enough? No. We can all do more. We can all do more in reaching that goal.

Today, on National Hunger Awareness Day, we need to begin by asking ourselves what more can we do to eliminate hunger and poverty in our community and in our world. It has been said: To those to whom much is given, much is required. We live in this great country. Such a blessing to each and every one of us. The opportunity to do for our fellow man is an incredible responsibility. To us, much has been given, and much will be required in giving back.

I appreciate my colleagues' attention to this issue, and I ask each and every one to reflect on what it is that we can do collectively as a government that reflects the values of who we are as an American family and what each of us has to do individually that reflects the values that we hold dear. One of the things we must remember, hunger is something that has a cure. There are many diseases and many things we debate on the floor of this body for which we don't yet have a cure. We don't know how we are going to solve those problems. Hunger has a solution and it has a cure and it is our responsibility to strive hard each and every day to find that cure for our fellow man.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I want to commend my colleague from Arkansas, the senior Senator from Arkansas, for the passion that she has shared with us that she has had for some period of time about the plight of the hungry.

Indeed, she is accurate in pointing out that in the ancient Scriptures there are over 2,000 references to the poor. And, indeed, she quoted very accurately from the Book of Matthew, where one of the great admonitions is to do it unto the least of these, my brothers and sisters, and one of those admonitions: When I was hungry, you fed Me. So I thank her for that.

Having just come back from Africa, participating in a number of the world food programs there, I would note a food program is not only necessary there because of the obvious, the starvation and the drought, and so forth, but now, with the President's new initiative and additional funding on the HIV/AIDS plague, in the administering of the antiviral drugs which have had some very positive effect, we find they won't work because the patients can't tolerate them if they are hungry. So now a program worldwide of joining the two.

But the Senator from Arkansas has spoken so eloquently about hunger at home, hunger among us, and there is no reason in America, in the year 2007, that we should stand idly by and turn a blind eye to the needs around us among the poor. I thank her for her comments and her passion that she brings to this subject.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of National Hunger Awareness Day and to give voice to the difficult reality that exists for more than 35 million people in the United States—the experience of hunger.

In a society as civilized as ours, basic sustenance should be a guarantee. If children—or adults—are hungry in America, that is a problem for all of us.

Yet hunger continues to affect the lives of millions of families, including over 14 million children who live below the poverty line.

In the past few years, there have been multiple efforts to make ''hunger'' disappear—not as a troubling reality for millions, but as a term in surveys and press releases.

Every year, the USDA issues a report that measures Americans' access to food, and it has consistently used the word ''hunger'' to describe those who can least afford to put food on the table.

But starting in 2006, hunger facts and figures began to disappear and were replaced by measures of ''food security,'' a more scientifically palatable term.

Yesterday, the Washington Post reported on the proposed administration budget cuts to the Survey on Income and Program Participation—the only large-scale measure of the impact of Medicaid, food stamps, school lunches, unemployment and other safety net programs for the poor.

All these efforts put forth the false notion that nobody's hungry in America.

But despite the fact that we don't use words and we don't use numbers, the presence of hunger is ever so clear.

We can see it in the faces of children at school who have not had a decent meal since yesterday's school lunch. We can see it in the families at food pantries showing up a day earlier than normal because their monthly pay is not stretching as far it once did. We can see it in the loving parent giving up their own meal to make sure their child has something to eat at night.

In a land that prides itself as the land of plenty, we cannot hide the fact that we need to do a better job at making sure everybody has at least enough to eat.

Each hungry child that we allow suffer chips away at the moral strength of our country. This land of opportunity—and the American dream—should not allow for 37 million of its people to live in poverty, to live hungry.

Our moral strength, our commitment to our community is a foundation of our country. The well-known American journalist, Bill Moyer, just last week put it best when he said:

> It's right there in the Constitution—in the Preamble: ''We, the People''—that radical, magnificent, democratic, inspired and exhilarating idea that we are in this together, one for all and all for one.

And he was right, this is the ''heart of democracy'' and more importantly, it is the heart of humanity. As Bill says, the prayers we say are prayers for all of us: ''Give us this day our daily bread.'' And his is the most important message that should inspire us today: ''We're all in this together; one person's hunger is another's duty''.

Hunger is a problem for all of us. I hope that we all work together to fulfill our duty to end hunger in our Nation and the world.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise to speak today on the occasion of National Hunger Awareness Day.

Hunger and poverty are among the great moral challenges confronting our society. Hunger and poverty require us all to respond—because our society can be judged by how we treat our most vulnerable citizens. If there is a child out there who has done everything she has been asked and still has to say no to the college of her dreams, that makes a difference in our lives, even if it is not our child. If there is a senior citizen who has to go bag groceries because some company broke their promise about his pension, that matters to us, even if it is not our grandparent. If there is a veteran who has been wounded in this war, and ends up back here on the streets picking through a dumpster for food, that diminishes the patriotism of every American.

This week the Food Research and Action Center, FRAC, has released its annual study: ''State of the States: 2007.'' This important research highlights levels of hunger, poverty and the use of federal nutrition programs nationally and in each State.

This report and its findings underscore why we must continue the push in Congress to strengthen proven antihunger measures such as the Food Stamp Program. We have made progress over the last few decades in combating extreme hunger in our communities. But the work is not over. In Illinois, for example, more than 150,000 households are hungry, and many more families live at the margins and are at risk of becoming hungry. We can do better. That is why I have joined my friend DICK DURBIN in pushing to strengthen antihunger measures in this year's farm bill, and I will continue to support vital programs that can reduce hunger in our communities. The Food Stamp Program, for example, helped an average of 26.7 million Americans each month last year, while on average the USDA has estimated that every Food Stamp dollar generates approximately $1.80 in economic activity. And for many families, Food Stamp support is vital during their transition from TANF to employment. This is the kind of nutrition and antipoverty program Congress should be enhancing and investing in.

I am also proud to be a cosponsor of S. 1172, the Hunger Free Communities Act, which was introduced by Senator DURBIN and enjoys strong bipartisan support. This measure would improve and strengthen Hunger-Free community grants that aide our frontline antihunger organizations, as well as establishing much needed, hunger-focused research efforts within USDA and setting national goals for reducing hunger.

Other Federal nutrition programs, such as the National School Lunch Program, Women, Infants and Children, WIC, and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, CSFP, offer critical support to some of our Nation's neediest citizens. After all, how can we expect our children to be productive and attentive at school when they haven't had breakfast or lunch?

I have learned from my time in Washington that hunger is one of those issues that every politician likes to talk about. What is harder, it seems, is to follow through and take substantive steps to eradicate hunger in our communities. That is why I am grateful for the close support and collaboration of our many friends and outside groups that are at the frontline of combating hunger and raising the profile of this issue every day. They hold us accountable for ensuring our deeds match our words.

I hope that my colleagues will continue to join in this important moral endeavor of addressing the most basic needs of our brothers and sisters—and strengthening our Federal nutrition programs.•

WILLIAM CLIFTON FRANCE, JR.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, we have been mourning the loss of our colleague today, and I have had the opportunity earlier this morning of sharing with the Senate my comments concerning the life of Senator THOMAS. Indeed, America is mourning another one of her great sons, and that is the past president of NASCAR, the one who built NASCAR into what it is today, the No. 1 motor sport—one of the greatest of all sports now, with 75 million followers—and that is Bill France, Jr., who died just a few days ago.

Bill France is one of those great American success stories. He learned from his father, way back in the old days when he was tending to a gasoline station in Daytona Beach, FL, where he got the idea of starting to race stock cars. The first races were rather rudimentary because they went on that beautiful hard-packed sand of Daytona Beach. They would go down the beach for quite a distance, turn, come up on a road that is today called Highway A1A—and back then it was a dirt road—go down that a distance, turn back on to the beach, and continue the circular drive using the beautiful Daytona Beach. Of course, that graduated into the building of the Daytona Speedway, until we now have this NASCAR being America's No. 1 form of motor sports for 75 million fans.

Bill France, in building this sport, not only started to improve the Daytona International Speedway, but his International Speedway Corporation oversaw other raceways, such as Darlington, Talladega, and others. Bill France followed in the footsteps of his dad, Bill Sr. He was a big man, 6 feet 5 inches. Bill Sr. was the founder and the first president of NASCAR. The France family lost Bill Sr. some number of years ago. I had the privilege of knowing Mr. France, Sr., and then see his son bring this sport into the prominent

position that it is among all sports in the entire world.

William Clifton France. The France family mourns his loss. The Senate's condolences go out to Betty Jane and his daughter, Lisa France Kennedy; to his son, Brian France; and to the entire France family. America has lost one of her great citizens, but America is the better for the great things that Bill France has built.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PRYOR). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, a number of things continue to be revealed as we analyze this monumental piece of legislation which purports to comprehensively reform immigration law in America and, indeed, any comprehensive reform bill would be extensive because it is an incredibly complex subject with many moving parts, many legal niceties and complexities, all of which, if we are going to have a system that works, need to come into place.

It has been stated repeatedly by those who have proposed and promoted the legislation which is before us today that this legislation will secure the border and we will have a lawful system of immigration in the future. Those claims have been made repeatedly. The proponents have said they are going to have additional Border Patrol agents, and so forth. Indeed, the PowerPoint that the White House used to make their presentations early on promised to ''secure U.S. borders'' and ''not to repeat the 1986 failure.''

Others are saying the same thing. One of the Senators who is involved in the process said, ''I am delighted we are going to secure the border.'' Another Senator said, ''This legislation will finally accomplish the extraordinary goal of securing our borders.'' Another said, ''The agreement we just reached is the best possible chance we have to secure our borders. In this legislation we are doubling the border patrol; we are increasing detention space.'' Another Senator said, ''This will restore the rule of law. Without the legislation, we will have anarchy.'' Another one said, ''We started out with 18,000 additional border patrol officers. We will increase the detention capacity.'' And so on and so forth. Even our former Governor Jeb Bush and Ken Mehlman wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal and said, ''It will make sure our borders become secure.''

''We have had broke borders in this country for 20 years.'' That is the truth. ''It is time we get them fixed.'' That is the truth.

Then they add, ''And this bill will do just that.''

Okay. There are many more I could quote along that line. But I hope, therefore, that every member of our body who understands the Congressional Budget Office and the work that organization does, how it is designed to analyze statutory language in our legislation to give us a budget score and other analysis of what that legislation is all about, they made a tremendously significant announcement yesterday, one that is quite frightening and all of us should pay attention to.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the new Senate bill will only reduce net annual illegal immigration by 25 percent. It will add 550,000 visa overstays to the illegal population by 2017, and up to 1 million visa overstays by 2027.

In the section titled ''Effects on the United States Population,'' the CBO states, and I quote their article, their report:

> CBO estimates that implementing those requirements [enforcement and verification requirements] would reduce the net annual flow of illegal immigrants by one-quarter.

Twenty-five percent. Then they go on to note the problem with visa overstays, in addition, saying this:

> Other aspects of the legislation are likely to increase the number of illegal immigrants, in particular, through people overstaying their visas from the guest worker and H–1B programs.
>
> CBO estimates that another 1.1 million people would be added by 2017 as a result of the guest worker program, about half of them authorized workers and dependents, the remainder the result of unauthorized overstays. That figure would grow to 2 million by 2027.

What I want to say to my colleagues is—and those people who have worked hard on the bill to try to create a piece of legislation that politically they think can be passed, and they worked together with special interest groups and everybody but the U.S. Border Patrol, and everybody but the American people who had an interest in immigration, they all plotted on how to write this thing up so they can eliminate political problems and split babies in half—all of that is supposed to create a system that first and foremost would create a lawful system of immigration, would eliminate the illegality and create border security.

Now we have the Congressional Budget Office telling us that at best it is only going reduce illegal immigration 25 percent. As a price for that, we are supposed to grant amnesty to 12 million people who are here, provide options for chain migration to continue for 8 years, denying during that time highly competitive people from all over the world who want to come here an opportunity to come here, and delay some of the things in the bill that I think are positive and ought to become law.

I want to tell my colleagues once more, think about this as you consider whether you can justify supporting the legislation. Because if it is going to reduce the illegal flow into this country by 25 percent, and actually through the guest worker program is going to allow more people to overstay, then we have got a problem. You see, visa overstays are already nearly 40 percent of the illegal population. Those are people who come into the country legally, they stay here through their allotted time; they just do not leave when the time is up. They stay, they overstay.

Under the plan we have here that has a temporary guest worker program, that would have after the first year some 400,000 temporary workers here at a given time, their parents could come to visit them, their spouses could come to visit them. Even spouses could come to visit if the spouse does not certify they intend to return and stay in their home country; a real tipoff that they intend to stay illegally in the United States if they are not entitled to stay; they want to stay illegally. So I think those are matters that are important to us.

I also note there is a glaring omission in the trigger language of the legislation, and that omission is the U.S. exit visa, the U.S. visa exit portion. In other words, when you come into the country with a biometric card, you are approved to work as a temporary worker at some place, and you do your duty, you are supposed to stay 1 year, a season, you are supposed to stay 2 years, and then return. What happens when you return or do not return?

Ten years ago we required that by 2005, we have a recording system that records your exit from the country, like you may have when you go to work and you record your time clock out when you leave work. Therefore, we know if the person who came left when they were supposed to leave, and you know if they did not.

That is not in the bill. That is not required as a part of the requirement before the amnesty takes place. I wanted to share that with my colleagues. I think it should cause a great deal of uneasiness for all of us. It makes you wonder how committed the drafters of this legislation—and frankly, a lot of lawyers and people with experience in immigration and some of them not even Senators, were deeply involved in all of this in writing the legislation. I am not sure everybody caught all of these things. We are just now hearing what is in the bill, frankly.

So however they drafted it, whoever wrote this in, time and again you see provisions in the bill—and I have listed 20; we will soon have 25 loopholes of this kind and nature that I think indicate the drafters were not as committed to enforcement as they have suggested. Oftentimes, as I noted, drafters are not the Senators who did not do all of the fine-printing themselves.

I want to note one thing in the CBO report. It has been stated more than once.

Mr. President, I see the majority leader here. I can delay other activity.

I wanted to raise this issue. I would be glad to yield to him. I will wrap up and say one more thing.

It was repeatedly noted that the score by the Congressional Budget Office indicated the bill had minimal cost to the taxpayer over the first 10 years. Now we knew without dispute that in the second 10 and even in the decades that go beyond that, the cost surges. But even in the first 10, they said there would be little, if any, cost. But if you read their latest report in detail, you will note that is only true if you consider Social Security taxes paid by those people who are legalized under this bill.

But, you see, that should not be counted and will not be counted in a budget situation, because the money paid to Social Security is set aside for that person's retirement. If they pay into Social Security now, they are going to draw it in retirement later. That is an off-budget matter. That is a Social Security matter. That income should not be counted. When you eliminate that money for Social Security, you come out with a $33 billion cost in the first 10 years of this legislation, according to our own Congressional Budget Office. Those numbers will surge in the decades to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MENENDEZ.) The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the benefit of all Members, we are very close, we hope, to having two votes. It should be momentarily, in the next 10 minutes. It might be better.

We are trying to work out something on the McConnell amendment and the Feingold amendment. We have been very close to that for some time now. I am told we are very close to it now. We also have staff, both majority and minority staff, working on setting up about a dozen votes for tomorrow on amendments that are pending.

As everyone knows, I offered earlier today to have the staffs work to find out what votes the minority has that they feel would be germane postcloture, so maybe we can come up with a finite list of those. We are willing to be reasonable, but we do have to move this along.

I have had a number of Members say to me: Well, let us take another week or two on this bill; it is worth it. I know how people feel about this bill. We are not spending another week or two on this bill. It is Tuesday. We still have Wednesday, Thursday, Friday to finish this bill, could work into the weekend if necessary. This is an important bill, but we need to finish it. We need to finish this. That is why cloture will be filed tonight. I have offered a unanimous consent request so we would not even have to vote on it Thursday morning; we could vote on it Thursday night. I have also suggested if people are serious about moving this bill, we only need the one cloture vote on a substitute. That is the way it normally works, anyway; you don't have to turn around and vote on the bill itself. Rarely does that happen. That would only be if someone is trying to stall this matter.

I hope we can dispose of a lot of amendments. I hope tomorrow or the next day we could vitiate the request for cloture and have final passage on the bill. We want to be reasonable. That is why the staffs have been instructed to try to work on a way to get from here to there.

But this stage has been very difficult, because a lot of people who want to offer most of the amendments are people who have no intention of ever voting for this bill, no matter what happens. We are still going to process their amendments. They have a right to their amendments as does anyone else, even though their definition of improving the bill is, I guess, relative.

Mr. President, we still do not have anything here yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, as I understand the procedure the leader has been exercising, it is only one or two amendments are allowed to be placed in the pending category, and if one attempts to bring up an amendment, leadership objects.

I tried to bring up an amendment Friday, and there was an objection to make it pending. I tried to bring up an amendment Monday. There was an objection on a very—we are sort of being slow walked. I would ask the leader, would he allow us to bring up a substantial number of amendments and get them pending, so if he files for cloture and got it, you would have a chance to get those amendments voted on? If they are not pending, we will not get to vote on them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, he has two amendments that are pending now.

We have found in weeks past, months past, it is important to dispose of amendments that are pending; otherwise, you wind up that the person who offered the last amendment controls what goes on here on the floor. There have been a number of additional amendments that have been filed today. As I indicated, staff is now working on a procedure to dispose of all of the pending amendments, have votes on those tomorrow.

As I have said earlier today, in fact a few minutes ago again, often here in the Senate, when we come to situations such as this, we say: Okay, let's get a list of finite amendments. How many amendments do you want to offer? Then we try to work that out. It is a little difficult to do, because any one Senator can stop that. But we are trying to come up with a finite list of amendments. The two managers, Senators KENNEDY and SPECTER, have worked on this, and their staffs are working on this, along with mine. Right now there is an effort to move this forward. I hope we can do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1170

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there is an amendment that has been filed and may be considered this evening, which I think is extremely important. I wish to speak to it. It is the McConnell amendment, offered by the Republican leader, amendment 1170, to the immigration bill.

This amendment has very little to do with this immigration bill, but it is one of the most important issues any Congress could ever consider. It is about Americans' right to vote.

The right to vote is the most fundamental right in a free and Democratic society. In fact, in Reynolds v. Sims, the Supreme Court called it ''preservative of other basic civil and political rights.''

I think that is fair warning to all of us that when we consider the McConnell amendment, we should understand this is not just another amendment. This amendment goes to the heart of our franchise as Americans. It goes to the heart of our democracy. We have come a long way in our country on the issue of voting rights. Last year, we reauthorized the historic Voting Rights Act, the landmark act passed in 1965 safeguarding the right to vote for millions of Americans who had been denied that fundamental right for generations. The amendment offered by Senator MCCONNELL to this immigration bill will undermine the Voting Rights Act. It will restrict voting rights in America. It will diminish the voting rights of our American citizens, particularly minorities, the poor, the elderly, and the disabled. That is a historic decision. This is not another commonplace amendment; it is an amendment of great moment.

I might add, the McConnell amendment is opposed by nearly every major civil rights group in America today. The McConnell amendment, simply stated, would require that all Americans bring a government-issued, current, valid photo ID with them when they vote. The idea may sound reasonable on its face until you look closely.

The fact is, many Americans don't have a photo ID. Twelve percent of Americans don't have a driver's license. Who are those 12 percent? By and large, they are minorities, the poor, the elderly, and the disabled. A 2005 University of Wisconsin study showed that over 50 percent of African-American and Hispanic adults in Milwaukee don't have a valid driver's license. The McConnell amendment will have a disproportionately negative impact on these groups. It will diminish their right to vote.

Second, the McConnell amendment may be on its face unconstitutional. The State of Georgia passed a photo ID law in 2005, and it was struck down by the courts. A Federal district court judge said it constituted a modern-day

''poll tax'' and was presumptively unconstitutional. An appellate panel of three judges, including two Republican appointees, agreed. What gave rise to the Georgia photo ID law? Was there a history of election fraud in that State? No. The Georgia secretary of state said she was unaware of a single documented case in recent years of fraud through impersonation of a voter at the polls.

Cries of voter fraud are heard over and over again. It is one of Karl Rove's inspired strategies to keep raising this issue. But these are phantom cries. Look at the numbers. Since 2002, 196 million votes have been cast in Federal elections. Do you know how many voter fraud convictions there have been from those 196 million votes? Fifty-two out of 196 million. Most of these were for vote-buying and voter registration fraud, neither of which would be stopped by a photo ID.

Sadly, and cynically, photo ID laws are being pushed by some for partisan reasons.

Seventh Circuit Judge Terrence Evans wrote, while dissenting in a recent Federal case that upheld a photo ID law in Indiana:

> Let's not beat around the bush. The Indiana voter photo ID is a not-too-thinly-veiled attempt to discourage election-day turnout by certain folks believed to skew Democratic. We should subject this law to strict scrutiny . . . and strike it down as an undue burden on the fundamental right to vote.

We have recently learned about the troubling role played by partisan political appointees at Alberto Gonzales's Justice Department in clearing the Georgia photo ID law. According to press reports, the career staff at the Justice Department made a recommendation to object to the Georgia photo ID law because they believed it would have a discriminatory impact on minority voters. But the career employees at the Department of Justice were overruled by the political appointees of the President and Alberto Gonzales.

One of these political appointees, Bradley Schlozman, was rewarded by receiving a U.S. attorney appointment in Kansas City, MO—job well done for Mr. Schlozman. He went to Kansas City and decided he would continue to pursue the Karl Rove strategy of voter fraud. By any objective measure, Mr. Schlozman was unqualified to be a U.S. attorney. As he testified earlier today at a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, Mr. Schlozman had never worked as a prosecutor and never even tried a case. But by embracing this phantom voter strategy of Karl Rove in Georgia, Mr. Schlozman earned his stripes and was promoted. In the eyes of Karl Rove, Kyle Sampson, and Monica Goodling, he was a ''loyal Bushie.''

I was proud to cosponsor a resolution in 2005 by my colleague, Senator OBAMA. The resolution condemned the Justice Department's approval of the Georgia photo ID law and expressed the sense of Congress that requiring a photo ID in order to vote places a discriminatory burden on voting rights. The McConnell amendment is an attempt to impose the Georgia photo ID law on America. This measure was debated and defeated in 2002 when we enacted the Help America Vote Act. It should be defeated again now.

I realize the photo ID requirement was proposed a few years ago by a bipartisan commission. But since that commission report was issued, new research conducted for the bipartisan Election Assistance Commission has shown that photo ID requirements reduced turnout in the 2004 election by 3 percent. It showed that with voter ID requirements, Hispanics were 10 percent less likely to vote and African Americans 6 percent less likely. Is that what we should do in Congress—create barriers for minorities to vote?

The McConnell amendment is unfair and unconstitutional. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 7:20 this evening be for debate to run concurrently with respect to the McConnell amendment No. 1170 and the Feingold amendment No. 1176, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators MCCONNELL, FEINGOLD, or their designees; that no amendment be in order to either amendment prior to the vote; that each amendment must receive 60 affirmative votes to be agreed to; that if they do not receive 60 affirmative votes, then the amendment be withdrawn; that the amendments be voted in the order listed in this agreement; and that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to the second vote and that the second vote be 10 minutes in duration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 1348 tomorrow, June 6, there be 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled between Senators KENNEDY and CORNYN or their designees, with the time to run concurrently on the Cornyn amendment No. 1184, as modified, and a Kennedy amendment relating to the same subject, with no amendments in order to either amendment prior to the vote; that upon the use or yielding back of the time, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Kennedy amendment, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Cornyn amendment, with 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the second vote, and with the above occurring without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I would hope this would set the process in order that we can work through all these amendments. The staffs have been working, lining up other amendments, for votes on those. This is the third time now I have asked for a list of finite amendments. We hope they will be germane amendments but finite amendments. We will see if we can have a period of time that we ask for those. When that time arrives, those would be all the amendments that would be available on this bill. We have done that on many previous occasions. I hope it works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, a group of Senators who constructed this bill have been meeting and are trying to follow the plan that the majority leader has just articulated. We would ask the cooperation of all those who have amendments to be in a position to move promptly tomorrow with time agreements to see if we can't show sufficient progress tomorrow to see the light at the end of the tunnel.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 1176

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 1176. This amendment contains the language of S. 621, the Wartime Treatment Study Act, a bipartisan bill I have introduced with my friend from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY.

This amendment would create two fact-finding commissions: one commission to review the U.S. Government's treatment of German Americans, Italian Americans, and European Latin Americans during World War II, and another commission to review the U.S. Government's treatment of Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi persecution during World War II. This amendment would help us to learn more about how recent immigrants and refugees were treated during World War II.

The United States fought a courageous battle against the spread of Nazism and fascism. But we should not let justifiable pride in our Nation's triumph in World War II blind us to the treatment of some Americans by their own government.

Many Americans are aware that during World War II, under the authority of Executive Order 9066 and the Alien Enemies Act, the U.S. Government forced more than 100,000 ethnic Japanese from their homes and into relocation and internment camps. Through the work of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians created by Congress in 1980, this unfortunate episode in our history finally received the official acknowledgment and condemnation it deserved.

But that same respect has not been shown to the many German Americans, Italian Americans, and European Latin Americans who were taken from their homes, subjected to curfews, limited in their travel, deprived of their personal property, and, in the worst cases, placed in internment camps. This amendment would simply create a commission to review the facts and circumstances of the U.S. Government's

treatment of German Americans, Italian Americans, and other European Americans during World War II. It is time for a full accounting of that sad chapter in our history.

A second commission created by this amendment would review the treatment by the U.S. government of Jewish refugees who were fleeing Nazi persecution and genocide and tried to come to the United States. German and Austrian Jews applied for visas, but the United States severely limited their entry due to strict immigration policies, policies that many believe were motivated by fear that our enemies would send spies under the guise of refugees and by the unfortunate antiforeigner and anti-Semitic attitudes that were, sadly, all too common at that time.

It is time for the country to review the facts and determine how our immigration policies failed to provide adequate safe harbor to Jewish refugees fleeing the persecution of Nazi Germany.

It is urgent that we pass this legislation. We cannot wait any longer. The injustices to European Americans and Jewish refugees occurred more than 50 years ago. Many of those who were harmed are no longer with us, the rest are very elderly.

Americans must learn from these tragedies now, before there is no one left. These people have suffered long enough without the comfort of an official, independent study of what happened to them, and without knowing that this Nation recognizes their sacrifice and resolves to learn from the mistakes of the past.

This amendment does not call for reparations. All it does is ensure that the public has a full accounting of what happened. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the bipartisan Wartime Treatment Study Act as an amendment to this immigration legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Republican leader is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1170

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as we move forward on this immigration bill, we need to make sure we protect voters and the 15th amendment by protecting against illegal voting. The Constitution maintains that voting is a privilege reserved for U.S. citizens. Noncitizens do not have this right. Those who don't abide by our laws are not free to influence our political process or our policies with a vote.

The bipartisan Carter-Baker Commission on Federal Election Reform proposed requiring photo ID cards to ensure those who are voting are the same people as those on the rolls and that they are legally entitled to vote.

Photo IDs are needed in this country to board a plane, to enter a Federal building, to cash a check, even to join a wholesale shopping club. If they are required for buying bulk toothpaste, they should be required to prove that somebody actually has a right to vote.

Some have said this legislation penalizes those who are unable to afford a photo ID. In fact, it establishes a grant program to provide no-cost photo IDs to those who cannot afford them.

ID cards would reduce irregularities dramatically. In doing so, they would increase confidence in the system. An overwhelming majority of Americans support this attempt to ensure the integrity of our elections.

An NBC News-Wall Street Journal poll, last year, showed that 62 percent of respondents strongly—that is strongly—favor requiring a universal, tamperproof ID at the polls. Nineteen percent said they mildly favor IDs. Twelve percent were neutral.

Add that up, and you have over 80 percent who think this is a good idea. America is very accustomed to showing a photo ID to do virtually anything.

Ninety-three percent of those who were asked for their opinion were either undecided or in favor of implementing the control, as I indicated.

Two dozen States already require some form of ID at the polls. That is 24 of our States. Almost half of them already have this requirement.

My amendment simply establishes a Federal minimum standard that is consistent and allows States wide flexibility in determining the kind of ID required.

We need to harden antifraud protections at the polls to protect the rights of all voters. Voting is the cornerstone of our democracy, and we must preserve its integrity.

I yield the floor.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, this week, the Senate is debating how to reform our Nation's immigration policies, and while this is a contentious debate, there is one point I think all sides agree upon—U.S. citizenship is a prized possession. The most fundamental right afforded to us as U.S. citizens is the right to vote. I am disturbed that there is an amendment being offered on this bill that seeks to limit citizens' access to that right.

Senator MCCONNELL has offered an amendment that requires U.S. citizens to show identification before they can exercise the most important right afforded them by the U.S. Constitution. Proponents of this bill argue that this identification is necessary to combat voter fraud. In fact, before the last elections in 2006 we heard a great deal about the threat of voter fraud.

This administration staked a lot on that so-called threat. We have learned in recent months that such a threat just did not exist. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch said it best, when, in an April 17, 2007 editorial, the paper called this whole ''voter fraud'' issue a ''snipe hunt'': ''In a snipe hunt, gullible kids are taken out to the woods, handed sticks and gunny sacks and told track down the elusive snipe. Meanwhile, their pals, who know a snipe is a bird of marsh and shore and generally found nowhere near the woods, yuck it up.''

Well, in this snipe hunt, the Senate is supposed to fall prey to the ruse that there are folks out there just lining up on election day to fraudulently cast their vote and we in the Senate and in Congress need to get our sticks and gunny sacks ready, so we can snare some of these fraudulent voters. Well, let me tell you, I am not going to fall for it.

Because the facts say something different. A 5-year study by the Election Assistance Commission shows that voter fraud is almost non-existent. A report from the Missouri Secretary of State shows that no one in the State tried to vote with a fake ID in 2006. The Carter-Baker commission said that in 2002–2004 fraudulent votes made up .000003 percent of the votes cast. That is a lot of zeros. Let me say it a different way. Out of almost 200 million votes that were cast during these elections, 52 were fraudulent. To put that into some context, you are statistically more likely to get killed by lightning than to find a fraudulent vote in a Federal election.

The Department of Justice, which in 2002 created a voter fraud task force, has admitted that only 86 people were convicted of voter fraud-related crimes in the last 5 years and only 24 convictions during the last 3 years—a rate of 8 per year.

So, because 24 people nationwide in the last years may have voted despite their ineligibility to do so, we here in the Senate are supposed to pass a bill requiring all citizens to show ID when they vote.

That would be a mistake, and you only have to look to the State of Georgia to see why.

Georgia's photo ID requirement was a poll tax for the 21st century. It was a law that required some of the poorest in our country—those who probably don't have access to transportation—to possibly travel great distances and pay up to $35 just for the privilege of making their voice heard.

We have to remember this is a group that is disproportionately poor and without easy access to all the documents necessary for a government-issued ID. So even if this ID card were completely free, how easy would it be for an 85-year-old grandmother to find her birth certificate? Who would drive the destitute all the way to the nearest Federal building to get one of these cards? While the McConnell amendment authorizes ''such sums as may be necessary'' to pay for these ID cards, it is a frightening proposal to condition the right to vote on the appropriations process.

After Hurricane Katrina ravaged the gulf coast, our country awakened to the plight of the most vulnerable Americans—the ones who, when the storm hit, couldn't just hop in their SUVs, fill up with $100 worth of gas, put some bottled water in the trunk, drive off with their credit card in hand,

and check into the nearest hotel until the calamity passed. We learned that, when we pass laws and make policy in this country, our government too often forgets these Americans—that we too often ignore their needs.

Now, here is an amendment doing that again. This time, by limiting access to one of our most fundamental and constitutional-protected rights: the right to vote.

I would ask that all my colleagues reject the amendment so we can move on to the important business at hand.●

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky. The McConnell amendment would limit the ability of many American citizens to exercise the fundamental right to vote. It is nothing more than a 21st century poll tax.

The 24th amendment states that ''The right of citizens of the United States to vote . . . shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.''

This amendment would force all citizens to obtain a government-issued photo ID in order to vote. Many citizens who have voted for years don't own the government-issued photo identification needed to meet the requirement. They would have to pay for the ID or at least for the underlying documents needed to get one.

Among the persons who will be hardest hit are the elderly, minorities, and persons with disabilities. That is who this amendment is targeting.

Many seniors don't have photo ID because they don't need a driver's license. But they should still have the right to vote.

Many Americans who are blind or have other disabilities also don't have a photo ID because they don't have driver's licenses either. But they should still have the right to vote.

Some religious minorities, such as the Amish, want to vote, but their faith does not allow them to have their pictures taken. We should never require citizens to violate their religious beliefs or to pay to cast a vote.

Many African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans also lack photo ID. Under this amendment, these citizens would lose the right to vote if they don't get a government-issued photo ID.

Some citizens in this country were never issued a birth certificate, particularly African-American seniors born in the South or rural areas and Native Americans. If we pass this amendment, we turn our backs on them.

Many voters had their lives devastated by Hurricane Katrina. What about them? What about the elderly grandmother displaced by Hurricane Katrina who lost all of her possessions in the hurricane and now lives hundreds of miles from her birthplace and home? If she doesn't drive, how is she going to get the documents she needs to vote under this amendment? If she is retired or lost her job because of the storm, she may not be able to afford the documents. Separated from her family and neighbors, she may not have anyone to help her fill out the forms and get to the right government agencies to obtain the documents she needs.

This country failed the victims of Hurricane Katrina. Are we going to disenfranchise them as well?

Supporters of the amendment say, ''Don't worry. Under this amendment, States will give out free identification cards to those who can't afford them.'' That sounds good in theory, but what about in practice? Citizens will still have to deal with State and local bureaucracies to prove who they are.

Poll taxes have a dark and notorious history in this country. When we considered a poll tax ban in the 1965 Voting Rights Act, poll taxes were a tried-and-true tactic to prevent African Americans and poor whites from voting. I introduced an amendment to the 1965 act to ban poll taxes in all elections—Federal, State, and local. We had days and days of debate on the Senate floor about poll taxes. Not everyone agreed on how to fix the problem. The final amendment made clear that poll taxes infringe the right to vote and directed the Attorney General to challenge them in court.

A year later, in Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections, the Supreme Court held that poll taxes are unconstitutional. The Court declared that ''the right to vote is too precious, too fundamental to be so burdened or conditioned'' on the ability to pay.

We thought that poll taxes and other blatant barriers to the right to vote were vestiges of a bygone era. But today, Republican-controlled State legislatures around the country are attempting to enact photo identification laws.

Federal and State courts have already struck down State laws similar to the McConnell amendment. In Georgia, a Federal court has stopped two different attempts to impose a photo identification requirement. Judge Murphy ruled the first an unconstitutional poll tax because of the cost that hundreds of thousands of Georgians without photo identification would have to pay to obtain them.

The State's second attempt made the IDs free, just as this amendment supposedly does, but it was still struck down as unconstitutional. The court held that Georgia's interest in combating nonexistent vote fraud didn't justify the ''severe burden'' on voters without photo identification who would have to get through several layers of bureaucracy to obtain the documents required. A State court also ruled that the Georgia law violated the State constitution because it disenfranchised citizens who were otherwise qualified to vote.

A similar proposal recently was struck down in Missouri. The judge spelled out the problem loud and clear. For some, he said, the burden of a photo ID requirement may not seem great. But ''for the elderly, the poor, the undereducated, or otherwise disadvantaged, the burden can be great if not insurmountable, and it is those very people . . . who are the least equipped to bear the costs or navigate the many bureaucracies necessary to obtain the required documentation.''

Supporters of this modern-day poll tax claim it is just common sense. ''What's the big deal?'' they ask. After all, if you need a photo ID to get on a plane or rent a movie or drive a car, it is only reasonable to require such an ID to vote.

But voting is a right in this country and not simply a privilege. We need to restrict who can get on a plane or drive a car, but we should never restrict the precious right to vote. As Judge Callahan put it in the Missouri case, ''While a license to drive may be just that—a license and not a right, the right to vote is also just that—a right and not a license.''

When proponents of this amendment stand up to explain why America needs this legislation, listen carefully. During the floor debate on a similar proposal in the House, the amendment's Republican supporters strained to convince us that we have a major problem because noncitizens and others are posing as eligible voters. But they couldn't give us any evidence.

The fact is, voter fraud simply isn't a major problem. It certainly isn't a serious enough problem to justify disenfranchising Americans on a massive scale—which is exactly what this proposal would do.

Proponents of this 21st century poll tax have no evidence that it is needed because all the facts show it is not needed. Here is what the hard evidence tells us about voter impersonation in this country:

A recent article in the New York Times found that voter fraud is exceedingly rare. It found that, over a 5-year-period, the Justice Department, despite focusing its effort on prosecuting individuals for voter fraud, a top priority of Karl Rove, ''turned up virtually no evidence of any organized effort to skew federal elections'' through fraudulent voting. There have been only 86 convictions nationwide. That is less than 90 instances of anyone voting who wasn't supposed to vote in the entire country in 5 years. In addition, according to the article, many of these people, voted or registered to vote by mistake, without knowing they were not eligible.

Statewide surveys in Ohio after the 2002 and 2004 elections found only four instances of ineligible persons voting or attempting to vote—four out of over 9 million votes cast during those elections. That is a rate of 0.00004 percent.

In Georgia, where state legislators cited voting fraud as the need for a photo ID law, secretary of state Cathy Cox could recall only one case of voter fraud involving the impersonation of a

registered voter during her 10 years of service.

Out of nearly 200 million votes cast since 2002, only 86 individuals nationwide have been convicted of election fraud. And many of those offenses involved conduct that would not be remedied by a photo identification requirement.

The evidence also makes very clear that this proposal would disenfranchise millions of citizens who are eligible to vote.

A University of Wisconsin study found that in Milwaukee nearly 50 percent of African-American and Latino men did not have government-issued photo identification.

According to AARP, 36 percent of voters in Georgia over the age of 75 don't have government-issued photo identification.

Georgia Secretary of State Cox found that nearly 700,000, or 1 in 7, registered voters in Georgia do not have a driver's license or State-issued non-driver's license, which this amendment would require in order to vote.

According to the Department of Transportation, 6 to 12 percent of eligible voters do not currently have the identification the amendment would require.

The American Association of People with Disabilities estimates that nearly 4 million Americans with disabilities would be disenfranchised if this proposal takes effect.

Native Americans living on tribal lands, often without street addresses and with traditions that don't permit the taking of their picture, would also be disenfranchised by this law.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that 11 million U.S.-born citizens do not have a birth certificate or passport readily available to them and therefore could be disenfranchised under this amendment. The burden falls unequally on some geographic regions as well as on our most vulnerable populations:

It hurts the elderly—some 2.3 million elderly Americans lack the required documents.

It hurts rural residents, since approximately 4.5 million rural Americans lack the documents necessary to establish their citizenship.

It hurts citizens living in the South and Midwest—8.4 million residents of Southern and Midwestern States don't have the documents this amendment would require to vote.

It hurts the poor—nearly 3 million citizens making less than $25,000 a year lack a passport and birth certificate.

It hurts African Americans—2 million African Americans lack a passport and birth certificate. Many elderly African Americans have no birth certificate because they were born at home at a time when hospitals were closed to African Americans because of racial discrimination. One study estimates that a fifth of all African Americans born in 1939 and 1940 were never issued birth certificates.

Under the Bush administration we are running historic deficits and our debt is mounting. We can't afford the cost of a program designed to fight a nonexistent problem.

At a time when Americans have serious concerns about the proper functioning and integrity of voting machines, the Republican Party responds with a solution in search of a problem. They want to pass a law that threatens to disenfranchise millions of eligible voters. To those who were disenfranchised in the 2000 and 2004 elections by wrongful purges, erroneous registration lists, poll worker errors, uncounted provisional ballots, of long lines, this is our answer?

If the Senator from Kentucky is serious about election reform, we stand ready to work together. But it is cynical to take such a serious and important issue, so fundamental to democracy, and use it for partisan politics.

Last July, Congress reauthorized the Voting Rights Act with broad bipartisan support. The reauthorization passed overwhelmingly in the House and by a unanimous vote in the Senate. Republicans and Democrats came together to tear down barriers to the ballot box.

Now some on the other side of the aisle want to erect new barriers to voting by telling Americans they need a passport to vote. If we adopt this amendment, we undermine the Voting Rights Act's important protections. This amendment would disenfranchise many of the same voters we tried to protect with that historic legislation last year.

Mr. President, that is unfair, undemocratic, and unconstitutional. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Wisconsin has 1 minute 37 seconds. The Republican leader has 2 minutes 7 seconds.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I assume we will not have the time before the vote, then. This is the remaining time we have, correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, my amendment, again, contains the language of S. 621, the Wartime Treatment Study Act, a bill I have introduced with my friend from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY. It is not controversial.

It would simply create two fact-finding commissions: one commission to review the U.S. Government's treatment of German Americans, Italian Americans, and European Latin Americans during World War II and another commission to review the U.S. Government's treatment of Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi persecution during World War II.

These commissions would complete the work of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, created by Congress in 1980 to study the relocation and internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. Thanks to that commission, this unfortunate episode in our history finally received the official acknowledgement and condemnation it deserved.

My amendment would simply allow that work to be completed. It is time to pass this legislation, now, before all the individuals affected by these policies are gone. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The time for the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, is the time up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute 41 seconds left of the Republican leader's time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we start the vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1170

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1170.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 41, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 184 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Alexander	Craig	Hutchison
Allard	Crapo	Inhofe
Bennett	DeMint	Isakson
Bond	Dole	Kyl
Bunning	Domenici	Lott
Burr	Ensign	Lugar
Chambliss	Enzi	Martinez
Coburn	Graham	McConnell
Cochran	Grassley	Roberts
Coleman	Gregg	Sessions
Corker	Hagel	Shelby
Cornyn	Hatch	

Smith	Stevens	Vitter
Specter	Thune	Warner

NAYS—52

Akaka	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Inouye	Pryor
Bayh	Kennedy	Reed
Bingaman	Kerry	Reid
Boxer	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Brown	Kohl	Salazar
Byrd	Landrieu	Sanders
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Snowe
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Lieberman	Sununu
Clinton	Lincoln	Tester
Collins	McCaskill	Voinovich
Conrad	Menendez	Webb
Dorgan	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wyden
Feingold	Murray	
Feinstein	Nelson (FL)	

NOT VOTING—6

Biden	Dodd	McCain
Brownback	Johnson	Obama

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 41, the nays are 52. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. CLINTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1176

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote with respect to the Feingold amendment.

Who yields time? The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, my amendment contains the language of S. 621, the Wartime Treatment Study Act, which is a bill I have introduced with my friend from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY. It is noncontroversial.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is correct. Will the Senate please be in order. Will Senators and staff take their conversations out of the Chamber so the Senator can be heard.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator is about to speak. Other Senators should listen. So I will stand right here until we get order. May we have order in the Senate?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Look at the people up there. There are people up there. They ought not be in that well when there are votes going on. Read your rule book. Come on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore is correct.

The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I again thank the Senator from West Virginia.

This bill would simply create two fact-finding commissions: one commission to review the U.S. Government's treatment of German Americans, Italian Americans, and European Latin Americans during World War II, and another commission to review the U.S. Government's treatment of Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi persecution during World War II.

These commissions would complete the work of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians created by Congress in 1980 to study the relocation and internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. Thanks to that commission, this unfortunate episode in our history finally received the official acknowledgment and condemnation it deserved. My amendment would simply allow that work to be completed. It is time to pass this legislation now before all of the individuals affected by these policies are gone. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, there are two problems with the legislation, as detailed in a 5- or 6-page memorandum from the Department of Justice, Richard Hertling, the principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General who opposes this legislation. First, it falsely asserts in the findings matters that slander America incorrectly. It finds that thousands of individuals were subjected to devastating violations of civil rights through arrest, internment, property confiscation, deportation, and detrimental effects still being experienced; whereas, the Department of Justice asked the senior historian at the U.S. Holocaust Museum about this language and he found that language was outrageously exaggerated and was inaccurate.

That is in the legislation. When asked would Senator FEINGOLD accept an amendment that prohibited reparations—and reparations have been done in some of these cases—that language was not accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 67, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 185 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Akaka	Gregg	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Hagel	Pryor
Bayh	Harkin	Reed
Bingaman	Hutchison	Reid
Boxer	Inouye	Roberts
Brown	Isakson	Rockefeller
Burr	Kennedy	Salazar
Byrd	Kerry	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Kohl	Shelby
Carper	Landrieu	Smith
Casey	Lautenberg	Snowe
Clinton	Leahy	Specter
Coburn	Levin	Stabenow
Coleman	Lieberman	Sununu
Collins	Lincoln	Tester
Conrad	Lugar	Thune
Dorgan	McCaskill	Voinovich
Durbin	Menendez	Webb
Feingold	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Graham	Murray	
Grassley	Nelson (FL)	

NAYS—26

Alexander	Craig	Kyl
Allard	Crapo	Lott
Bennett	DeMint	Martinez
Bond	Dole	McConnell
Bunning	Domenici	Sessions
Chambliss	Ensign	Stevens
Cochran	Enzi	Vitter
Corker	Hatch	Warner
Cornyn	Inhofe	

NOT VOTING—6

Biden	Dodd	McCain
Brownback	Johnson	Obama

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 67, the nays are 26. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are working in good faith to move this bill forward. We had seven rollcall votes before the recess and six additional amendments adopted by voice vote. That is 13. Yesterday, we adopted four more amendments by voice vote. Today, we had four rollcall votes. Tomorrow morning, we will vote on the Cornyn-Kennedy amendment, eligibility for legalization program, and then we are prepared to enter a unanimous consent agreement for the 10 remaining amendments that are pending. We have done quite well. We will have done 23 rollcall votes when we finish these 3 tomorrow, and we adopted 10 by voice vote. I know the staff has been working on this for some time now. I hope we can work out an arrangement to get rid of the pending amendments and move on to other amendments people talked about all day they want to offer. I think that is appropriate.

Tonight, we are going to, because we agreed to lay down a Domenici amendment and one I am going to offer dealing with earned-income tax credit—those will be the two amendments we are going to lay down tonight. Anyway, somebody else is going to do it. There are two amendments we are going to lay down tonight, so we will have two more that will be pending tomorrow,

and I hope we can arrange votes on those amendments. Once we finish those amendments, I hope other Senators will offer amendments. I hope they will consider some germane amendments.

In addition to the amendments that are pending, we have a number of amendments that are at the desk, I understand, and we have taken a look at those, and maybe we can work something out on those amendments.

This is a difficult bill, we understand that. I hope the offers I made today are considered serious. I repeat, I am not going to go through the litany of amendments, the unanimous consent requests. One is we would vote cloture—rather than Thursday morning, do it Thursday night. That is certainly something we could consider. Anyway, there are all kinds of alternatives we can do to move this bill forward if people want to do that.

As I said, there is no need to run through the unanimous consent requests I did previously. We will call it quits for the night. There is no more business on this bill.

Mr. President, I ask, so the managers don't have to stay around—I wonder if we can move to a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. That way, the Senator from Alabama can speak, and I would certainly consent to, when we take up the bill tomorrow, his remarks appearing as though we are working on the pending legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. I am sorry, I did not hear the majority leader.

Mr. REID. I asked unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business. I know the Senator from Alabama wishes to speak. I assume it is on matters dealing with immigration.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, with regard to that, I have amendments I offered last Thursday and Friday and Monday that were not accepted. I was going to ask if those amendments could be made pending in addition to the nine amendments which were filed this week which I would like to make pending so we can have votes on them.

Mr. REID. I withdraw my consent for morning business, Mr. President. I think we have a couple of amendments that are part of the 10 we are going to try to get rid of tomorrow.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, for clarification, two amendments are basically the same amendment. We would only vote on one pending that I offered last week. In addition, last week, I filed two more amendments, and an objection was made to making them pending. So I renew my offer to at least make those two amendments pending. I filed them this morning.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Alabama, I think we have made a suggestion, and it is appropriate to move forward, that with regard to the 10 or 12 amendments now pending, we will set up times to vote on these, either by motions to table or if we can work out side-by-sides, whatever it takes, and then move to other amendments.

Certainly, the Senator from Alabama has been patient. We understand he has other amendments he wants to offer. But I object at this time until we get some plan for tomorrow to dispose of these amendments we have.

I have indicated a number of different alternatives, and others may come up with better suggestions. One is, let's get a list of finite amendments from the minority. We will add ours in with those, and we have done that on a number of occasions here. It will have to be done by unanimous consent, but it is worth a try. We can have a list of how many amendments people think are appropriate on this bill. Let's see if we can get that done by tomorrow morning.

We know the Senator from Alabama has a number he wishes to make part of that list, and other Senators have amendments they want to make part of that list. I have seen Senator THUNE, Senator DEMINT, and Senator COBURN here. There are other people who want to offer amendments, I understand, but let's get a finite list of who wants to offer amendments and what the amendments are.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I take that as an objection to my request.

Mr. REID. Yes, I did object. I am sorry I didn't make it clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SESSIONS. Would the majority——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader controls the time.

Mr. REID. We are on the bill still; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, we are.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the substitute amendment No. 1150 to Calendar No. 144, S. 1348, comprehensive immigration legislation.

Harry Reid, Jeff Bingaman, Dick Durbin, Charles Schumer, Daniel K. Akaka, Jack Reed, Mark Pryor, Joe Biden, Amy Klobuchar, Daniel K. Inouye, Herb Kohl, H.R. Clinton, Evan Bayh, Ken Salazar, Debbie Stabenow, Frank R. Lautenberg, Joe Lieberman.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on Calendar No. 144, S. 1348, Comprehensive Immigration legislation.

Harry Reid, Jeff Bingaman, Dick Durbin, Charles Schumer, Daniel K. Akaka, Jack Reed, Mark Pryor, Joe Biden, Amy Klobuchar, Daniel K. Inouye, Herb Kohl, H.R. Clinton, Evan Bayh, Ken Salazar, Debbie Stabenow, Frank R. Lautenberg, Joe Lieberman.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The junior Senator from Alabama is recognized.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I appreciate the role of the majority leader. I have great affection for the majority leader. He is an effective leader for his agenda. But with regard to what is happening now, we need to fully understand that by utilizing the ability he has as a leader and as other members of his party—they have objected to calling up amendments and making them pending. When you object to making an amendment pending, all you have is a filed amendment. And when you file cloture, amendments that are not pending are not entitled to be voted on.

So, in effect, we are at the mercy of the majority leader. He has not allowed a full and vigorous offering of amendments and votes on those amendments. I know people can sometimes ask for too many votes and abuse the process, but we really are dealing with a monstrous bill that is very complex and has a loophole here and a loophole there that can place the bill in such a situation that it really is not enforceable and will not work, and there are a host of problems, a host of loopholes in the bill. This bill has been moving forward to passage under the railroad system we have here.

Let me remind everybody how it happened. First, 2 weeks before we had our recess, the old bill, last year's bill that the House refused to even take up, was brought up without committee hearings this year and brought up by the majority leader under rule XIV for consideration and debate. So about a week goes by, and then come last Tuesday before our recess, Tuesday morning, he plops down on this floor an amendment but really a complete substitute. If put in proper bill language, it would probably be nearly a thousand pages. It is a substitute, a bill never seen before, a bill—except maybe a few days by people who got their hands on it—a bill that has never gone through committee was put down, and the majority leader indicated he wanted to vote on it that week and we were going to have

a vote on Friday, and there is was a lot of push back. He agreed to put it off.

We only had a few votes last week. We didn't vote last Friday. We didn't have the bill up even on Monday. So for only 3 days the week before the recess, we were engaged with actual amendments on this legislation. Then we come back, and on Monday of this week, we had a few Senators show up, no votes, and a few of us talked a little bit, and that was it. So nothing was done Monday. I recall I did offer to bring up amendments and asked to bring up amendments and make pending amendments last Thursday, last Friday, and Monday of this week.

I just want to say that we are not moving in a legitimate way. This was a completely new bill which was offered as a substitute to last year's bill. Senator SPECTER, the ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, who supports this legislation, said in retrospect we should have gone to committee with it. I say that would have helped to have had a little bit of sunshine on it. But as we examine the bill in more depth, as we look at it more closely, what we see is that as sunlight falls on the mackerel, it begins to smell more and more, I have to tell you.

As it was promoted to me by the White House talking points and by Senators who thought it was a good piece of legislation, I had some belief that it could be progress over last year. Indeed, I thought there was a real potential to make a bill this year that I could support and with which we could make progress. But as we have examined it, it fails to meet the promises that were contained in those principles set forth as they were writing up the bill. It just does not. It does not have good enforcement. It does not. The trigger mechanism that guarantees enforcement before amnesty is weak and ineffectual. The shift to merit-based, skill-based immigration is ineffectual, and it puts off for 8 years, and we have people offering amendments to weaken that even further. So those were good principles that were stated but did not become reality.

I saw part of the debate on the TV in the cloakroom a few minutes ago and people were saying this is going to make the country safe, and we need to pass it because it is going to make us safe. Well, let us talk about some of the loopholes that are in this legislation still. I have listed 20. I think we probably have a lot more than that which we could have listed, but I will share some of the weaknesses.

This is as a result of the fact that individuals in the U.S. Border Patrol were not consulted in how to write the bill. If they had been consulted, some of these weaknesses wouldn't have been here. It is interesting, however, that some of these weaknesses were pointed out and complained of, but the drafters refused to listen. Why not?

For example, loophole No. 5: Legal status must be granted to illegal aliens 24 hours after they file an application—must be granted legal status—even if the alien has not yet passed all appropriate background checks.

Last year, the bill called for 90 days to complete the background checks. Yes, some aspects can be completed within a few minutes or a few hours, but a lot of things cannot. What if the person is named John Smith? There are a hundred John Smiths. How are you going to check those? A thousand John Smiths. I think this is a weakness.

In fact, the Border Patrol experts who called a press conference yesterday raised that particular point in a number of ways. Kent Lundgren, the national chairman of the Association of Former Border Patrol Agents, was contemptuous of the bill and said there are ''no meaningful criminal or terrorist checks'' in the bill. He said, ''There is no way records can be done in 24 hours.''

Jim Dorcy, an agent with 30 years experience, and who has also moved up to inspector general of the Department of Justice, said: ''24-hour check is a recipe for disaster.''

Then he went on to say, ''I call it the al Qaeda Dream Bill.'' That was from a TV program I happened to catch last night on C–SPAN, a National Press Club presentation by a group of former Border Patrol officers, and I am going to quote from them a little more in a minute.

Look at loophole No. 7. They say this bill will make us safer, but under the bill that is before us today, illegal aliens with terrorism connections are not barred from getting amnesty. An illegal alien with terrorist connections is not barred from getting amnesty. An illegal alien seeking most immigration benefits normally would have to show ''good moral character.''

For all its flaws, last year's bill specifically barred aliens with terrorism connections from being able to meet the definition of ''good moral character.'' How simple is that? And from being eligible for amnesty. But this year's bill does neither. This is another example of a provision in this year's bill that make it weaker than last year's bill, and I am finding this more and more.

We were told this bill was much better than last year's bill. I even told people that I think this is going to be a better bill than last year's. I am interested in what is contained in it. But repeatedly I am finding provisions like this one that indicate this bill is weaker than last year's.

Additionally, the bill's drafters ignored the Bush administration's request that changes be made in the asylum, cancellation of removal, and withholding of removal statutes in order to prevent aliens with terrorist connections from receiving relief. Last year's section 204 of the bill added the new terrorism bars to good moral character.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given an additional 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Last year's bill added new terrorism bars to the good moral character requirement and required that an alien prove they have good moral character. Under the Immigration and Naturalization Act, the INA, an illegal alien must have good moral character to receive most of the immigration benefits, such as cancellation of removal from being here illegally.

But according to the current law, the law in effect today, an alien cannot have good moral character if they are habitual drunkards, get the majority of their income from illegal gambling, have given false testimony for immigration purposes, have been in jail for 180 days, have been convicted of an aggravated felony, or have engaged in genocide, torture, or extrajudicial killings. Those are some of the things that bar you from good moral character. This year's bill, however, is completely missing these new terrorism bars, and the bill no longer requires good moral character as a prerequisite to amnesty.

I wonder what this tells us about the mindset of the people who are actually putting the pencil to paper and drafting this legislation. Surely our Senators didn't fully understand it. But I have to say I am particularly troubled, because the Bush administration, as much as they have wanted a bill that would be exceedingly generous to immigrants, wanted this language strengthened, and the committee, the group that wrote the bill, rejected their request, which is hard for me to believe.

Additionally, during the course of the negotiations, the Bush administration requested that language be added to the bill to make sure that terrorism bars kept aliens from being granted asylum, cancellation, and the withholding of removal. Those requests should have been included and they were not. So one of the amendments I want to see voted on would be to restore the bars—the same or similar language we had in last year's bill that they took out over the objection of the administration.

Another example of a weakness in our provisions is some aggravated felons who have sexually abused a minor will be eligible for amnesty under this bill. A child molester who committed the crime of molestation before the bill is enacted is not barred from getting amnesty if their conviction document fails to state the age of the victim. The bill, after someone raised this problem, corrected this problem, but it was only for future child molesters and did not close the loophole for current or past child molesters.

In some States, the sexual abuse of a minor can result in a misdemeanor conviction. Those convictions are not

always considered an aggravated felony for immigration or deportation purposes. This is not an uncommon problem. There have been lawsuits and appeals over this very issue. This is not uncommon.

One study, according to these Border Patrol experts at their press conference yesterday, indicated a report out of Atlanta found that 250,000 of the 12 million illegal aliens here may have been involved in the sexual abuse of a minor. That is a lot of people. Why should we give amnesty and citizenship to those who may have been involved in those kinds of criminal violations? Citizenship in the United States requires good moral character.

We don't have to accept everybody who wants to be a citizen. We don't have to allow anyone who broke into our country to ever become a citizen. If they have broken into our country and are here illegally and they ask for amnesty, we have every right to say you don't get it if you are a child molester or have terrorist connections.

Look at loophole No. 8. This one is a bit amazing, I think, for anyone, and I find it difficult to believe. I am not making this up. This is in the bill on page 289. Instead of ensuring that members of violent gangs, such as MS–13, are deported, the bill will allow violent gang members to get amnesty as long as they renounce their gang membership on their application. It has a question there: Are you a member of a gang? If you said yes, the next question is: Do you renounce your membership? And if you say yes, I renounce my membership, you get to stay and become a citizen. Under this bill, it will not prevent amnesty. On page 289, the bill requires that you list gang memberships.

Why do we allow this? If an illegal alien will be a member of a violent international gang, such as the Mara Salvatrucha 13, the famous MS–13, a violent international gang involved in murders, drugs, and all kinds of crimes, why don't we say that blocks him from being eligible for amnesty under the bill? Now, if they are a citizen, OK, they get to stay in the country. They can be a gang member. But if they are not a citizen and they are here illegally and are petitioning to be given amnesty, I would say they shouldn't be given it. They should be prohibited.

Obviously, the loyalty to these illegal criminal gangs is such that it is contrary to the ideals of American citizenship in which your loyalty is to the United States of America. As Kris Kobach, a former top attorney at the Department of Justice, stated in a Heritage Foundation Web memo, posted after the new substitute bill was introduced, titled ''Rewarding Illegal Aliens: Senate Bill Undermines The Rule of Law'':

> More than 30,000 illegal alien gang members operate in 33 States—30,000 illegal alien gang members operate in 33 States—trafficking in drugs, arms, and people. Deporting illegal-alien gang members has been a top ICE priority.

It is one of the top priorities of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement organization. That is what they do. The Senate bill would end that. I am quoting Mr. Kobach.

> To qualify for amnesty, all a gang member would need to do is note his gang membership and sign a renunciation.

I ask again, what kind of mindset is at work here? Is our goal to please every illegal alien, to make sure every illegal alien gets to stay in the country regardless or is it to serve our legitimate national interests? I suggest any immigration bill we pass should serve our national interest. There is nothing wrong with that. Our responsibility is to America, to the people in America. Somehow we have gotten that confused.

There are good people in this body who are more concerned about how not to exclude anybody, to make sure everybody who is here gets to stay. And somehow, some way, through a maneuver or signing a document saying you renounce your gang membership, you will get to stay. It raises serious questions in my mind about how this bill was written.

Let me mention we may have a vote on this, I think tomorrow. This is amazing to me. Aliens who have already had their day in court, those who have been given and received a final order of removal, who have signed a voluntary departure order, or had reinstatement of their final orders of removal—that is they got a delay on their final order of removal and they got a stay—they are eligible for amnesty under the bill.

The same is true for aliens who have made a false claim to citizenship, for those who have engaged in document fraud. More than 636,000 alien fugitives could be covered by this one loophole—page 285 of the bill waives the following inadmissibility grounds. It waives these grounds that would normally be a basis for inadmissability.

No. 1, ''Failure to attend a removal proceeding.'' You have been released on bail. They said: You are believed to be here illegally. The court hearing is going to be 3 weeks from today. We will release you on your own recognizance. You just sign a document or post a small bail and you show up at the court hearing 3 weeks from today, 2 weeks from today, 2 months from today.

What if they don't show up? What if they didn't show up, they were apprehended, ordered to show up in court and didn't show up—amnesty—OK, that is excluded.

Another category, ''Final orders of removal for alien smugglers.'' If you have been apprehended, you have been ordered removed because you were proven to be involved in alien smuggling, smuggling of other people into our country—coyotes: You are OK. That is OK. You get to stay, too.

''Aliens unlawfully present after previous immigration violations or deportation orders.'' You have been caught for previous violations. You have been ordered deported. You are back again. You are excluded and you get to stay. And aliens who have previously been removed—we spend a lot of money. We fly people back to Brazil and Honduras and Indonesia and China. What if they come again? Do they get amnesty, too? Yes, they do.

This language appears to be in conflict with another statute that suggests otherwise. But when you read it, my legal team and I agree that the court would clearly rule that this specific language would be such that those individuals would get to stay in the country.

The list goes on. Loophole No. 10. The talking points we were provided with that indicated this to be a good bill and that we should be supportive of it emphasize that the new bill we have would promote greater assimilation of those who come here to our country and greater English proficiency—both of which I think are good ideas and we need to work on and should be a part of any immigration legislation that is passed. I believe that. However, the bill doesn't do it. Illegal aliens are not required to demonstrate any proficiency in English for more than a decade after they have been granted amnesty.

You have heard people say we are requiring English. We are not requiring it for 10 years. Learning English is not required for illegal aliens to receive the probationary benefits or the first 4-year Z visa or the second 4-year Z visa.

The first Z visa renewal, beginning on the second 4-year visa, requires only that the alien demonstrate an ''attempt'' to learn English by being ''on a waiting list for English classes.'' Passing a basic English test is required only for a second renewal, the third 4-year Z visa, and then the alien only has to pass the test ''prior to the expiration of the second extension of Z status,'' 12 years down the road.

The bill's sponsors claim they have to learn English before being granted amnesty. That is not true. Nothing in the bill requires the illegal alien to have any English skills before receiving probationary status, before receiving the first Z visa that lasts for 4 years. Only upon filing for renewal of the Z visa up to 6½ years down the road does the illegal alien have to meet any language requirement. At that time, the requirement is fulfilled with the most minimal effort: ''Demonstrating enrollment in'' or being on a ''waiting list for English classes.''

Second, when the alien applies for a second Z visa renewal, which would be 8 to 10 years from now, is there any real English requirement. At that time, the alien must ''pass the naturalization test.'' It is common knowledge that the test is not a real English proficiency test—it is not. So there is not an emphasis on English. Even then, it is not clear that passing the test would be required before the second extension of Z visa status is granted. As a matter of fact, on page 295 the bill states that:

. . . the alien may make up to three attempts . . . but must satisfy the requirement prior to the expiration of the second extension of Z visa status.

As the bill is written, there is no real English requirement until 12 to 14 years down the road, and it is not as strong.

I don't know why we are so concerned about that. Is it a pandering? Is it some attempt to please people who are here illegally? Good policy, I submit, the right policy—both for the United States and for those here receiving amnesty—would be to encourage them to learn English sooner rather than later. How long does it take? Twelve years is too long, and I think that is a mistake in the bill.

Mr. President, I see my colleague, Senator KYL here. I will be pleased to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. KYL and Mr. SESSIONS are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEDBETTER DECISION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in correcting the Supreme Court's decision last week in Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company. That decision has undermined a core protection of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the landmark law against job discrimination based on gender, race, national origin, and religion. Title VII has made America a stronger, fairer, and better land. It embodies principles at the heart of our society—fairness and justice for all.

Americans believe in fair treatment, equal pay, and an honest chance at success in the workplace. These values have made our country a beacon of hope and opportunity around the world. The Ledbetter decision undermined these bedrock principles by imposing unrealistically short time limits for employees seeking redress for wage discrimination.

In the case before the Supreme Court, a jury had found that Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company had discriminated against Lily Ledbetter by downgrading her evaluations because she was a woman in a traditionally male job. Year after year, the company used these unfair evaluations to pay her less than her male coworkers who held the same job. The jury was outraged by Goodyear's misconduct and awarded back to Ms. Ledbetter to correct this basic injustice and hold the company accountable.

The Supreme Court ruled against her, holding that she had waited too long to file her lawsuit. It ruled that she should have filed her lawsuit within a short time after Goodyear first decided to pay her less than her male colleagues. Never mind that she didn't know at the outset that male workers were paid more. Never mind that the company discriminated against her for decades and that the discrimination continued with each new paycheck she received.

Requiring employees to file pay discrimination claims within a short time after the employer decides to discriminate makes no sense. Pay discrimination is different from other discriminatory actions because workers generally don't know what their colleagues earn. It is not a case of being told ''you're fired'' or ''you didn't get the job'' when workers at least knows they have been denied a job benefit. With pay discrimination, the paycheck comes in the mail, and workers usually have no idea if they are being paid fairly. Common sense and basic fairness require that they should be able to file a complaint within a reasonable time after getting a discriminatory paycheck instead of having to file the complaint soon after the company first decides to shortchange them for discriminatory reasons.

The Court's decision in the *Ledbetter* case is not only unfair, it sets up a perverse incentive for workers to file lawsuits before they have investigated whether pay decisions are actually based on discrimination. Under the decision, workers who wait to get all the information before filing a complaint of discrimination could be out of time. As a result, the decision will create unnecessary litigation as workers rush to beat the clock on their equal pay claims.

The Supreme Court's decision also breaks faith with the Civil Rights Act of 1991, which was enacted with overwhelming bipartisan support—a vote of 93 to 5 in the Senate and 381 to 38 in the House. The 1991 act had corrected this same problem in the context of seniority, overturning the Court's decision in a separate case. At the time, there was no need to clarify title VII for pay discrimination claims since the courts were interpreting title VII correctly. Obviously, Congress needs to act again to ensure that the law adequately protects workers against pay discrimination.

It is unacceptable that victims of discrimination are unable to file a lawsuit against ongoing discrimination. Yet that is what happened to Lily Ledbetter. I hope that all of us, on both sides of the aisle, can join in correcting this obvious wrong.

Unfortunately, in recent years, the Supreme Court also has undermined other bipartisan civil rights laws in ways Congress never intended. It has limited the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, made it harder to protect children who are harassed in our schools, and eliminated individuals' right to challenge practices that have a discriminatory impact on their access to public services. Congress needs to correct these problems as well.

Let's not allow what happened to Lily Ledbetter to happen to any other victims of discrimination. As Justice Ginsburg wrote in her powerful dissent, the Court's decision is ''totally at odds with the robust protection against employment discrimination Congress intended Title VII to secure.'' I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to restore the law as it was before the *Ledbetter* decision, so that victims of ongoing pay discrimination have a reasonable time to file their claims. The Lily Ledbetters of our Nation deserve no less.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT JAY EDWARD MARTIN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on May 16, 2007, I attended SSG Jay Edward Martin's funeral. A soldier born and raised in Baltimore, MD, Sergeant Martin lost his life in service to our country. He was 29 years old. I rise today to pay tribute to his life and his sacrifice.

Sergeant Martin and two others were killed Sunday, April 29, when an improvised explosive device detonated near their vehicle during combat operations in Baghdad.

Sergeant Martin was not new to the military. After joining the Army in November 1997, he served for nearly 2 years in Germany and Bosnia. He was then stationed at Fort Irwin in California as an Army recruiter. But as a recruiter, Sergeant Martin grew restless and chose to go to Baghdad. A childhood friend remembers Jay's explanation: ''I'm supposed to be fighting for my country; I can't sit in an office.'' An experienced soldier, Sergeant Martin knew the risks and challenges he would face, and this knowledge makes his decision to serve all the more admirable.

Sergeant Martin had been scheduled for a 2-week break from Iraq in April. But in a selfless move—one that Jay's family describes as typical of his generous spirit—he allowed a fellow soldier whose wife just had a baby to take his place.

Jay is remembered by those who knew him for his determination, bravery, and devotion to service. Jay displayed remarkable leadership, focus, and determination even as he suffered setbacks in his young life. Jay's mother died when he was only 8 years old, but Jay remained focused on his dream of becoming a pilot and joining the military. An aunt, Lori Martin-Graham, recalls that he would talk about military service for hours with her husband, who had served in the Navy.

Sergeant Martin spoke fervently about the importance of college and attended Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University in Daytona Beach, FL. He

left after a year when he realized his poor vision would prevent him from becoming a pilot. Jay moved forward and joined the Army. ''Jay was always . . . positive, ambitious,'' remembered a friend. ''He was always your good conscience.''

As one of Sergeant Martin's sisters, Lark Adams, put it, ''He was just a shining star. He followed the rules. He did what he was supposed to. He was an example to everyone.''

After his death, Jay's fiancé Maria Padilla, explained that he would have wanted to see those close to him ''laughing because he left us doing what he loved. He left us being the soldier he was so proud of being.''

I hope his family and all who loved Jay will find comfort in that image of the proud and selfless soldier who won several awards including the Army Commendation Medal and the Army Good Conduct Medal. But I also hope they find joy in their memories of the young man who devised hide-and-seek strategy with his friends, who was a swim and track star at Forest Park High School, who took such great pride in his Dodge Stratus RT, who played video games in his grandmother's kitchen, and who debated the future of the F–14 with his uncle.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Jay's father Dwight Martin and stepmother Penny Martin; his grandfather Harry Martin; his four sisters, Lark, Dove, Raven and Shannon; his fiancé Maria, and all the other relatives and friends who are bereaved. We honor him as a hero and together mourn his loss.

MATTHEW SHEPARD ACT OF 2007

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On July 7, 2002 in Tampa, FL, Devin Scott Angus attacked Sonny Gonzales and Stephen Hair as the two men were leaving a gay pride event at the Florida Aquarium. Angus allegedly yelled antigay slurs at the men, dropped his pants, and screamed additional obscenities. He then attacked Gonzales and Hair, repeatedly punching and kicking them. Gonzales suffered a gash in his head, while Hair suffered a skull fracture, a cracked sinus, and a broken front tooth. According to reports, Angus' sole motivation was the victims' sexual orientation.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Matthew Shepard Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

HONORING EARNELL LUSTER

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, every day, millions of American make sacrifices for their families and friends. Yet the man I honor today has made the ultimate sacrifice for neither kin nor kind. Earnell Luster is a former Marine and a great American. As a lifelong resident of Minneapolis, MN, he exemplified the role of a Good Samaritan within his community. Mr. Luster sacrificed his own life for the sake of another, and his bravery and courage makes him a hero.

On February 15, 2007, Mr. Luster was walking by an apartment building in south Minneapolis when he came across two women who were being repeatedly beaten by a male attacker. Being the man he was, Mr. Luster could not walk away from what he was witnessing. He sprang into action by demanding the attacker halt his assault upon the women. By doing so, he gave the women enough time to escape their attacker. Tragically, the attacker turned his anger on Mr. Luster and delivered several blows to his head that proved to be fatal. That evening, in an act of true selflessness, Earnell Luster gave his life for another.

His actions that evening exemplify the life he lived. As a well-respected elder in his church and within his community, Mr. Luster lived a life full of joy, duty, and great conviction. His service to the Marines in the mid-1970s demonstrates the strength of his character. Mr. Luster enjoyed life, especially the opportunities that he had to go fishing with his twin brother Earnest.

Earnell Luster's tragic death is evidence that crime can affect each one of us. Our commitment to fighting crime must not ebb and flow with the statistics.

My thoughts and prayers remain with Earnell's twin brother Earnest, his mother Lorraine Scott, and his entire family. Mr. Luster's selfless act of bravery earns him a place in the hearts of Minnesotans and Americans everywhere.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TED STEVENS

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I rise to join in this body's hearty congratulations to our colleague from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, as the longest serving Republican Senator. The remarkable thing about TED STEVENS is not the number of years he has served but the amount of service he has put into those years.

The Founders did a unique thing when they created the Senate. They knew that democracy should both let the majority rule most of the time but also protect minority viewpoints from the tyranny of the majority. They created a House of Representatives based on proportional representation. Meanwhile, in the Senate, they gave every State, large and small, exactly two votes. They then went a step further, and created the Senate as a body that operates by consensus. The result is a place where one person with a good idea can impact the entire body.

TED STEVENS is a living embodiment of the wisdom of our Founding Fathers. He is precisely the kind of Senator they hoped for: forceful, persevering, principled and indefatigably devoted to his State's interests.

Alaska is a unique State and Senator STEVENS reflects its style and unlimited potential exceptionally. In every aspect, Alaska is a long, long way from Washington, DC, and its unusual bureaucratic culture. We all benefit from the independent, self-reliant spirit of Alaska that the Senator brings, reminding us of the pioneer heritage of the West. I am personally appreciative of the Senator's hospitality when visiting in his home State. I thought we had ''wide open spaces'' in Minnesota, but Alaska's are certainly both wider and more open.

When President Abraham Lincoln's Secretary of State, William Seward, finalized the purchase of Alaska, it was thought to be a folly. How blessed we all are as Americans to have its abundant wilderness and natural resources as part of our national experience.

I have found that when people want to learn something really important, they prefer an example to an explanation. As I have tried to learn my way around this institution, Senator STEVENS has been a role model, an example, and a friend. I thank him for his kindness.

But even more I thank him for his service which has made this Nation safer, stronger and freer for all. He makes his great State and all his colleagues proud to say they know TED STEVENS.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING NORM GRAYSON

• Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today I honor in the RECORD of the Senate Norm Grayson, an outstanding realtor and a great friend, and to acknowledge a very special occasion.

On June 15, 2007, Norm will celebrate his 40th year in the real estate business and host a barbeque for hundreds of friends in Oconee County. Although I cannot be there in person, it is a privilege to stand in this Senate and honor this tremendous milestone.

Norm and my father Ed were the best of friends. Both men are legends in Georgia real estate. Norm has earned CRS, CCIM, and CRB designations, as well as the Home Builders CBI designation. Among his many achievements, Norm has served as president of the Athens Board of Realtors and the Athens Home Builders Association.

For his outstanding accomplishments and commitment to the highest ethical standards, Norm was named Realtor of the Year by the Georgia Association of Realtors in 1980. The Georgia Association of Realtors also honored him in 1987 with its President's Award and the Athens Board of Realtors recognized Norm in 1996 with its Lifetime Meritorious Service Award.

Norm and his lovely wife Faye are great Georgians and wonderful friends. Norm is a class act who is well loved in work and at home. It gives me a great deal of pleasure, and it is a privilege to recognize on the floor of the United States Senate the contributions of Norm Grayson to the real estate industry and the State of Georgia. He is an inspiration.●

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF COFFEE GROWERS OF COLUMBIA

● Mr. LEAHY. I wish to speak briefly about the National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia.

The federation is a nonprofit grassroots organization that organizes and monitors the extensive network of coffee growers throughout Colombia. Since 1927, it has worked to build an economically and environmentally sustainable coffee culture, strengthen community networks of coffee growers throughout the country, and promote exports of Colombian coffee worldwide. The federation will celebrate its 80th anniversary on June 27 and should be commended for its accomplishments.

Coffee is grown today in more than half of Colombia's 1,098 municipalities, employing some 2 million people comprising 566,000 families. Many of these people live and work in small towns and rural areas, not unlike the farmers of my own State of Vermont. In fact, several Vermont companies, including Green Mountain Coffee and Coffee Enterprises, sell coffee produced by Colombian coffee growers who are supported by the federation.

In a country where everyone has been affected by the armed conflict and the economic and social disruption it has caused, the Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia has focused increasingly on supporting the social aspects of coffee growers' lives. The federation has worked to bring trained teachers, schools, health clinics, roads, electrification, and other infrastructure to coffee-growing communities. It has provided technical training and the benefits of federation-sponsored research and development to coffee growers to help them improve yields and quality and to market their product. The results speak for themselves. Today, Colombia is the world's second largest coffee exporter by value, totaling $1.677 billion of coffee exported in 2006.

The Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia should be recognized and commended for the 80 years that it has contributed in important ways to the well-being of the Colombian people.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1585. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2079. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting, the report of legislative proposals relative to the National Defense Authorization Bill for fiscal year 2008; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2080. A communication from the Principal Deputy, Office of the Under Secretary (Personnel and Readiness), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, relative to a study of initiatives to expand the relationship between the Department and Job Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2081. A communication from the Acting Deputy, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the results of a public-private competition; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2082. A communication from the Principal Deputy, Office of the Under Secretary (Personnel and Readiness), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status and results of the Department's List of Institutions of Higher Education Ineligible for Federal Funds; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2083. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Barry M. Costello, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2084. A communication from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to exceptions granted by the Secretary for government securities brokers and dealers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2085. A communication from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a modification of the auction process for issuing United States Treasury obligations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2086. A communication from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to material violations or suspected material violations of regulations dealing with Treasury auctions and other Treasury securities offerings; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2087. A communication from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Manufactured Home Dispute Resolution Program'' ((RIN2502–AH98)(FR–4813–F–03)) received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2088. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2006 management report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2089. A communication from the Acting Legal Advisor to the Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''MariTel, Inc. and Mobex Network Services, LLC—Petitions for Rule Making to Amend the Commission's Rules to Provide Additional Flexibility for AMTS and VHF Public Coast Station Licensees'' ((FCC 07–87)(WT Docket No. 94–257)) received on June 4, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2090. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''In the Matter of Facilitating Opportunities for Flexible, Efficient, and Reliable Spectrum for Use Employing Cognitive Radio Technologies'' ((FCC 07–66)(ET Docket No. 03–108)) received on June 4, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2091. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''In the Matter of Modifications of Parts 2 and 15 of the Commission's Rules for Unlicensed Devices and Equipment Approval'' ((FCC 07–56)(ET Docket No. 03–201)) received on June 4, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2092. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2007 Management Measures'' (RIN0648–AV56) received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2093. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; U.S. Atlantic Billfish Tournament Management Measures'' (RIN0648–AV25) received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2094. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law,

the report of a rule entitled ''Approval of 2007 Georges Bank Cod Fixed Gear Sector Operations Plan and Agreement and Allocation of Georges Bank Cod Total Allowable Catch'' (RIN0648–AV22) received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2095. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Specification of Fiscal Year 2007 TACs for GB Cod, Haddock, and Yellowtail Flounder'' (RIN0648–AU63) received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2096. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2007 Georges Bank Cod Hook Sector Operations Plan and Agreement and Allocation of Georges Bank Cod Total Allowable Catch'' (RIN0648–AV20) received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2097. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a status report on the Section 154 Northern Wisconsin Environmental Infrastructure Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2098. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Requirements for Unclassified Information Technology Resources'' (RIN2700–AD26) received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2099. A communication from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the country of origin and the sellers of uranium and uranium enrichment services purchased by owners and operators of U.S. civilian nuclear power reactors during calendar year 2006; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2100. A communication from the Associate Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's inventory of commercial activities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2101. A communication from the Acting White House Liaison, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination and confirmation for the position of Principal Deputy Administrator, received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2102. A communication from the Director, Office of Enforcement, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Accounting and Reporting Requirements for Nonoperating Public Utilities and Licensees'' (RIN1902–AD23) received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2103. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the actions federal agencies are taking to incorporate and implement the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2104. A communication from the Associate Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, a draft bill entitled, ''The Fiscally Responsible Energy Amendments Act of 2007'' to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2105. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Environmental Protection and Border Security on the U.S.-Mexico Border, Tenth Report of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board to the President and Congress of the United States'' to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2106. A communication from the Acting Regulations Officer of Social Security, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Privacy and Disclosure of Official Records and Information'' (RIN0960–AE88) received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2107. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the certification for fiscal year 2007 that no United Nations organization or affiliated agency grants recognition to any organization which supports pedophilia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2108. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2007–108—2007–117); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2109. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the re-certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of the AN/ASA–70 Tactical Display Group for the Japanese P–3C Anti-Submarine Program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2110. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the certification of a proposed amendment to a license for the export of defense services associated with the Helicopter Long Range Active Sonar Mod. 2 System for the Canadian Maritime Helicopter Program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2111. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Director, received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2112. A communication from the Interim Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the acquisitions made by the Corporation from entities that manufacture the articles, materials, or supplies outside of the United States during fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2113. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Deputy Secretary, received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2114. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Director, received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2115. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Assistant Secretary of Labor, received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2116. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the acquisitions made by the Department from entities that manufacture the articles, materials, or supplies outside of the United States for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2117. A communication from the Director, Office of Standards and Variances, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sealing of Abandoned Areas'' (RIN1219–AB52) received on May 25, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2118. A communication from the Director, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the need to take measures to protect miners; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2119. A communication from the Chairman, Board of Governors, United States Postal Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Postal Service's management response to the report for the period ending March 31, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2120. A communication from the Director, Human Resources, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Category Rating System for calendar years 2005 and 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2121. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Department's Inspector General for the period of October 1, 2006, through March 31, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2122. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Office's Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2006, through March 30, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2123. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2124. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Attorney General's Report relative to the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act for the six months ending June 30, 2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2125. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's fiscal year 2006 inventory of inherently governmental and commercial activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2126. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Lender Oversight, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Business Loan Program; Lender Examination and Review Fees'' (RIN3245–AF49) received on May 30, 2007; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC–2127. A communication from the Director of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Department of Veterans Affairs Implementation of OMB Guidance on Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension'' (RIN2900–AM44) received on May 29, 2007; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–2128. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Emerald Ash Borer; Quarantined Areas; Maryland'' (Docket No. APHIS–2007–0028) received on June 1, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2129. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Wood Packaging Material; Treatment Modification'' (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0129) received on June 1, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2130. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Importation of Emerald Ash Borer Host Material from Canada'' (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0125) received on June 1, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2131. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Classical Swine Fever Status of the Mexican State of Nayarit'' (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0104) received on June 1, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1547. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–77).

By Mr. INOUYE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 1142. A bill to authorize the acquisition of interests in undeveloped coastal areas in order better to ensure their protection from development (Rept. No. 110–78).

By Mr. LEVIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1548. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

S. 1549. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military construction, and for other purposes.

S. 1550. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1539. A bill to designate the post office located at 309 East Linn Street, Marshalltown, Iowa, as the ''Major Scott Nisely Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. DOLE (for herself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BURR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. ALLARD):

S. 1540. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for the transportation of food for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1541. A bill to allow for expanded uses of funding allocated to Louisiana under the hazard mitigation program while preserving the goals of the program to reduce future damage from disasters through mitigation; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 1542. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 1543. A bill to establish a national geothermal initiative to encourage increased production of energy from geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 1544. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the quality and efficiency of health care, to provide the public with information on provider and supplier performance, and to enhance the education and awareness of consumers for evaluating health care services through the development and release of reports based on Medicare enrollment, claims, survey, and assessment data; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. SUNUNU, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1545. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 1546. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue code of 1986 to treat gold, silver, platinum, and palladium, in either coin or bar form, in the same manner as equities and mutual funds for purposes of the maximum capital gains rate for individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1547. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1548. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1549. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military construction, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1550. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1551. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to making progress toward the goal of eliminating tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1552. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property to the Alaska Railroad Corporation; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. McCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. ENZI, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR, Mr. BYRD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DODD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. McCAIN, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 220. A resolution honoring the life of Senator Craig Thomas; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 57

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 57, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for

purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 65

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to modify the age-60 standard for certain pilots and for other purposes.

S. 130

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 130, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend reasonable cost contracts under Medicare.

S. 185

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to restore habeas corpus for those detained by the United States.

S. 294

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 294, a bill to reauthorize Amtrak, and for other purposes.

S. 329

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 329, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for cardiac rehabilitation and pulmonary rehabilitation services.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to prohibit the import, export, and sale of goods made with sweatshop labor, and for other purposes.

S. 376

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 376, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 399

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 399, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to include podiatrists as physicians for purposes of covering physicians services under the Medicaid program.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to require convicted sex offenders to register online identifiers, and for other purposes.

S. 492

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 492, a bill to promote stabilization and reconstruction efforts in Somalia, to establish a Special Envoy for Somalia to strengthen United States support to the people of Somalia in their efforts to establish a lasting peace and form a democratically elected and stable central government, and for other purposes.

S. 609

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 609, a bill to amend section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that funds received as universal service contributions and the universal service support programs established pursuant to that section are not subject to certain provisions of title 31, United States Code, commonly known as the Antideficiency Act.

S. 625

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 625, a bill to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products.

S. 717

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 717, a bill to repeal title II of the REAL ID Act of 2005, to restore section 7212 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which provides States additional regulatory flexibility and funding authorization to more rapidly produce tamper- and counterfeit-resistant driver's licenses, and to protect privacy and civil liberties by providing interested stakeholders on a negotiated rulemaking with guidance to achieve improved 21st century licenses to improve national security.

S. 860

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 860, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States the option to provide Medicaid coverage for low-income individuals infected with HIV.

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. 860, supra.

S. 881

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 881, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE) were added as cosponsors of S. 901, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional authorizations of appropriations for the health centers program under section 330 of such Act.

S. 906

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 906, a bill to prohibit the sale, distribution, transfer, and export of elemental mercury, and for other purposes.

S. 911

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 911, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to the current treatments and information regarding pediatric cancers, establish a population-based national childhood cancer database, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancers.

S. 932

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize physical therapists to evaluate and treat Medicare beneficiaries without a requirement for a physician referral, and for other purposes.

S. 940

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 940, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income.

S. 941

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 941, a bill to increase Federal support for Community Health Centers and the National Health Service Corps in order to ensure access to health care for millions of Americans living in medically-underserved areas.

S. 1038

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1038, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand workplace health incentives by equalizing the tax consequences of employee athletic facility use.

S. 1146

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1146, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve health care for veterans who live in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1172

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1172, a bill to reduce hunger in the United States.

S. 1223

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1223, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to support efforts by local or regional television or radio broadcasters to provide essential public information programming in the event of a major disaster, and for other purposes.

S. 1233

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1233, a bill to provide and enhance intervention, rehabilitative treatment, and services to veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes.

S. 1254

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1254, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the reductions in social security benefits which are required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain government pensions shall be equal to the amount by which two-thirds of the total amount of the combined monthly benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds $1,200, adjusted for inflation.

S. 1295

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1295, a bill to amend the African Development Foundation Act to change the name of the Foundation, modify the administrative authorities of the Foundation, and for other purposes.

S. 1301

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1301, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 1310

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1310, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of increased payments for ground ambulance services under the Medicare program.

S. 1317

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1317, a bill to posthumously award a congressional gold medal to Constance Baker Motley.

S. 1337

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1337, a bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for equal coverage of mental health services under the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1353, a bill to nullify the determinations of the Copyright Royalty Judges with respect to webcasting, to modify the basis for making such a determination, and for other purposes.

S. 1382

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1382, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Registry.

S. 1406

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to strengthen polar bear conservation efforts, and for other purposes.

S. 1416

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1416, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction for mortgage insurance premiums.

S. 1430

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1430, a bill to authorize State and local governments to direct divestiture from, and prevent investment in, companies with investments of $20,000,000 or more in Iran's energy sector, and for other purposes.

S. 1444

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1444, a bill to provide for free mailing privileges for personal correspondence and parcels sent to members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty in Iraq or Afghanistan.

S. 1448

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1448, a bill to extend the same Federal benefits to law enforcement officers serving private institutions of higher education and rail carriers that apply to law enforcement officers serving units of State and local government.

S. 1457

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1457, a bill to provide for the protection of mail delivery on certain postal routes, and for other purposes.

S. 1460

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1460, a bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Development Act of 2002 to support beginning farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes.

S. 1464

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1464, a bill to establish a Global Service Fellowship Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1502

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1502, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to encourage owners and operators of privately-held farm, ranch, and forest land to voluntarily make their land available for access by the public under programs administered by States and tribal governments.

S. 1529

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1529, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to end benefit erosion, support working families with child care expenses, encourage retirement and education savings, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Attorney General Alberto Gonzales no longer holds the confidence of the Senate and of the American people.

S. RES. 82

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr.

AKAKA) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 82, a resolution designating August 16, 2007 as ''National Airborne Day''.

S. RES. 203

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 203, a resolution calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop genocide and violence in Darfur, Sudan.

S. RES. 206

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 206, a resolution to provide for a budget point of order against legislation that increases income taxes on taxpayers, including hardworking middle-income families, entrepreneurs, and college students.

AMENDMENT NO. 1174

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1174 intended to be proposed to S. 1348, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1539. A bill to designate the post office located at 309 East Linn Street, Marshalltown, Iowa, as the ''Major Scott Nisely Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill honoring and memorializing a fallen Iowa hero. Scott Nisely had served his country in Iraq just short of a year when, on September 30, 2006, he was killed in combat.

Scott Nisely served his country in many capacities during his lifetime. He devoted his life to his family, church, and country and has positively affected numerous lives. Scott Nisely's military service includes about 25 years with the U.S. Marine Corps, starting as an ROTC student, then 12 years on active duty, almost 9 years in the Marine Corps Reserve during which he achieved the rank of major. Most recently, he took a significant decrease in rank to serve his country once again in the Iowa Army National Guard for about 4 years until he was killed in combat. His public service also includes 12 years with the U.S. Postal Service. In addition, Scott served his community by his participation in the First Baptist Church's music ministry as a drummer. He was a devoted father who walked his daughter down the aisle for her wedding right before his deployment to Iraq. The wedding had been moved up because Sarah, his daughter, wanted him in her wedding and was worried he wouldn't return home.

In recognition of this devoted family man and public servant, the bill I am introducing with the support of my colleague from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, would name the post office located at 309 East Linn Street in Marshalltown, IA, the Major Scott Nisely Post Office. The idea came from Scott's coworkers at the Marshalltown Post Office and it is indeed a fitting tribute. Representative LATHAM is introducing identical legislation in the House of Representatives today with the support of the other members of Iowa's House delegation. I am pleased to be able to propose this small token of recognition and gratitude for someone who has given so much to his country, and I urge its swift consideration.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today I join with my senior colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, in introducing a bill to name the Marshalltown Post Office in honor of MAJ Scott Nisely, who was killed in action in Iraq on September 30, 2006.

Major Nisely enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in 1981 and served in Operation Desert Storm. In 1994, he moved to Marshalltown, IA, with his family and worked at the Iowa Veterans Home as well as at the Marshalltown and Des Moines Post Offices. Because of his love for his country and the military, Major Nisely took a demotion to join the Iowa National Guard and was sent to Iraq in 2005.

Major Nisely was a dedicated husband and father, beloved for his sense of humor and positive attitude. Having served in Operation Desert Storm, he was already a respected Marine veteran and a hero to his family and friends. But with our Armed Forces engaged in Iraq, he once again felt compelled to fight for his country. Major Nisely served in two wars, set a sterling example of selfless service to country, and paid the ultimate price while fighting in Iraq. I am proud to join my colleague in naming the post office in Marshalltown the Major Scott Nisely Post Office, in honor of this fallen hero.

By Mrs. DOLE (for herself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BURR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. ALLARD):

S. 1540. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for the transportation of food for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, today is the sixth National Hunger Awareness Day—a day to reflect on the fact that in this Nation alone more than 35 million people are experiencing hunger or are at risk for hunger. It is also a day to recognize the tremendous efforts of individuals who graciously give their time and resources to help those in need.

Hunger is far too prevalent, but I think Washington Post columnist David Broder hit the nail on the head when he wrote: ''America has some problems that defy solution. This one does not. It just needs caring people and a caring government, working together.'' I agree, the battle to end hunger in our country is a campaign that cannot be won in months or even a few years, but it is a victory within reach. And I am motivated to do what I can to make a positive difference in this fight against hunger—both in the United States and beyond our borders.

In America—the land of prosperity and plenty—some people have the misconception that hunger plagues only far-away, undeveloped nations. The reality is that hunger is a silent enemy lurking within 1 in 10 U.S. households. In my home State of North Carolina alone, nearly 1 million of our 8.8 million residents are struggling with food security issues. In recent years, once-thriving North Carolina towns have been economically crippled by the shuttering of textile mills and furniture factories. People have lost their jobs—and sometimes their ability to put food on the table. I know this scenario is not unique to North Carolina, as many American manufacturing jobs have moved overseas. While many folks are finding new employment, these days a steady income doesn't necessarily provide for three square meals a day.

To help struggling families and individuals, our nation is blessed to have many faith-based and other nonprofit service organizations that work to fight hunger. Over the last year, I have toured a number of these organizations in my home State—such as MANNA FoodBank in Asheville, Second Harvest Food Bank of Metrolina in Charlotte, and Meals on Wheels of Senior Services in Winston-Salem. I also have visited the DC Central Kitchen here in Washington—just a few blocks from the Capitol. At each of these organizations, I am inspired by the dedicated staff and volunteers who have such a passion for helping others.

Another hunger relief organization that I hold in the highest regard is the Society of St. Andrew, which gleans produce from farms and then packages, processes and transports excess food to feed hungry people across the country. When I think of gleaning, I often think of Ruth in the Old Testament. Her story takes place during a famine in Bethlehem, and Ruth gleaned so that her family could eat. In Biblical times, farmers were encouraged to leave crops in their fields for the poor and for travelers. It is a practice we should be utilizing much more extensively today—considering that in this country, 27 percent of all the food produced annually is lost at the retail, consumer, and food service levels. This means we are wasting about 3,044 pounds of good food every second.

The Society of St. Andrew recently passed a milestone—saving and distributing a total of 500 million pounds of food since 1983. This translates into

more than 1.5 billion servings. Already this year, the organization has provided more than 5.5 million pounds of produce. Amazingly, it only costs about 2 cents a serving to glean and deliver this food to those in need. And all of this work is done by the hands of tens of thousands of volunteers and a very small staff. I have gleaned in North Carolina fields with my friends at the Society of St. Andrew, and they are truly a remarkable group.

Like any humanitarian endeavor, the gleaning system works because of cooperative efforts. Private organizations and individuals are doing a great job—but with very limited resources. One of the single largest concerns for gleaners is transportation—how to actually get food to those in need. To help address this problem, I am proud to reintroduce today the Hunger Relief Trucking Tax Credit Act, which would change the Tax Code to give transportation companies tax incentives for volunteering trucks to transfer gleaned food. Specifically, my bill would create a 25-cent tax credit for each mile that food is transported for hunger relief efforts by a donated truck and driver.

This bill would provide a little extra encouragement for trucking companies to donate space in their vehicles to help more food reach more hungry people. I am grateful to my colleagues, Senators LINCOLN, BURR, DURBIN, VITTER and ALLARD, for joining this effort, and I welcome the support of relief organizations like the Society of St. Andrew, the American Trucking Association, and America's Second Harvest.

In addition, Senators LAUTENBERG, LINCOLN, and I plan to soon reintroduce the Food Employment Empowerment and Development Program Act, or the FEED Act. The idea behind this legislation is simple: combine food rescue with job training, thus teaching unemployed and homeless adults the skills needed to work in the food service industry.

With support from the FEED Act, community kitchens will receive much-needed resources to help collect rescued food and provide 2 million meals each year to the hungry. Successful FEED Act-type programs already exist. For example, in Charlotte, NC, the Community Culinary School recruits students from social service agencies, homeless shelters, halfway houses and work release programs. And just around the comer from here, 25 students recently began training in the DC Central Kitchen's 68th culinary job training class. This is a model program, which began in 1990, and it is always a great privilege to visit the kitchen and meet with the individuals who have faced adversity but are now on track for a career in the food service industry.

We also must do more to help America's 12 million hungry children get on the right track. As a result of hunger, these children have higher levels of chronic illness, depression, and behavior problems. This is a travesty that can and must be prevented, and school feeding programs provide a critical means to this end. The National School Lunch Program feeds 30 million children in more than 100,000 schools each day. While reduced price meals are available to students whose family income is below 130 percent of the poverty level, State and local school board members have informed me that many families struggle to even pay this fee. In too many cases, this is creating an insurmountable barrier to participation.

That is why I am a strong supporter of eliminating the reduced price fee for these families and harmonizing the free income guideline with the WIC income guideline, which is 185 percent of poverty. In 2004, we succeeded in having a five-State pilot program authorized, and since then, a number of colleagues have joined me in urging funding for the program. I am very proud that the fiscal year 2008 Senate budget resolution finally includes the funds, and I will continue to push this during the appropriations process—because expanding the free lunch program has great potential to alleviate hunger for millions of children and help them succeed in school.

School feeding programs also offer tremendous opportunity to reach some of the 400 million chronically hungry children across the globe. Earlier this year, Senator DICK DURBIN and I introduced a bill to reauthorize the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. This program was named for my husband Senator Bob Dole and his good friend Senator George McGovern—both of whom remain tremendous advocates for this and other child nutrition initiatives.

As with the U.S. school lunch program, the McGovern-Dole program helps attract children to schools. The nutritious meals provided help keep them alert and focused so they can learn and nourished so they can grow and mature. First authorized in 2002, the program provides for donations of U.S. agricultural products and financial and technical assistance for school food programs and maternal and child nutrition projects in low-income countries that are committed to universal education. In 2005 alone, the McGovern-Dole program distributed 120,000 metric tons of U.S. food commodities, including wheat, wheat flour, corn, rice, dry beans, and vegetable oils, to schools that run feeding programs in the world's poorest countries. In addition to Federal funding, outside donors have provided approximately $1 billion to complement the McGovern-Dole program, making this initiative a successful public-private partnership.

McGovern-Dole has a proven track record of reducing hunger among school-age children and improving literacy and primary education enrollment in areas where conflict, hunger, poverty and HIV/AIDS are prevalent. School meals, teacher training, and related support have helped boost school enrollment and academic performance. These positive results are especially true among girls, including those who live where girls are commonly mistreated and marginalized.

Throughout my career in public service, I have seen the faces of hunger so many times. During my time at the American Red Cross, I witnessed hunger and starvation in war-torn Rwanda and famine-stricken Somalia. In Baidoa, I came upon a little boy lying under a sack. I thought he was dead, but as his brother sat him up, I could see that he was severely malnourished. I asked for camel's milk to feed him, and as I raised the cup to his mouth, I put my arm around his back. The feeling of the little bones almost piercing through his flesh is something I will never forget. That is when the horror of starvation becomes real—when you can touch it.

In Deuteronomy 15:7, the Bible tells us, ''If there is among you a poor man, one of your brethren, in any of your towns within your land which the Lord your God gives you, you shall not harden your heart or shut your hand against your poor brother.''

I implore friends on both sides of the aisle—and the people of this great country—to join in this mission, this grassroots network of compassion that transcends political ideology and provides hope and security not only for those in need today but for future generations. Let us stand and fight as one in this mission to end hunger.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 1542. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Investing for Tomorrow's Schools Act of 2007, an act that is critical in bringing our Nation's schools into the 21st century. If passed, this legislation would provide States with an economical way to fund school construction. Please allow me to express my thanks to my friend, Senator HARKIN, for joining my efforts in the Senate, as well as to Representative TAUSCHER for his leadership in the House and his introduction of the companion bill.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gave our Nation's school buildings a D in their last report card, with 75 percent of facilities deemed inadequate for education. Yet our children attend these schools every day.

When students attend rundown schools, their well-being and ability to learn is threatened. In 2004, in Washingtonville, NY, the roof over a classroom, in the 44-year-old Taft Elementary, collapsed. Had the collapse occurred just 32 days later, 15 children and 2 teachers could have been seriously injured or even killed.

This past January, New York's Manhasset School District issued a report describing the condition of its

only high school. The 72-year-old building has exceeded its life expectancy, with a roof ''beyond the stages of patching and repairing'' and in need of replacement. Last school year, part of the ceiling collapsed in one of the stairwells.

Buildings like this one, in use beyond their life expectancy, are dangerous and don't meet the demands of the 21st century. The lack of adequate school buildings hampers today's most promising and innovative efforts to boost student achievement. Many older school buildings are in a dangerous state of disrepair and have seriously outdated facilities. Many do not even have the proper wiring for computer networks. While we work to give students the academic tools they need to compete in the 21st century, we must also upgrade school facilities to give students a learning environment conducive to success. This is why we included a new provision in this legislation creating healthy high-performance schools guidelines to direct schools during renovation and construction in order to create schools that will foster the development of children.

According to the National Education Association, repairs and modernization nationwide will cost $322 billion. Last year, over $20 billion was spent nationwide on school construction. At that rate, it will take more than 16 years to modernize school buildings, when today's kindergartners could be graduating from college. Clearly, school construction is costly, but a price cannot be put on the value of our children's education and well-being. We must use innovative methods in providing funding for schools to make these essential renovations.

That is why I am introducing this bill. At the center of this bill is the creation of State infrastructure banks, which would improve financing for school construction. This financing mechanism was pioneered by the Reagan administration, which used it to help local communities fund water treatment and clean water facilities. The Clinton administration also used State infrastructure banks to help States finance transportation projects.

State infrastructure banks have been successful in financing public projects at a low cost to taxpayers. They would offer school districts flexible options of loan and credit enhancement assistance, such as low-interest loans, bond-financing security, loan guarantees, and credit support for financing projects, which result in lower interest rates. State infrastructure banks would not strain the Federal Treasury or the American taxpayer. After initial funding, they would require no ongoing Federal appropriations. As loans are repaid, funds would be replenished, and banks could make new loans available.

Passage of this bill would help provide immediate aid to the neediest schools and help local communities fund affordable construction far into the future. This modest proposal is one step in the school construction solution. We must continue to move forward in this Congress by creating an academic setting that will prepare our students for the 21st century workplace. I ask my colleagues to join me and Senator HARKIN in supporting this critical piece of legislation.

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 1543. A bill to establish a national geothermal initiative to encourage increased production of energy from geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to introduce the National Geothermal Initiative Act of 2007, along with my cosponsors, Senators REID, MURKOWSKI, STEVENS, SALAZAR, TESTER, and SNOWE. This bipartisan bill establishes a national goal where at least 20 percent of the total electrical energy production in the United States should be from geothermal resources by 2030. Under the National Geothermal Initiative, the national goal will be accomplished by establishing and carrying out new programs for geothermal research, development, demonstration, and commercial application. This act also extends an ongoing study being conducted by the United States Geological Survey to characterize the complete geothermal resource base for use in future geothermal energy development. Finally, the act will provide international market support for geothermal energy development. It is critical with ever increasing energy demands that new energy solutions are continually developed and explored. With continued research, development, demonstration, and deployment of new technologies, geothermal energy holds great promise as a growing renewable energy source.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1543

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 ''National Geothermal Initiative Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) domestic geothermal resources have the potential to provide vast amounts of clean, renewable, and reliable energy to the United States;

(2) Federal policies and programs are critical to achieving the potential of those resources;

(3) Federal tax policies should be modified to appropriately support the longer lead-times of geothermal facilities and address the high risks of geothermal exploration and development;

(4) sustained and expanded research programs are needed—

(A) to support the goal of increased energy production from geothermal resources; and

(B) to develop the technologies that will enable commercial production of energy from more geothermal resources;

(5) a comprehensive national resource assessment is needed to support policymakers and industry needs;

(6) a national exploration and development technology and information center should be established to support the achievement of increased geothermal energy production; and

(7) implementation and completion of geothermal and other renewable initiatives on public land in the United States is critical, consistent with the principles and requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and other applicable law.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL GOAL.

Congress declares that it shall be a national goal to achieve 20 percent of total electrical energy production in the United States from geothermal resources by not later than 2030.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) INITIATIVE.—The term ''Initiative'' means the national geothermal initiative established by section 5(a).

(2) NATIONAL GOAL.—The term ''national goal'' means the national goal of increased energy production from geothermal resources described in section 3.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 5. NATIONAL GEOTHERMAL INITIATIVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a national geothermal initiative under which the Federal Government shall seek to achieve the national goal.

(b) FEDERAL SUPPORT AND COORDINATION.—In carrying out the Initiative, each Federal agency shall give priority to programs and efforts necessary to support achievement of the national goal to the extent consistent with applicable law.

(c) ENERGY AND INTERIOR GOALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior shall establish and carry out policies and programs—

(A) to characterize the complete geothermal resource base (including engineered geothermal systems) of the United States by not later than 2010;

(B) to sustain an annual growth rate in the use of geothermal power, heat, and heat pump applications of at least 10 percent;

(C) to demonstrate state-of-the-art energy production from the full range of geothermal resources in the United States;

(D) to achieve new power or commercial heat production from geothermal resources in at least 25 States; and

(E) to develop the tools and techniques to construct an engineered geothermal system power plant.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 3 years thereafter, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly submit to the appropriate Committees of Congress a report that describes—

(A) the proposed plan to achieve the goals described in paragraph (1); and

(B) a description of the progress during the period covered by the report toward achieving those goals.

(d) GEOTHERMAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND COMMERCIAL APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a program of geothermal research, development, demonstration, outreach and education, and commercial application to support the achievement of the national goal.

(2) REQUIREMENTS OF PROGRAM.—In carrying out the geothermal research program

described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) prioritize funding for the discovery and characterization of geothermal resources;

(B) expand funding for cost-shared drilling;

(C)(i) establish, at a national laboratory or university research center selected by the Secretary, a national geothermal exploration research and information center;

(ii) support development and application of new exploration and development technologies through the center; and

(iii) in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, disseminate geological and geophysical data to support geothermal exploration activities through the center.

(D) support cooperative programs with and among States, including with the Great Basin Center for Geothermal Energy, the Intermountain West Geothermal Consortium, and other similar State and regional initiatives, to expand knowledge of the geothermal resource base of the United States and potential applications of that resource base;

(E) improve and advance high-temperature and high-pressure drilling, completion, and instrumentation technologies benefiting geothermal well construction;

(F) demonstrate geothermal applications in settings that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, are noncommercial;

(G) research, develop, and demonstrate engineered geothermal systems techniques for commercial application of the technologies, including advances in—

(i) reservoir stimulation;

(ii) reservoir characterization, monitoring, and modeling;

(iii) stress mapping;

(iv) tracer development;

(v) 3-dimensional tomography; and

(vi) understanding seismic effects of deep drilling and reservoir engineering; and

(H) support the development and application of the full range of geothermal technologies and applications.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this subsection—

(A) $75,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

(B) $110,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2012; and

(C) for fiscal year 2013 and each fiscal year thereafter through fiscal year 2030, such sums as are necessary.

(e) GEOTHERMAL ASSESSMENT, EXPLORATION INFORMATION, AND PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—

(1) INTERIOR.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary of the Interior—

(A) acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall, not later than 2010—

(i) conduct and complete a comprehensive nationwide geothermal resource assessment that examines the full range of geothermal resources in the United States; and

(ii) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the results of the assessment; and

(B) in planning and leasing, shall consider the national goal established under this Act.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out this subsection—

(A) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

(B) $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 to 2012; and

(C) for fiscal year 2013 and each fiscal year thereafter through fiscal year 2030, such sums as are necessary.

SEC. 6. INTERMOUNTAIN WEST GEOTHERMAL CONSORTIUM.

Section 237 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15874) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2020.''.

SEC. 7. INTERNATIONAL MARKET SUPPORT FOR GEOTHERMAL ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.

(a) UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—The United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with other appropriate Federal and multilateral agencies, shall support international and regional development to promote the use of geothermal resources, including (as appropriate) the African Rift Geothermal Development Facility.

(b) UNITED STATES TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY.—The United States Trade and Development Agency shall support the Initiative by—

(1) encouraging participation by United States firms in actions taken to carry out subsection (a); and

(2) providing grants and other financial support for feasibility and resource assessment studies.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 1544. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the quality and efficiency of health care, to provide the public with information on provider and supplier performance, and to enhance the education and awareness of consumers for evaluating health care services through the development and release of reports based on Medicare enrollment, claims, survey, and assessment data; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the United States spends more on health care as a percentage of GDP than any other industrialized country and costs continue to rise. However, there is significant variation in the quality of health care consumers receive. Are we getting a good deal? The Medicare Quality Enhancement Act, which I have introduced today with Senator CLINTON, seeks to improve U.S. health care by providing qualified private-sector organizations access to Medicare data for the development and release of reports on the quality, cost, efficiency and effectiveness of our health care system.

Consumer groups, employers, insurance companies, labor unions and others have repeatedly requested access to Medicare data to improve the quality of the health care provided to their members, employees and beneficiaries and to help control the ever-rising costs of health care. While there remains legal debate over whether this data can be released, the Medicare Quality Enhancement Act ensures that the data collected by Medicare and paid for by the taxpayer can be utilized by qualified organizations to measure quality and control costs while protecting beneficiary privacy.

The Medicare Quality Enhancement Act of 2007: requires CMS to provide Medicare enrollment, claims, survey and assessment data to private sector Medicare Quality Reporting Organizations, MQROs, to develop reports to measure health care quality for the public; mandates the protection of beneficiary privacy; empowers consumer groups, providers, employers, insurance plans, labor unions and others to request reports from MQROs; and provides for the public release of all reports.

Attempts are already being made by employers and insurance companies to measure quality. However, with limited amounts of privately held data, their analysis is not broad enough to provide the most accurate results. However, MQROs will have access to Medicare data and be authorized to aggregate both private and public data, providing a significantly more robust assessment of both quality and efficiency while requiring the complete protection of beneficiary health information.

In order for America's health care system to improve, we need to know more and understand the quality of the care we are purchasing. The time has come for the health care community to compete on quality, value and cost, and not be rewarded simply for volume of care provided.

The Medicare Quality Enhancement Act ensures that the public will finally have the tools necessary to make informed health care decisions for themselves and their families.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1552. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property to the Alaska Railroad Corporation; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill that will authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property to the Alaska Railroad Corporation. This parcel of land is used by GSA for a fleet management center at 2nd and Christensen avenue in downtown Anchorage. The site is approximately 78,000 sq. feet and is surrounded on two sides by Alaska Railroad property. This property was owned by the Alaska Railroad during the period of Federal ownership and was leased to the General Services administration. At the time the railroad was transferred from Federal to State ownership, the parcel of land where the fleet center is located was successfully obtained by GSA for its motor pool function due to its close proximity to downtown Anchorage and other Federal agencies.

This parcel of land is a key transportation component for the redevelopment of Ship Creek. Allowing the Alaska Railroad to get the property back, either through a land exchange or fair market purchase, will allow the Railroad to make additional improvements in the area. GSA has indicated a desire

to move from its present location to a location closer to the military bases in Anchorage as most of their business has become the management of a motor pool for the bases.

As consideration for the property, the administrator shall require the AKRR Corporation to either convey a replacement facility to GSA or pay the fair market value of the property based on the highest and best use as determined by an independent appraisal commissioned by the administrator and paid for by the Alaska Railroad Corporation. All proceeds derived from any payment for the property shall be deposited in the Federal buildings fund.

The GSA supports this legislation to expedite their move from the present location to one that will allow them to better serve the military bases.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1552

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF GSA FLEET MANAGEMENT CENTER TO ALASKA RAILROAD CORPORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of this section, the Administrator of General Services shall convey, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, by quitclaim deed, to the Alaska Railroad Corporation, an entity of the State of Alaska (in this section referred to as the ''Corporation''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of real property described in subsection (b), known as the GSA Fleet Management Center.

(b) GSA FLEET MANAGEMENT CENTER.—The parcel to be conveyed under subsection (a) is the parcel located at the intersection of 2nd Avenue and Christensen Avenue in Anchorage, Alaska, consisting of approximately 78,000 square feet of land and the improvements thereon.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the parcel to be conveyed under subsection (a), the Administrator shall require the Corporation to—

(A) convey replacement property in accordance with paragraph (2); or

(B) pay the purchase price for the parcel in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) REPLACEMENT PROPERTY.—If the Administrator requires the Corporation to provide consideration under paragraph (1)(A), the Corporation shall—

(A) convey, and pay the cost of conveying, to the United States, acting by and through the Administrator, fee simple title to real property, including a building, that the Administrator determines to be suitable as a replacement facility for the parcel to be conveyed under subsection (a); and

(B) provide such other consideration as the Administrator and the Corporation may agree, including payment of the costs of relocating the occupants vacating the parcel to be conveyed under subsection (a).

(3) PURCHASE PRICE.—If the Administrator requires the Corporation to provide consideration under paragraph (1)(B), the Corporation shall pay to the Administrator the fair market value of the parcel to be conveyed under subsection (a) based on its highest and best use as determined by an independent appraisal commissioned by the Administrator and paid for by the Corporation.

(d) APPRAISAL.—In the case of an appraisal under subsection (c)(3)—

(1) the appraisal shall be performed by an appraiser mutually acceptable to the Administrator and the Corporation; and

(2) the assumptions, scope of work, and other terms and conditions related to the appraisal assignment shall be mutually acceptable to the Administrator and the Corporation.

(e) PROCEEDS.—

(1) DEPOSIT.—Any proceeds received under subsection (c) shall be paid into the Federal Buildings Fund established under section 592 of title 40, United States Code.

(2) EXPENDITURE.—Amounts paid into the Federal Buildings Fund under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Administrator upon deposit for expenditure for any lawful purpose consistent with existing authorities granted to the Administrator; except that the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate 30 days advance written notice of any expenditure of the proceeds.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Administrator may require such additional terms and conditions to the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Administrator considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY AND SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the parcels to be conveyed under subsections (a) and (c)(2) shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Administrator and the Corporation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 220—HONORING THE LIFE OF SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. ENZI, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR, Mr. BYRD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DODD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 220

Whereas Senator Craig Thomas had a long and honorable history of public service, serving in the United States Marine Corps, the Wyoming State Legislature, the United States House of Representatives, and the United States Senate;

Whereas Senator Craig Thomas represented the people of Wyoming with honor and distinction for over 20 years;

Whereas Senator Craig Thomas was first elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1989;

Whereas Senator Craig Thomas was subsequently elected 3 times to the United States Senate by record margins of more than 70 percent; and

Whereas Senator Craig Thomas's life and career were marked by the best of his Western values: hard work, plain speaking, common sense, courage, and integrity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the United States Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Craig Thomas, a Senator from the State of Wyoming;

(2) the Senate mourns the loss of one of its most esteemed members, Senator Craig Thomas, and expresses its condolences to the people of Wyoming and to his wife, Susan, and his 4 children;

(3) the Secretary of the Senate shall communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of Senator Craig Thomas; and

(4) when the Senate adjourns today, it shall stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of Senator Craig Thomas.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1282. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1283. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1284. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1285. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1286. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1287. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1288. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1289. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1290. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1291. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1292. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1293. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1294. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1295. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1296. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1297. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1298. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1299. Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1300. Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1301. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1302. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1303. Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. MARTINEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1304. Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. MARTINEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1305. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1306. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1307. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1308. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1309. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1310. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1311. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. DEMINT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1312. Mr. BIDEN (for himself and Mr. LUGAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1313. Mr. WEBB submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1314. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1315. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1316. Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1317. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1318. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. ENSIGN, and Mr. COLEMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1319. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1320. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1321. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1322. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1323. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1324. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1325. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1326. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1327. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1328. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1329. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1330. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1331. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER)) to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1332. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1333. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1282. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 274A(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as amended by section 302(a) of the amendment), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

''(2) PREEMPTION.—This section preempts any State or local law that—

''(A) requires the use of the EEVS in a manner that—

''(i) conflicts with any Federal policy, procedure, or timetable; or

''(ii) imposes a civil or criminal sanction (other than through licensing or other similar laws) on a person that employs, or recruits or refers for a fee for employment, any unauthorized alien; and

''(B) requires, as a condition of conducting, continuing, or expanding a business, that, to achieve compliance with subsection (a) or (b), a business entity—

''(i) shall provide, build, fund, or maintain a shelter, structure, or designated area at or near the place of business of the entity for use by—

''(I) any individual who is not an employee of the business entity who enters or seeks to enter the property of the entity for the purpose of seeking employment by the entity; or

''(II) any contractor, customer, or other person over which the business entity has no authority; or

''(ii) shall carry out any other activity to facilitate the employment by others of—

''(I) any individual who is not an employee of the business entity who enters or seeks to enter the property of the entity for the purpose of seeking employment by the entity; or

''(II) any contractor, customer, or other person over which the business entity has no authority.''.

SA 1283. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 218B(e)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 403(a), strike ''An employer in a high unemployment'' and all that follows through the end of the paragraph.

SA 1284. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 411 and insert the following:

SEC. 411. COMPLIANCE INVESTIGATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, shall increase, by not less than 400 per year for each of the 5 fiscal years after the date of enactment of this Act, the number of positions for compliance investigators and attorneys dedicated to the enforcement of labor standards, including those contained in sections 218A, 218B, and 218C, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) and the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) in geographic and occupational areas in which a high percentage of workers are Y nonimmigrants.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor for each of the 5 fiscal years after the date of enactment of this Act such sums as may be necessary to carry out subsection (a).

SA 1285. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. ALLOCATION OF FIELD AGENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(f) (8 U.S.C. 1103(f)) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) MINIMUM NUMBER OF AGENTS ALLOCATED TO STATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall allocate to each State—

''(A) not fewer than 40 full-time active duty agents of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement to—

''(i) investigate immigration violations; and

''(ii) ensure the departure of all removable aliens; and

''(B) not fewer than 15 full-time active duty agents of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services to carry out immigration and naturalization adjudication functions.

''(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the requirement under paragraph (1) for any State with a population of fewer than 2,000,000 residents, according to the most recent information published by the Bureau of the Census.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1286. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 113 (relating to the release of aliens from noncontiguous countries).

SA 1287. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection (a) of section 1, add the following:

(6) SURVEILLANCE PLAN AND NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR BORDER SECURITY.—The Department of Homeland Security has developed—

(A) a comprehensive plan for systematic surveillance of the international land and maritime borders of the United States pursuant to section 126; and

(B) a national strategy for border security pursuant to section 127.

SA 1288. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection (a) of section 1, add the following:

(6) ENTRY AND EXIT SYSTEM.—The Department of Homeland Security has fully implemented an automated entry and exit control system that will—

(A)(i) collect a record of departure for every alien departing the United States; and

(ii) match the records of departure with the record of the arrival of the alien in the United States; and

(B) enable the Secretary to identify, through searching procedures on the Internet, lawfully-admitted nonimmigrants who remain in the United States beyond the applicable period authorized by the Secretary.

Strike section 130 (relating to the US–Visit System).

SA 1289. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 287, line 31, strike ''Z-1'' and insert ''any Z''.

On page 287, line 34, strike ''$1,000'' and insert ''$5,000''.

On page 287, strike line 36 and all that follows through ''(iii)'' on line 41, and insert ''(ii)''.

On page 304, strike line 36 and all that follows through ''behalf,'' on line 38 and insert the following: ''status, the Secretary of Homeland Security may impose an additional penalty in an amount not to exceed $5,000,''.

SA 1290. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 293, line 12, insert ''and'' after ''center;''.

On page 293, line 13, strike the semicolon at the end and insert a period.

On page 293, strike lines 14 through 32

SA 1291. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 317, strike line 8 and all that follows through ''(b)'' on line 12.

SA 1292. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 288, line 33, insert the following:

(9) MEDICAL EXAMINATION.—An applicant for Z nonimmigrant status shall, at the alien's expense, obtain proper immunizations and undergo an appropriate medical examination that conforms to generally accepted professional standards of medical practice.

SA 1293. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 288, strike lines 6 through 9 and insert the following: ''subsection, any Z nonimmigrant shall pay a State impact assistance fee in an amount equal to $500.''.

SA 1294. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 304, line 4, strike ''Z-1'' and insert ''Z''.

On page 304, lines 10 and 11, strike ''Unless otherwise directed by the Secretary of State, a Z-1'' and insert ''A Z''.

On page 304, line 15, strike ''A consular office'' and all that follows through line 20.

SA 1295. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 288, line 33, insert the following:

(9) ENGLISH AND CIVICS.—An alien who is 18 years of age or older shall meet the requirements under section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)).

On page 295, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 296, line 22, and insert the following:

(I) REQUIREMENT AT FIRST RENEWAL.—At or before the time of application for the first extension of Z nonimmigrant status, an alien who is 18 years of age or older shall meet the requirements under section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)).

(II) EXCEPTION.—The requirement under subclause (I) shall not apply to any person who, on the date of the filing of the person's application for an extension of Z nonimmigrant status—

(aa) is unable to comply because of physical or developmental disability or mental impairment to comply with such requirement; or

(bb) is older than 70 years of age and has been living in the United States for periods totaling not less than 20 years.

SA 1296. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 289, line 8, strike ''If, during the one-year'' and all that follows through line 14.

SA 1297. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 291, strike lines 22 through 38.

SA 1298. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 289, line 42, strike ''may'' and insert ''shall''.

On page 290, line 18, strike ''by the end of the next business day''.

On page 290, line 44, and page 291, line 1, strike ''or the end of the next business day, whichever is sooner''.

On page 296, line 39, strike ''may'' and insert ''shall''.

SA 1299. Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 223, line 27, strike ''101(a)(15)(Y)(ii)(II)'' and ''(101)(a)(15)(Y)(ii)''.

On page 224, in the handwritten material, by striking ''(9)(A)'' and inserting ''(10)(A), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this section''.

On page 225, strike the period at the end and insert the following: ''; and

(4) in paragraph (11), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this section—

(A) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(10)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) The numerical limitations under paragraph (1)(D) shall be allocated for each fiscal year to ensure that the total number of aliens subject to such numerical limits who enter the United States pursuant to a visa or are accorded nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(Y)(ii) during the first 6 months of such fiscal year is not greater than 50 percent of the total number of such visas available for that fiscal year.''.

SA 1300. Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SECTION ____. EXPEDITED ADJUDICATION OF EMPLOYER PETITIONS FOR ATHLETES, ARTISTS, ENTERTAINERS, AND OTHER ALIENS OF EXTRAORDINARY ABILITY.

Section 214(c) (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Attorney General'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security''; and

(2) in paragraph (6)(D)—

(A) by striking ''Any person'' and inserting the following:

''(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), any person''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall adjudicate each petition for an alien described in subparagraph (O) or (P) of section 101(a)(15) not later than 30 days after—

''(I) the date on which the petitioner submits the petition with a written advisory opinion, letter of no objection, or request for a waiver; or

''(II) the date on which the 15-day period described in clause (i) has expired, if the petitioner has had an appropriate opportunity to supply rebuttal evidence.

''(iii) If a petition described in clause (ii) is not adjudicated before the end of the 30-day period described in clause (ii) and the petitioner is a qualified nonprofit organization or an individual or entity petitioning primarily on behalf of a qualified nonprofit organization, the Secretary shall provide the petitioner with the premium-processing services referred to in section 286(u), without a fee.''.

SA 1301. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 218A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 402(a), add the following new subsection:

''(v) SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.—

''(1) SOCIAL SECURITY PAYROLL TAX.—Notwithstanding whether an agreement under section 233 of the Social Security Act is in effect between the United States and the home country of Y nonimmigrant, upon submission of a request at a United States Consulate in the home country of an alien who has ceased to be a Y nonimmigrant as result of termination of employment in the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the alien an amount equal to the total tax imposed under section 3101(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on the wages received by the alien and 50 percent of the tax imposed under section 1401(a) of such Code on the self-employment income of such alien while the alien was in such nonimmigrant status (without interest). An alien receiving such a payment shall be—

''(A) ineligible for any future admission to the United States under a Y nonimmigrant status; and

''(B) prohibited from being credited for purposes of computing benefits or determining insured status under title II of the Social Security Act for any quarter of coverage on which such payment is based.

''(2) MEDICARE PAYROLL TAX.—Not later than 1 year after such date of enactment, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall issue regulations establishing procedures for transferring amounts collected from the tax imposed under section 3101(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on the wages received by Y nonimmigrant and 50 percent of the tax imposed under section 1401(b) of such Code on the self-employment income of such alien while working in the United States to the State Impact Assistance Account established under section 286(x) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356(x)) for the purpose of the Secretary of Heath and Human Services making grants to States to provide health services to noncitizens in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (4) of such section.

''(3) ENUMERATION BY THE COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND CERTIFICATION OF WORK HISTORY BY THE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security shall implement a system to—

''(i) allow for the enumeration by the Commissioner of Social Security of any Y nonimmigrant, concurrent with the granting of the alien such status;

''(ii) require such alien, as a condition of receiving a payment described in paragraph (1), to—

''(I) provide the Secretary and the Commissioner of Social Security with the number assigned to the alien by the Commissioner of Social Security in accordance with clause (i); and

''(II) execute the document described in subparagraph (C); and

''(iii) provide the Commissioner of Social Security with a copy of such document and a certification specifying, after a review conducted in accordance with subparagraph (B), the year or years for which the alien was authorized to work in the United States.

''(B) REVIEW AND TRANSMITTAL OF CERTIFICATION OF WORK STATUS.—For purposes of carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall review the records of the Department of Homeland Security and any other evidence the Secretary determines appropriate for making a determination as to the authorization of an alien granted Y nonimmigrant status to work in the United States during any period for when the alien was not granted such status, including such evidence as the alien may provide such as correspondence with the Department of Homeland Security and copies of employer records.

''(C) DOCUMENT DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii)(II), a document described in this subparagraph is a document, executed by a Y nonimmigrant as part of a request submitted under paragraph (1), in which the alien—

''(i) renounces any entitlement to benefits under title II of the Social Security Act based on wages or self-employment income of the alien earned—

''(I) while holding such status; or

''(II) during any year or period of years in which the alien was not authorized to work in the United States; and

''(ii) acknowledges the detailed list of each year during which (or during any part of which) the Secretary has determined that the alien was authorized to work in the United States and that any wages or self-employment income of the alien earned during any year or part year not so listed shall not be credited to the alien for purposes of determining eligibility for, or the amount of—

''(I) a payment to the alien under paragraph (1); or

''(II) any benefit for which the alien may become eligible for under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of a subsequent admission to the United States under a status other than as a Y nonimmigrant.

''(4) APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL PUBLIC BENEFITS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the application of title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) to a Y nonimmigrant and in no event shall an alien be considered a qualified alien under such title while granted such status.

''(5) ADMINISTRATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Reform Act of 2007, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Commissioner of Social Security, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall each issue regulations establishing procedures for carrying out this paragraph, without regard to the requirements of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Administrative Procedure Act).''.

SA 1302. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 607 and insert the following:

SEC. 607. PRECLUSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY CREDITS FOR YEARS WITHOUT WORK AUTHORIZATION.

(a) INSURED STATUS.—Section 214 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 414) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''For'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (e), for''; and

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

''(d)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3) and subsection (e), for purposes of this section and for purposes of determining a qualifying quarter of coverage under section 402(b)(2)(B) of the Personal Responsibility

and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1612(b)(2)(B))—

''(A) no quarter of coverage shall be credited if, with respect to any individual who is not a United States citizen or national, the individual is assigned a social security account number after 2007 and such quarter of coverage is earned prior to the year in which such social security account number is assigned;

''(B) no quarter of coverage shall be credited for any calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Reform Act of 2007, if, with respect to an individual who is not a United States citizen or national, the Secretary of Homeland Security has certified in accordance with paragraph (2)(B) to the Commissioner that the individual is not authorized to engage in work activity in the United States; and

''(C) there shall be a rebuttable presumption that an alien who is granted nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(Z) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(Z)) and who was granted a social security account number prior to 2007, has no qualifying quarters of coverage earned prior to the date that the alien is granted such status.

''(2) The Commissioner of Social Security shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Homeland Security under which the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

''(A) provide the Commissioner of Social Security with such information as the Commissioner determines necessary to carry out the prohibition set forth in paragraph (1)(A);

''(B) for purposes of carrying out paragraph (1)(B), notify the Commissioner of Social Security with respect to any alien who is granted authority to enter the United States and engage in work activity and for any alien already in the United States who is granted authority to work or whose period of authority to work is extended or otherwise reinstated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, of—

''(i) such determination and the granting of such authority by the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

''(ii) the date on which such authority to work in the United States is cancelled, revoked, or otherwise shall cease; and

''(C) for purposes of a request by an alien to which paragraph(1)(C) applies to overcome the presumption applied under such paragraph, notify the Commissioner of Social Security that the alien has submitted to the Secretary of Homeland Security appropriate, verifiable documents proving creditable quarters of coverage during a period—

''(i) prior to the date that the alien is granted nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(Z) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (which shall include any probationary period for which the alien was granted such status); and

''(ii) that the alien was present in the United States pursuant to a grant of status under a provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) and authorized to engage in work activity while so present.

Each notification provided by the Secretary of Homeland Security under this paragraph shall specify with respect to an alien, the alien's name, date of birth, admission status, beginning and ending dates for such status, and, if applicable, number enumerated by the Commissioner of Social Security for such alien.

''(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any quarter of coverage earned by an individual who satisfies the criterion specified in subsection (c)(2).

''(e) Subsection (d) shall not apply with respect to a determination under subsection (a) or (b) for a deceased individual in the case of a child who is a United States citizen and who is applying for child's insurance benefits under section 202(d) based on the wages and self-employment income of such deceased individual.''.

(b) BENEFIT COMPUTATION.—Section 215(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(e)) is amended—

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

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

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

''(3) in computing the average indexed monthly earnings of an individual, there shall not be counted any wages or self-employment income for any year for which no quarter of coverage may be credited to such individual as a result of the application of section 214(d).''.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR SECRETARY TO TRANSMIT NOTICE OF STATUS.—Not later than—

(1) 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall enter into the agreement with the Commissioner of Social Security required under section 214(d)(2) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), for purposes of carrying out paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(C) of section 214(d) of the Social Security Act; and

(2) 24 months after such date, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall enter into the agreement with the Commissioner of Social Security required under such section 214(d)(2) for purposes of carrying out paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B) of such section.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to quarters of coverage otherwise creditable for years beginning on or after the date that is 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR APPLICATIONS FOR BENEFITS BASED ON SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBER ASSIGNED PRIOR TO 2007.—Paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(C) of section 214(d) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), shall be effective with respect to applications for benefits filed after the 6th month beginning after the month in which this Act is enacted.

SA 1303. Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. MARTINEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, insert the following:

SEC. 2____. DEPLOYMENT OF TECHNOLOGY TO IMPROVE VISA PROCESSING.

Section 222 (8 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) VISA APPLICATION INTERVIEWS.—

''(1) VIDEOCONFERENCING.—For purposes of subsection (h), the term 'in person interview' includes an interview conducted by videoconference or similar technology after the date on which the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, certifies that security measures and audit mechanisms have been implemented to ensure that biometrics collected for a visa applicant during an interview using videoconference or similar technology are those of the visa applicant.

''(2) MOBILE VISA INTERVIEWS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Sate is authorized to carry out a pilot program to conduct visa interviews using mobile teams of consular officials after the date on which the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, certifies that such a pilot program may be carried out without jeopardizing the integrity of the visa interview process or the safety and security of consular officers.

''(B) FUNDING.—The Secretary of State shall use amounts otherwise appropriated to the Department of State to carry out the program authorized under subparagraph (A).''.

SA 1304. Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. MARTINEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. DETERMINATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CHILDREN UNDER THE HAITIAN REFUGEE IMMIGRATION FAIRNESS ACT OF 1998.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 902(d) of the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1998 (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) DETERMINATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CHILDREN.—

''(A) USE OF APPLICATION FILING DATE.—Determinations made under this subsection as to whether an individual is a child of a parent shall be made using the age and status of the individual on October 21, 1998.

''(B) APPLICATION SUBMISSION BY PARENT.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(C), an application under this subsection filed based on status as a child may be filed for the benefit of such child by a parent or guardian of the child, if the child is physically present in the United States on such filing date.''.

(b) NEW APPLICATIONS AND MOTIONS TO REOPEN.—

(1) NEW APPLICATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 902(a)(1)(A) of the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1998, an alien who is eligible for adjustment of status under such Act, as amended by subsection (a), may submit an application for adjustment of status under such Act not later than the later of—

(A) 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) 1 year after the date on which final regulations implementing this section, and the amendment made by subsection (a), are promulgated.

(2) MOTIONS TO REOPEN.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for the reopening and reconsideration of applications for adjustment of status under the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1998 that are affected by the amendment made by subsection (a).

(3) RELATIONSHIP OF APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ORDERS.—Section 902(a)(3) of the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1998 shall apply to an alien present in the United States who has been ordered excluded, deported, removed, or ordered to depart voluntarily, and who files an application under paragraph (1) or a motion under paragraph (2), in the same manner as such section 902(a)(3) applied to aliens filing applications for adjustment of status under such Act prior to April 1, 2000.

(c) INADMISSIBILITY DETERMINATION.—Section 902 of the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1998 (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) is amended in subsections (a)(1)(B) and (d)(1)(D) by inserting ''(6)(C)(i),'' after ''(6)(A),''.

SA 1305. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform

and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 409 (relating to numerical limitations), strike ''Section 214(g) of the Act'' and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 214(g) of the Act

In section 214(g)(1)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)(1)(D)) (as amended by section 409(a)(1)(B)), insert ''subject to paragraph (3),'' before ''under section 101(a)(15)(Y)(ii)(II)''.

In section 409(a), redesignate the handwritten paragraph (3) as paragraph (5).

In section 409(a), strike paragraph (2) (relating to the redesignation of paragraphs), and insert the following:

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (11) as paragraphs (4) through (13), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated), by striking ''paragraph (5)'' each place it appears and inserting ''paragraph (7)'';

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

In section 214(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)) (as amended by section 409(a)), insert after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) LIMITATION FOR FISH ROE TECHNICIANS.—The numerical limitation described in paragraph (1)(D) shall not apply to any nonimmigrant alien—

''(A) who is issued a visa or otherwise provided status under section 101(a)(15)(Y)(ii); and

''(B) who is employed, or has received an offer of employment, as a fish roe processor, a fish roe technician, or a supervisor of fish roe processing.''.

At the end of section 409, add the following:

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(11)(A)(ii), by striking ''subsection (g)(8)(C)'' and inserting ''subsection (g)(10)(C)''; and

(2) in subsection (j)(2), by striking ''subsection (g)(8)(A)'' and inserting ''subsection (g)(10)(A)''.

SA 1306. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 401(a)(1), redesignate subparagraphs (A) through (C) as subparagraphs (B) through (D), respectively, and insert before subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) the following:

(A) in clause (ii)(a), by inserting ''for employment as a fish roe processor or fish roe technician or'' before ''to perform agricultural labor or services'';

SA 1307. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 708 of the bill and insert the following:

SEC. 708. HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT TEST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall incorporate a knowledge and understanding of the meaning of the Oath of Allegiance provided by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1448) into the history and government test given to applicants for citizenship.

(b) TEST REDESIGN.—The goals of any naturalization test redesign undertaken by the Office of Citizenship of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services with respect to determining if a candidate for naturalization meets the requirements relating to the English language and the fundamentals of the history, and of the principles and form of government, of the United States, under section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, shall include that a candidate demonstrate—

(1) a sufficient understanding of the English language for usage in everyday life;

(2) an understanding of American common values and traditions, including the principles of the Constitution of the United States, the Pledge of Allegiance, respect for the flag of the United States, the National Anthem, and voting in public elections;

(3) an understanding of the history of the United States, including the key events, key persons, key ideas, and key documents that shaped the institutions and democratic heritage of the United States;

(4) an attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and the well-being and happiness of the people of the United States; and

(5) an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in the United States.

(c) REPORT.—The United States Citizenship and Immigration Service shall report to Congress on how the current test redesign is meeting the requirements described in subsection (b).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) KEY DOCUMENTS.—The term ''key documents'' means the documents that established or explained the foundational principles of democracy in the United States, including the United States Constitution and the amendments to the Constitution (particularly the Bill of Rights), the Declaration of Independence, the Federalist Papers, and the Emancipation Proclamation.

(2) KEY EVENTS.—The term ''key events'' means the critical turning points in the history of the United States , including the American Revolution, the Civil War, the world wars of the twentieth century, the civil rights movement, and the major court decisions and legislation that contributed to extending the promise of democracy in American life.

(3) KEY IDEAS.—The term ''key ideas'' means the ideas that shaped the democratic institutions and heritage of the United States, including the notion of equal justice under the law, freedom, individualism, human rights, and a belief in progress.

(4) KEY PERSONS.—The term ''key persons'' means the men and women who led the United States as founding fathers, elected officials, scientists, inventors, pioneers, advocates of equal rights, entrepreneurs, and artists.

SA 1308. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 420(a)(1)(A), redesignate clauses (i) through (iii) as clauses (ii) through (iv), respectively, and insert before clause (ii) (as so redesignated) the following:

(i) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking ''(D) The application'' and inserting the following:

''(D) SPECIFICATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The application''; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) VERIFICATION OF EMPLOYER ID NUMBER.—The application shall be denied unless the Secretary of Labor verifies that the employer identification number provided on the application is valid and accurate.'';

In section 420(a)(1)(A), strike clause (iv) (as so redesignated) and insert the following:

(iv) in subparagraph (G)(i)—

(I) by striking ''In the case of an application described in subparagraph (E)(ii), subject'' and inserting ''Subject'';

(II) in subclause (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(III) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) has posted, for a period of not less than 30 days, the available position on a public job bank website that—

''(aa) is accessible through the Internet;

''(bb) is national in scope;

''(cc) has been in operation on the Internet for at least the 18-month period ending on the date on which the position is posted;

''(dd) does not require a registration fee or membership fee to search the job postings of the website; and

''(ee) has a valid Federal or State employer identification number.'';

SA 1309. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. REPORT ON PROCESSING OF VISA APPLICATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to Congress that includes the following information with respect to each visa-issuing post operated by the Department of State where, during the preceding 12 months, the length of time between the submission of a request for a personal interview for a nonimmigrant visa and the date of the personal interview of the applicant exceeded, on average, 30 days:

(1) The number of visa applications submitted to the Department in each of the 3 preceding fiscal years, including information regarding each type of visa applied for.

(2) The number of visa applications that were approved in each of the 3 preceding fiscal years, including information regarding the number of each type of visa approved.

(3) The number of visa applications in each of the 3 preceding fiscal years that were subject to a Security Advisory opinion or similar specialized review.

(4) The average length of time between the submission of a visa application and the personal interview of the applicant in each of the 3 preceding fiscal years, including information regarding the type of visa applied for.

(5) The percentage of visa applicants who were refused a visa in each of the 3 preceding fiscal years, including information regarding the type of visa applied for.

(6) The number of consular officers processing visa applications in each of the 3 preceding fiscal years.

(7) A description of each new procedure or program designed to improve the processing of visa applications that was implemented in each of the 3 preceding fiscal years.

(8) A description of construction or improvement of facilities for processing visa applications in each of the 3 preceding fiscal years.

(9) A description of particular communications initiatives or outreach undertaken to communicate the visa application process to potential or actual visa applicants.

(10) An analysis of the facilities, personnel, information systems, and other factors affecting the duration of time between the submission of a visa application and the personal interview of the applicant, and the impact of those factors on the quality of the review of the application.

(11) Specific recommendations as to any additional facilities personnel, information systems, or other requirements that would allow the personal interview, where appropriate, to occur not more than 30 days following the submission of a visa application.

SA 1310. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VII, insert the following:

SEC. _____. GLOBAL HEALTH CARE COOPERATION.

(a) QUALIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRANTS.—Section 502(e) of this Act is amended by striking paragraph (6), and section 212(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

''(5) QUALIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRANTS.—

''(A) UNQUALIFIED PHYSICIANS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An alien who is a graduate of a medical school not accredited by a body or bodies approved for the purpose by the Secretary of Education (regardless of whether such school of medicine is in the United States) and who is coming to the United States principally to perform services as a member of the medical profession is inadmissible, unless the alien—

''(I) has passed parts I and II of the National Board of Medical Examiners Examination (or an equivalent examination as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services); and

''(II) is competent in oral and written English.

''(ii) EXCEPTION.—An alien who is a graduate of a medical school shall be considered to have passed parts I and II of the National Board of Medical Examiners if the alien was fully and permanently licensed to practice medicine in a State on January 9, 1978, and was practicing medicine in a State on that date.

''(B) UNCERTIFIED FOREIGN HEALTH-CARE WORKERS.—Subject to subsection (r), any alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing labor as a health-care worker, other than a physician, is inadmissible unless the alien presents to the consular officer, or, in the case of an adjustment of status, the Secretary of Homeland Security, a certificate from the Commission on Graduates of Foreign Nursing Schools, or a certificate from an equivalent independent credentialing organization approved by the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, verifying that—

''(i) the alien's education, training, license, and experience—

''(I) meet all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements for entry into the United States under the classification specified in the application;

''(II) are comparable with that required for an American health-care worker of the same type; and

''(III) are authentic and, in the case of a license, unencumbered;

''(ii) the alien has the level of competence in oral and written English considered by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, to be appropriate for health care work of the kind in which the alien will be engaged, as shown by an appropriate score on one or more nationally recognized, commercially available, standardized assessments of the applicant's ability to speak and write; and

''(iii) if a majority of States licensing the profession in which the alien intends to work recognize a test predicting the success on the profession's licensing or certification examination, the alien has passed such a test or has passed such an examination.

For purposes of clause (ii), determination of the standardized tests required and of the minimum scores that are appropriate are within the sole discretion of the Secretary of Health and Human Services and are not subject to further administrative or judicial review.

''(C) APPLICATION.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall apply to immigrants seeking admission or adjustment of status under paragraph (1) of section 203(b), including immigrants who receive 1 or more points under a merit-based evaluation system based on employment (including offers of employment and intended employment) or experience as a physician or a health care worker.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 212(r) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(R)) is amended by striking ''subsection (a)(5)(C)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (a)(5)(B)''.

(c) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 317 the following:

''SEC. 317A. TEMPORARY ABSENCE OF ALIENS PROVIDING HEALTH CARE IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall allow an eligible alien and the spouse or child of such alien to reside in a candidate country during the period that the eligible alien is working as a physician or other health care worker in a candidate country. During such period the eligible alien and such spouse or child shall be considered—

''(1) to be physically present and residing in the United States for purposes of naturalization under section 316(a); and

''(2) to meet the continuous residency requirements under section 316(b).

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CANDIDATE COUNTRY.—The term 'candidate country' means a country that the Secretary of State determines to be—

''(A) eligible for assistance from the International Development Association, in which the per capita income of the country is equal to or less than the historical ceiling of the International Development Association for the applicable fiscal year, as defined by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;

''(B) classified as a lower middle income country in the then most recent edition of the World Development Report for Reconstruction and Development published by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and having an income greater than the historical ceiling for International Development Association eligibility for the applicable fiscal year; or

''(C) qualified to be a candidate country due to special circumstances, including natural disasters or public health emergencies.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ALIEN.—The term 'eligible alien' means an alien who—

''(A) has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; and

''(B) is a physician or other healthcare worker.

''(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult with the Secretary of State in carrying out this section.

''(d) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of State shall publish—

''(1) a list of candidate countries not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Improving America's Security Act of 2007, and annually thereafter; and

''(2) an amendment to the list described in paragraph (1) at the time any country qualifies as a candidate country due to special circumstances under subsection (b)(1)(C).''.

(d) RULEMAKING.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to carry out the amendments made by this subsection.

(2) CONTENT.—The regulations promulgated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

(A) permit an eligible alien (as defined in section 317A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a)) and the spouse or child of the eligible alien to reside in a foreign country to work as a physician or other healthcare worker as described in subsection (a) of such section 317A for not less than a 12-month period and not more than a 24-month period, and shall permit the Secretary to extend such period for an additional period not to exceed 12 months, if the Secretary determines that such country has a continuing need for such a physician or other healthcare worker;

(B) provide for the issuance of documents by the Secretary to such eligible alien, and such spouse or child, if appropriate, to demonstrate that such eligible alien, and such spouse or child, if appropriate, is authorized to reside in such country under such section 317A; and

(C) provide for an expedited process through which the Secretary shall review applications for such an eligible alien to reside in a foreign country pursuant to subsection (a) of such section 317A if the Secretary of State determines a country is a candidate country pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(C) of such section 317A.

(e) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 101(a)(13)(C)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(13)(C)(ii)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''except in the case of an eligible alien, or the spouse or child of such alien, who is authorized to be absent from the United States under section 317A,''.

(2) DOCUMENTARY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 211(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1181(b)) is amended by inserting '', including an eligible alien authorized to reside in a foreign country under section 317A and the spouse or child of such eligible alien, if appropriate,'' after ''101(a)(27)(A),''.

(3) INELIGIBLE ALIENS.—Section 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I)) is amended by inserting ''other than an eligible alien authorized to reside in a foreign country under section 317A and the spouse or child of such eligible alien, if appropriate,'' after ''Act,''.

(4) NATURALIZATION.—Section 319(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1430(b)) is amended by inserting ''an eligible alien who is residing or has resided in a foreign country under section 317A'' before ''and (C)''.

(5) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 317 the following:

''Sec. 317A. Temporary absence of aliens providing health care in developing countries''.

(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection and the amendments made by this subsection.

(f) ATTESTATION BY HEALTH CARE WORKERS.—

(1) ATTESTATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 212(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) HEALTH CARE WORKERS WITH OTHER OBLIGATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing labor as a physician or other health care worker is inadmissible unless the alien submits to the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of State, as appropriate, an attestation that the alien is not seeking to enter the United States for such purpose during any period in which the alien has an outstanding obligation to the government of the alien's country of origin or the alien's country of residence.

''(ii) OBLIGATION DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term 'obligation' means an obligation incurred as part of a valid, voluntary individual agreement in which the alien received financial assistance to defray the costs of education or training to qualify as a physician or other health care worker in consideration for a commitment to work as a physician or other health care worker in the alien's country of origin or the alien's country of residence.

''(iii) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive a finding of inadmissibility under clause (i) if the Secretary determines that—

''(I) the obligation was incurred by coercion or other improper means;

''(II) the alien and the government of the country to which the alien has an outstanding obligation have reached a valid, voluntary agreement, pursuant to which the alien's obligation has been deemed satisfied, or the alien has shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the alien has been unable to reach such an agreement because of coercion or other improper means; or

''(III) the obligation should not be enforced due to other extraordinary circumstances, including undue hardship that would be suffered by the alien in the absence of a waiver.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION.—

(A) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) APPLICATION BY THE SECRETARY.—Not later than the effective date described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall begin to carry out subparagraph (D) of section 212(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)), including the requirement for the attestation and the granting of a waiver described in clause (iii) of such subparagraph (D), regardless of whether regulations to implement such subparagraph have been promulgated.

SA 1311. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. DEMINT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 1, strike ''the probationary benefits conferred by section 601(h) of this Act,''.

At the end of section 1, insert the following:

(e) CERTIFICATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF EXISTING PROVISIONS OF LAW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the requirements under subsection (a), at such time as any of the provisions described in paragraph (2) have been satisfied, the Secretary of the department or agency responsible for implementing the requirements shall certify to the President that the provisions of paragraph (2) have been satisfied.

(2) EXISTING LAW.—The following provisions of existing law shall be fully implemented, as previously directed by the Congress, prior to the certification set forth in paragraph (1):

(A) The Department has achieved and maintained operational control over the entire international land and maritime borders of the United States as required under the Secure Fence Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–367)

(B) The total miles of fence required under such Act have been constructed.

(C) All databases maintained by the Department which contain information on aliens shall be fully integrated as required by section 202 of the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002 (8 U.S.C. 1722).

(D) The Department shall have implemented a system to record the departure of every alien departing the United States and of matching records of departure with the records of arrivals in the United States through the US–VISIT program as required by section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1221 note).

(E) The provision of law that prevents States and localities from adopting ''sanctuary'' policies or that prevents State and local employees from communicating with the Department are fully enforced as required by section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373).

(F) The Department employs fully operational equipment at each port of entry and uses such equipment in a manner that allows unique biometric identifiers to be compared and visas, travel documents, passports, and other documents authenticated in accordance with section 303 of the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002 (8 U.S.C. 1732).

(G) An alien with a border crossing card is prevented from entering the United States until the biometric identifier on the border crossing card is matched against the alien as required by section 101(a)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(6)).

(H) Any alien who is likely to become a public charge is denied entry into the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)).

(f) PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW OF CERTIFICATIONS.—

(1) PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the President has received a certification, the President may approve or disapprove the certification. Any Presidential disapproval of a certification shall be made if the President believes that the requirements set forth have not been met.

(B) DISAPPROVAL.—In the event the President disapproves of a certification, the President shall deliver a notice of disapproval to the Secretary of the department or agency which made such certification. Such notice shall contain information that describes the manner in which the immigration enforcement measure was deficient, and the Secretary of the department or agency responsible for implementing said immigration enforcement measure shall continue to work to implement such measure.

(C) CONTINUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of the department or agency responsible for implementing an immigration enforcement measure shall consider such measure approved, unless the Secretary receives the notice set forth in subparagraph (B). In instances where an immigration enforcement measure is deemed approved, the Secretary shall continue to ensure that the immigration enforcement measure continues to be fully implemented as directed by the Congress.

(g) PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the final certification has been approved by the President, the President shall submit to the Congress a notice of Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement.

(2) REPORT.—The certification required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted with an accompanying report that details such information as is necessary for the Congress to make an independent determination that each of the immigration enforcement measures has been fully and properly implemented.

(3) CONTENTS.—The Presidential Certification required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted—

(A) in the Senate, to the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs; and the Committee on Finance; and

(B) in the House of Representatives, to the Speaker, the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security; and the Committee on Ways and Means.

(h) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement is made by the President under this section, subtitle A of title IV, title V, and subtitles A through C of title VI of this Act shall not be implemented unless, during the first 90-calendar day period of continuous session of the Congress after the date of the receipt by the Congress of such notice of Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement, the Congress passes a Resolution of Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement in accordance with this subsection, and such resolution is enacted into law.

(2) PROCEDURES APPLICABLE TO THE SENATE.—

(A) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—The provisions under this paragraph are enacted by Congress—

(i) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they are deemed a part of the rules of the Senate, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in the Senate in the case of a Resolution of Immigration Enforcement, and such provisions supersede other rules of the Senate only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(ii) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of the Senate) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

(B) INTRODUCTION; REFERRAL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the first day on which the Senate is in session following the day on which any notice of Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement is received by the Congress, a Resolution of Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement shall be introduced (by request) in the Senate by either the Majority Leader or Minority Leader. If such resolution is not introduced as provided in

the preceding sentence, any Senator may introduce such resolution on the third day on which the Senate is in session after the date or receipt of the Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement.

(ii) REFERRAL.—Upon introduction, a Resolution of Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement shall be referred jointly to each of the committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter referenced in the Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement by the President of the Senate. Upon the expiration of 60 days of continuous session after the introduction of the Resolution of Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement, each committee to which such resolution was referred shall make its recommendations to the Senate.

(iii) DISCHARGE.—If any committee to which is referred a resolution introduced under paragraph (2)(A) has not reported such resolution at the end of 60 days of continuous session of the Congress after introduction of such resolution, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such resolution, and such resolution shall be placed on the legislative calendar of the Senate.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—When each committee to which a resolution has been referred has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution described in paragraph (2)(C), it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for any Member of the Senate to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall not be debatable. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of such resolution is agreed to, such resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until the disposition of such resolution.

(ii) DEBATE.—Debate on a resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection with such resolution, shall be limited to not more than 30 hours, which shall be divided equally between Members favoring and Members opposing such resolution. A motion to further limit debate shall be in order and shall not be debatable. The resolution shall not be subject to amendment, to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to recommit such resolution shall not be in order.

(iii) FINAL VOTE.—Immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a resolution of approval, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of such debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on such resolution shall occur.

(iv) APPEALS.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a resolution of approval shall be limited to 1 hour of debate.

(D) RECEIPT OF A RESOLUTION FROM THE HOUSE.—If the Senate receives from the House of Representatives a Resolution of Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) The resolution of the House of Representatives shall not be referred to a committee and shall be placed on the Senate calendar, except that it shall not be in order to consider such resolution on the calendar received by the House of Representatives until such time as the Committee reports such resolution or is discharged from further consideration of a resolution, pursuant to this title.

(ii) With respect to the disposition by the Senate with respect to such resolution, on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the Senate with respect to such approval, a resolution from the House of Representatives with respect to such measures shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the Senate.

(3) PROCEDURES APPLICABLE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—The provisions of this paragraph are enacted by Congress—

(i) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such they are deemed a part of the rules of the House of Representatives, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in the House of Representatives in the case of Resolutions of Certification Immigration Enforcement, and such provisions supersede other rules of the House of Representatives only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(ii) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of the House of Representatives) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(B) INTRODUCTION; REFERRAL.—Resolutions of certification shall upon introduction, be immediately referred by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to the appropriate committee or committees of the House of Representatives. Any such resolution received from the Senate shall be held at the Speaker's table.

(C) DISCHARGE.—Upon the expiration of 60 days of continuous session after the introduction of the first resolution of certification with respect to any measure, each committee to which such resolution was referred shall be discharged from further consideration of such resolution, and such resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar, unless such resolution or an identical resolution was previously reported by each committee to which it was referred.

(D) CONSIDERATION.—It shall be in order for the Speaker to recognize a Member favoring a resolution to call up a resolution of certification after it has been on the appropriate calendar for 5 legislative days. When any such resolution is called up, the House of Representatives shall proceed to its immediate consideration and the Speaker shall recognize the Member calling up such resolution and a Member opposed to such resolution for 10 hours of debate in the House of Representatives, to be equally divided and controlled by such Members. When such time has expired, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion. No amendment to any such resolution shall be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

(E) RECEIPT OF RESOLUTION FROM SENATE.—If the House of Representatives receives from the Senate a Resolution of Certification Immigration Enforcement, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) Such resolution shall not be referred to a committee.

(ii) With respect to the disposition of the House of Representatives with respect to such resolution—

(I) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of the House of Representatives shall be the same as if no resolution from the Senate with respect to such resolution had been received; but

(II) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the House of Representatives with respect to such measures, a resolution from the Senate with respect to such resolution if the text is identical shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the House of Representatives.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT.—The term ''Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement'' means the certification required under this section, which is signed by the President, and reads as follows:

''Pursuant to the provisions set forth in section 1 of the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007 (the 'Act'), I do hereby transmit the Certification of Immigration Enforcement, certify that the borders of the United States are substantially secure, and certify that the following provisions of the Act have been fully satisfied, the measures set forth below are fully implemented, and the border security measures set forth in this section are fully operational.''.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The term ''certification'' means any of the certifications required under subsection (a).

(3) IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT MEASURE.—The term ''immigration enforcement measure'' means any of the measures required to be certified pursuant to subsection (a).

(4) RESOLUTION OF PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT.—The term ''Resolution of Presidential Certification of Immigration Enforcement'' means a joint resolution of the Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows:

''That Congress approves the certification of the President of the United States submitted to Congress on _____ that the national borders of the United States have been secured and, in accordance with the provisions of the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007.'',

---

SA 1312. Mr. BIDEN (for himself and Mr. LUGAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. RETURN OF TALENT PROGRAM.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Return of Talent Act''.

(b) RETURN OF TALENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 317 the following:

''SEC. 317A. TEMPORARY ABSENCE OF PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN THE RETURN OF TALENT PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall establish the Return of Talent Program to permit eligible aliens to temporarily return to the alien's country of citizenship in order to make a material contribution to that country if the country is engaged in post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction activities, for a period not exceeding 24 months, unless an exception is granted under subsection (d).

''(b) ELIGIBLE ALIEN.—An alien is eligible to participate in the Return of Talent Program established under subsection (a) if the alien meets the special immigrant description under section 101(a)(27)(N).

''(c) FAMILY MEMBERS.—The spouse, parents, siblings, and any minor children of an alien who participates in the Return of Talent Program established under subsection (a) may return to such alien's country of citizenship with the alien and reenter the United States with the alien.

''(d) EXTENSION OF TIME.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may extend the 24-month period referred to in subsection (a) upon a showing that circumstances warrant that an extension is necessary for post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction efforts.

''(e) RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS.—An immigrant described in section 101(a)(27)(N) who participates in the Return of Talent Program established under subsection (a), and the spouse, parents, siblings, and any minor children who accompany such immigrant to that immigrant's country of citizenship, shall be considered, during such period of participation in the program—

''(1) for purposes of section 316(a), physically present and residing in the United States for purposes of naturalization within the meaning of that section; and

''(2) for purposes of section 316(b), to meet the continuous residency requirements in that section.

''(f) OVERSIGHT AND ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall oversee and enforce the requirements of this section.''.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 317 the following:

''317A. Temporary absence of persons participating in the Return of Talent Program''.

(c) ELIGIBLE IMMIGRANTS.—Section 101(a)(27) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (L), by inserting a semicolon after ''Improvement Act of 1998'';

(2) in subparagraph (M), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(N) an immigrant who—

''(i) has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence;

''(ii) demonstrates an ability and willingness to make a material contribution to the post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction in the alien's country of citizenship; and

''(iii) as determined by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security—

''(I) is a citizen of a country in which Armed Forces of the United States are engaged, or have engaged in the 10 years preceding such determination, in combat or peacekeeping operations;

''(II) is a citizen of a country where authorization for United Nations peacekeeping operations was initiated by the United Nations Security Council during the 10 years preceding such determination; or

''(III) is a citizen of a country which received, during the preceding 2 years, funding from the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance of the United States Agency for International Development in response to a declared disaster in such country by the United States Ambassador, the Chief of the U.S. Mission, or the appropriate Assistant Secretary of State, that is beyond the ability of such country's response capacity and warrants a response by the United States Government.''.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to Congress that describes—

(1) the countries of citizenship of the participants in the Return of Talent Program established under section 317A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (b);

(2) the post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction efforts that benefitted, or were made possible, through participation in the program; and

(3) any other information that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services for fiscal year 2008, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section.

SA 1313. Mr. WEBB submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 282, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 283, line 8 and insert the following:

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF Z NONIMMIGRANT CATEGORY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(a)(15) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)), as amended by section 401(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(Z) subject to title VI of the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007, an alien who—

''(i)(I) has maintained a continuous physical presence in the United States since the date that is 4 years before the date of the enactment of the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007;

''(II) is employed, and seeks to continue performing labor, services, or education; and

''(III) the Secretary of Homeland Security determines has sufficient ties to a community in the United States, based on—

''(aa) whether the applicant has immediate relatives (as defined in section 201(b)(2)(A)) residing in the United States;

''(bb) the amount of cumulative time the applicant has lived in the United States;

''(cc) whether the applicant owns property in the United States;

''(dd) whether the applicant owns a business in the United States;

''(ee) the extent to which the applicant knows the English language;

''(ff) the applicant's work history in the United States;

''(gg) whether the applicant attended school (either primary, secondary, college, post-graduate) in the United States;

''(hh) the extent to which the applicant has a history of paying Federal and State income taxes;

''(ii) whether the applicant has been convicted of criminal activity in the United States; and

''(jj) whether the applicant has certifies his or her intention to ultimately become a United States citizen;

''(ii)(I) is the spouse or parent (65 years of age or older) of an alien described in clause (i);

''(II) was, during the 2-year period ending on the date on which the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007 was introduced in the Senate, the spouse of an alien who was subsequently classified as a Z nonimmigrant under this section, or is eligible for such classification, if—

''(aa) the termination of the relationship with such spouse was connected to domestic violence; and

''(bb) the spouse has been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty by the spouse or parent who is a Z nonimmigrant; or

''(III) is under 18 years of age at the time of application for nonimmigrant status under this subparagraph and was born to, or legally adopted by, a parent described in clause (i).''.

(2) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations, in accordance with the procedures set forth in sections 555, 556, and 557 of title 5, United States Code, which establish the precise system that the Secretary will use to make a determination under section 101(a)(15)(Z)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by paragraph (1).

On page 286, line 36, strike ''before January 1, 2007,'' and insert ''on the date that is 4 years before the date of the enactment of this Act''.

On page 286, line 43, strike ''be on January 1, 2007,'' and insert ''have been, on the date that is 4 years before the date of the enactment of this Act''.

On page 290, line 14, insert ''sufficient evidence that the alien resided in the United States for not less than 4 years before the date of the enactment of this Act and'' after ''submission of''.

On page 304, strike lines 2 through 20 and insert the following:

(ii) APPLICATION.—A Z–1 nonimmigrant's application for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence may be filed in person with a United States consulate outside the United States or with United States Citizenship and Immigration Services at any location in the United States designated by the Secretary.

SA 1314. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 290, line 34, strike ''and''.

On page 290, line 40, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

On page 290, line 41, insert the following:

(E) shall be eligible to serve as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

SA 1315. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 265, strike lines 17 through 25, and insert the following:

''(G) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the requirements of this paragraph shall apply only to merit-based, self-sponsored immigrants and not to merit-based, employer-sponsored immigrants described in paragraph (5).

''(H) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, any reference in this paragraph to a worldwide level of visas refers to the worldwide level specified in section 201(d)(1).'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (2), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''7.1 percent of such worldwide level'' and inserting ''4,200 of the worldwide level specified in section 201(d)(1)''; and

(B) by striking ''5,000'' and inserting ''2,500'';

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''7.1 percent of such worldwide level'' and inserting ''2,800 of the worldwide level specified in section 201(d)(1)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''3,000'' and inserting ''1,500''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following

''(5) MERIT-BASED EMPLOYER-SPONSORED IMMIGRANTS.—

''(A) PRIORITY WORKERS.—Visas shall first be made available in a number not to exceed 33.3 percent of the worldwide level specified in section 201(d)(5), to qualified immigrants who are aliens described in any of clauses (i) through (iii):

''(i) ALIENS WITH EXTRAORDINARY ABILITY.—An alien is described in this clause if—

''(I) the alien has extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics which has been demonstrated by sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in the field through extensive documentation;

''(II) the alien seeks to enter the United States to continue work in the area of extraordinary ability; and

''(III) the alien's entry into the United States will substantially benefit prospectively the United States.

''(ii) OUTSTANDING PROFESSORS AND RESEARCHERS.—An alien is described in this clause if—

''(I) the alien is recognized internationally as outstanding in a specific academic area;

''(II) the alien has at least 3 years of experience in teaching or research in the academic area; and

''(III) the alien seeks to enter the United States—

''(aa) for a tenured position (or tenure-track position) within an institution of higher education (as such term is defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)) to teach in the academic area;

''(bb) for a comparable position with an institution of higher education to conduct research in the area, or

''(cc) for a comparable position to conduct research in the area with a department, division, or institute of a private employer, if the department, division, or institute employs at least 3 individuals full-time in research activities and has achieved documented accomplishments in an academic field.

''(iii) CERTAIN MULTINATIONAL EXECUTIVES AND MANAGERS.—An alien is described in this clause if the alien, in the 3 years preceding the time of the alien's application for classification and admission into the United States under this paragraph, has been employed for at least 1 year by a firm or corporation or other legal entity or an affiliate or subsidiary thereof and the alien seeks to enter the United States in order to continue to render services to the same employer or to a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a capacity that is managerial or executive.

''(B) ALIENS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE PROFESSIONS HOLDING ADVANCED DEGREES OR ALIENS OF EXCEPTIONAL ABILITY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Visas shall be made available, in a number not to exceed 33.3 percent of the worldwide level specified in section 201(d)(5), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in subparagraph (A), to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.

''(ii) DETERMINATION OF EXCEPTIONAL ABILITY.—In determining under clause (i) whether an immigrant has exceptional ability, the possession of a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning or a license to practice or certification for a particular profession or occupation shall not by itself be considered sufficient evidence of such exceptional ability.

''(C) PROFESSIONALS.—

''(i) Visas shall be made available, in a number not to exceed 33.3 percent of the worldwide level specified in section 201(d)(5), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B), to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and who are members of the professions and who are not described in subparagraph (B).

''(D) LABOR CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—An immigrant visa may not be issued to an immigrant under subparagraph (B) or (C) until there has been a determination made by the Secretary of Labor that—

''(i) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified and available at the time such determination is made and at the place where the alien, or a substitute is to perform such skilled or unskilled labor; and

''(ii) the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed.

An employer may not substitute another qualified alien for the beneficiary of such determination unless an application to do so is made to and approved by the Secretary of Homeland Security.''.

(c) WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF MERIT-BASED EMPLOYER-SPONSORED IMMIGRANTS.—Section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151(d)), as amended by section 501(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) WORLDWIDE LEVEL FOR MERIT-BASED EMPLOYER-SPONSORED IMMIGRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The worldwide level of merit-based employer-sponsored immigrants under this paragraph for a fiscal year is equal to—

''(i) 140,000, plus

''(ii) the number computed under subparagraph (B).

''(B) ADDITIONAL NUMBER.—

''(i) FISCAL YEAR 2007.—The number computed under this subparagraph for fiscal year 2007 is zero.

''(ii) FISCAL YEAR 2008.—The number computed under this subparagraph for fiscal year 2008 is the difference (if any) between the worldwide level established under subparagraph (A) for the previous fiscal year and the number of visas issued under section 203(b)(2) during that fiscal year.''.

On page 262, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(c) PROVIDING EXEMPTIONS FROM MERIT-BASED LEVELS FOR VERY HIGHLY SKILLED IMMIGRANTS.—Section 201(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as amended by section 503(a)) (8 U.S.C. 1151(b)(1)) is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

''(H) Aliens who have earned a master's or higher degree from a United States institution of higher education, as such term is defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

''(I) Aliens who have earned a master's degree or higher degree in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics and have been working in a related field in the United States in a nonimmigrant status during the 3-year period preceding their application for an immigrant visa under section 203(b).

''(J) Aliens who—

''(i) have extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics which has been demonstrated by sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in the field through extensive documentation; and

''(ii) seek to enter the United States to continue work in the area of extraordinary ability.

''(K) Aliens who—

''(i) are recognized internationally as outstanding in a specific academic area;

''(ii) have at least 3 years of experience in teaching or research in the academic area; and

''(iii) who seek to enter the United States for—

''(I) a tenured position (or tenure-track position) within an institution of higher education to teach in the academic area;

''(II) a comparable position with an institution of higher education to conduct research in the area; or

''(III) a comparable position to conduct research in the area with a department, division, or institute of a private employer, if the department, division, or institute employs at least 3 persons full-time in research activities and has achieved documented accomplishments in an academic field.

''(L) Aliens who—

''(i) in the 3-year period preceding their application for an immigrant visa under section 203(b), have been employed for at least 1 year by a firm or corporation or other legal entity or an affiliate or subsidiary thereof; and

''(ii) who seek to enter the United States in order to continue to render services to the same employer or to a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a capacity that is managerial or executive.

''(M) The immediate relatives of an alien who is admitted as a merit-based employer-sponsored immigrant under subsection 203(b)(5).''.

On page 238, strike lines 13 through 24.

On page 239, strike lines 23 through 38 and insert the following:

(b) ENSURING ACCESS TO SKILLED WORKERS IN SPECIALTY OCCUPATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (6) of section 214(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)), as redesignated by section 409, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking '', until the number of aliens who are exempted from such numerical limitation during such year exceeds 20,000.'' and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) has earned a master's or higher degree in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics from an institution of higher education outside of the United States.''.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to any petition or visa application pending on the date of enactment of this Act and any petition or visa application filed on or after such date.

SA 1316. Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 401, add the following:

(d) SUNSET OF Y–1 VISA PROGRAM.—

(1) SUNSET.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, no alien may be issued a new visa as a Y–1 nonimmigrant (as defined in section 218B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 403) on the date that is 5 years after the date that the first such visa is issued.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) may be construed to affect issuance of visas to Y–2B nonimmigrants (as defined in such section 218B), under the AgJOBS Act of 2007, as added by subtitle C, under the H–2A visa program, or any visa program other than the Y–1 visa program.

SA 1317. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the table between page 262, line 36 and page 264, line 1, strike all the matter relating to ''Extended family'' and insert the following:

Extended family	Adult (21 or older) son or daughter of a United States citizen – **10 points** Adult (21 or older) son or daughter of a legal permanent resident – **10 pts** Sibling of a United States citizen or legal permanent resident – **10 pts** If an alien had applied for a family visa in any of the above categories after May 1, 2005 – **5 pts**	**15**
Total		**105**

SA 1318. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. ENSIGN, and Mr. COLEMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. TRANSMITTAL AND APPROVAL OF TOTALIZATION AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 233(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 433(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e)(1) Any agreement to establish a totalization arrangement which is entered into with another country under this section shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

''(A) the President, at least 90 calendar days before the date on which the President enters into the agreement, notifies each House of Congress of the President's intention to enter into the agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register,

''(B) the President transmits the text of such agreement to each House of Congress as provided in paragraph (2), and

''(C) an approval resolution regarding such agreement has passed both Houses of Congress and has been enacted into law.

''(2)(A) Whenever an agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is entered into, the President shall transmit to each House of Congress a document setting forth the final legal text of such agreement and including a report by the President in support of such agreement. The President's report shall include the following:

''(i) An estimate by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration of the effect of the agreement, in the short term and in the long term, on the receipts and disbursements under the social security system established by this title.

''(ii) A statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement and how such action will change or affect existing law.

''(iii) A statement describing whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated.

''(iv) A statement describing how and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving the purposes, policies, and objectives of this title.

''(v) An estimate by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, working in consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, of the number of individuals who may become eligible for any benefits under this title or who may otherwise be affected by the agreement.

''(vi) An assessment of the integrity of the retirement data and records (including birth, death, and marriage records) of the other country that is the subject of the agreement.

''(vii) An assessment of the ability of such country to track and monitor recipients of benefits under such agreement.

''(B) If any separate agreement or other understanding with another country (whether oral or in writing) relating to an agreement to establish a totalization arrangement under this section is not disclosed to Congress in the transmittal to Congress under this paragraph of the agreement to establish a totalization arrangement, then such separate agreement or understanding shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress under this section and shall have no force and effect under United States law.

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'approval resolution' means a joint resolution, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the proposed agreement entered into pursuant to section 233 of the Social Security Act between the United States and _____ establishing totalization arrangements between the social security system established by title II of such Act and the social security system of _____, transmitted to Congress by the President on _____, is hereby approved.', the first two blanks therein being filled with the name of the country with which the United States entered into the agreement, and the third blank therein being filled with the date of the transmittal of the agreement to Congress.

''(4) Whenever a document setting forth an agreement entered into under this section and the President's report in support of the agreement is transmitted to Congress pursuant to paragraph (2), copies of such document shall be delivered to both Houses of Congress on the same day and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session.

''(5) On the day on which a document setting forth the agreement is transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate pursuant to paragraph (1), an approval resolution with respect to such agreement shall be introduced (by request) in the House by the majority leader of the House, for himself or herself and the minority leader of the House, or by Members of the House designated by the majority leader and minority leader of the House; and shall be introduced (by request) in the Senate by the majority leader of the Senate, for himself or herself and the minority leader of the Senate, or by Members of the Senate designated by the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate. If either House is not in session on the day on which such an agreement is transmitted, the approval resolution with respect to such agreement shall be introduced in that House, as provided in the preceding sentence, on the first day thereafter on which that House is in session. The resolution introduced in the House of Representatives shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and the resolution introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Finance.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.—Section 233 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 433) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(f) BIENNIAL SSA REPORT ON IMPACT OF TOTALIZATION AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) REPORT.—For any totalization agreement transmitted to Congress on or after January 1, 2007, the Commissioner of Social Security shall submit a report to Congress and the Comptroller General that—

''(A) compares the estimates contained in the report submitted to Congress under clauses (i) and (v) of subsection (e)(2)(A) with respect to that agreement with the actual number of individuals affected by the agreement and the actual effect of the agreement on social security system receipts and disbursements; and

''(B) contains recommendations for adjusting the methods used to make the estimates.

''(2) DATES FOR SUBMISSION.—The report required under this subsection shall be provided not later than 2 years after the effective date of the totalization agreement that is the subject of the report and biennially thereafter.

''(g) GAO EVALUATION AND REPORT.—

''(1) EVALUATION OF INITIAL REPORT ON IMPACT OF TOTALIZATION AGREEMENTS.—With respect to each initial report regarding a totalization agreement submitted under subsection (f), the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an evaluation of the report that includes—

''(A) an evaluation of the procedures used for making the estimates required by subsection (e)(2)(A);

''(B) an evaluation of the procedures used for determining the actual number of individuals affected by the agreement and the effects of the totalization agreement on receipts and disbursements under the social security system; and

''(C) such recommendations as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of submission of an initial report regarding a totalization agreement under subsection (f), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the results of the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1).

''(3) DATA COLLECTION.—The Commissioner of Social Security shall collect and maintain the data necessary for the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct the evaluation required by paragraph (1).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to agreements establishing totalization arrangements entered into under section 233 of the Social Security Act which are transmitted to Congress on or after January 1, 2007.

SA 1319. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 214A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 622(b),

strike subsection (g) and all that follows through subparagraph (D) of subsection (j)(1), and insert the following:

''(g) FINE.—An alien granted a Z–A visa shall pay a fine of $1,000 to the Secretary.

''(h) TREATMENT OF ALIENS GRANTED A Z–A VISA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided under this subsection, an alien granted a Z–A visa or a Z–A dependent visa shall be considered to be an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence for purposes of any law other than any provision of this Act.

''(2) DELAYED ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL PUBLIC BENEFITS.—An alien granted a Z–A visa shall not be eligible, by reason of such status, for any form of assistance or benefit described in section 403(a) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613(a)) until 5 years after the date on which the alien is granted an adjustment of status under subsection (d).

''(3) TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT.—

''(A) PROHIBITION.—No alien granted a Z–A visa may be terminated from employment by any employer during the period of a Z–A visa except for just cause.

''(B) TREATMENT OF COMPLAINTS.—

''(i) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCESS.— The Secretary shall establish a process for the receipt, initial review, and disposition of complaints by aliens granted a Z–A visa who allege that they have been terminated without just cause. No proceeding shall be conducted under this subparagraph with respect to a termination unless the Secretary determines that the complaint was filed not later than 6 months after the date of the termination.

''(ii) INITIATION OF ARBITRATION.—If the Secretary finds that an alien has filed a complaint in accordance with clause (i) and there is reasonable cause to believe that the alien was terminated from employment without just cause, the Secretary shall initiate binding arbitration proceedings by requesting the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to appoint a mutually agreeable arbitrator from the roster of arbitrators maintained by such Service for the geographical area in which the employer is located. The procedures and rules of such Service shall be applicable to the selection of such arbitrator and to such arbitration proceedings. The Secretary shall pay the fee and expenses of the arbitrator, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose.

''(iii) ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS.— The arbitrator shall conduct the proceeding under this subparagraph in accordance with the policies and procedures promulgated by the American Arbitration Association applicable to private arbitration of employment disputes. The arbitrator shall make findings respecting whether the termination was for just cause. The arbitrator may not find that the termination was for just cause unless the employer so demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence. If the arbitrator finds that the termination was not for just cause, the arbitrator shall make a specific finding of the number of days or hours of work lost by the employee as a result of the termination. The arbitrator shall have no authority to order any other remedy, including reinstatement, back pay, or front pay to the affected employee. Not later than 30 days after the date of the conclusion of the arbitration proceeding, the arbitrator shall transmit the findings in the form of a written opinion to the parties to the arbitration and the Secretary. Such findings shall be final and conclusive, and no official or court of the United States shall have the power or jurisdiction to review any such findings.

''(iv) EFFECT OF ARBITRATION FINDINGS.—If the Secretary receives a finding of an arbitrator that an employer has terminated the employment of an alien who is granted a Z–A visa without just cause, the Secretary shall credit the alien for the number of days of work not performed during such period of termination for the purpose of determining if the alien meets the qualifying employment requirement of subsection (f)(2).

''(v) TREATMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEES.— Each party to an arbitration under this subparagraph shall bear the cost of their own attorney's fees for the arbitration.

''(vi) NONEXCLUSIVE REMEDY.—The complaint process provided for in this subparagraph is in addition to any other rights an employee may have in accordance with applicable law.

''(vii) EFFECT ON OTHER ACTIONS OR PROCEEDINGS.—Any finding of fact or law, judgment, conclusion, or final order made by an arbitrator in the proceeding before the Secretary shall not be conclusive or binding in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding between the employee and the employee's current or prior employer brought before an arbitrator, administrative agency, court, or judge of any State or the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts, except that the arbitrator's specific finding of the number of days or hours of work lost by the employee as a result of the employment termination may be referred to the Secretary pursuant to clause (iv).

''(4) RECORD OF EMPLOYMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each employer of an alien who is granted a Z–A visa shall annually—

''(i) provide a written record of employment to the alien; and

''(ii) provide a copy of such record to the Secretary.

''(B) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that an employer of an alien granted a Z–A visa has failed to provide the record of employment required under subparagraph (A) or has provided a false statement of material fact in such a record, the employer shall be subject to a civil money penalty in an amount not to exceed $1,000 per violation.

''(ii) LIMITATION.—The penalty applicable under clause (i) for failure to provide records shall not apply unless the alien has provided the employer with evidence of employment authorization granted under this subsection.

''(i) TERMINATION OF A GRANT OF Z–A VISA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may terminate a Z–A visa or a Z–A dependent visa granted to an alien only if the Secretary determines that the alien is deportable.

''(2) GROUNDS FOR TERMINATION.—Prior to the date that an alien granted a Z–A visa or a Z–A dependent visa becomes eligible for adjustment of status described in subsection (j), the Secretary may deny adjustment to permanent resident status and provide for termination of the alien's Z–A visa or Z–A dependent visa if—

''(A) the Secretary finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the grant of a Z–A visa was the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation (as described in section 212(a)(6)(C)(i)); or

''(B) the alien—

''(i) commits an act that makes the alien inadmissible to the United States as an immigrant, except as provided under subsection (c)(4);

''(ii) is convicted of a felony or 3 or more misdemeanors committed in the United States;

''(iii) is convicted of an offense, an element of which involves bodily injury, threat of serious bodily injury, or harm to property in excess of $500; or

''(iv) in the case of an alien granted a Z–A visa, fails to perform the agricultural employment described in subsection (j)(1)(A) unless the alien was unable to work in agricultural employment due to the extraordinary circumstances described in subsection (j)(1)(A)(iii).

''(3) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to ensure that the alien granted a Z–A visa complies with the qualifying agricultural employment described in subsection (j)(1)(A) at the end of the 5-year work period, which may include submission of an application pursuant to this subsection.

''(j) ADJUSTMENT TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE.—

''(1) Z–A VISA.—Except as provided in this subsection, the Secretary shall award the maximum number of points available pursuant to section 203(b)(1) and adjust the status of an alien granted a Z–A visa to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence under this Act, if the Secretary determines that the following requirements are satisfied:

''(A) QUALIFYING EMPLOYMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), the alien has performed at least—

''(I) 5 years of agricultural employment in the United States for at least 100 work days per year, during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the AgJOBS Act of 2007; or

''(II) 3 years of agricultural employment in the United States for at least 150 work days per year, during the 3-year period beginning on such date of the enactment.

''(ii) FOUR-YEAR PERIOD OF EMPLOYMENT.—An alien shall be considered to meet the requirements of clause (i) if the alien has performed 4 years of agricultural employment in the United States for at least 150 workdays during 3 years of those 4 years and at least 100 workdays during the remaining year, during the 4-year period beginning on such date of the enactment.

''(iii) EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—In determining whether an alien has met the requirement of clause (i), the Secretary may credit the alien with not more than 12 additional months to meet the requirement of that clause if the alien was unable to work in agricultural employment due to—

''(I) pregnancy, injury, or disease, if the alien can establish such pregnancy, disabling injury, or disease through medical records;

''(II) illness, disease, or other special needs of a minor child, if the alien can establish such illness, disease, or special needs through medical records; or

''(III) severe weather conditions that prevented the alien from engaging in agricultural employment for a significant period of time.

''(B) PROOF.—An alien may demonstrate compliance with the requirements of subparagraph (A) by submitting—

''(i) the record of employment described in subsection (h)(4); or

''(ii) such documentation as may be submitted under subsection (d)(3).

''(C) APPLICATION PERIOD.—Not later than 8 years after the date of the enactment of the AgJOBS Act of 2007, the alien must—

''(i) apply for adjustment of status; or

''(ii) renew the alien's Z visa status as described in section 601(k)(2).

''(D) FINE.—The alien pays to the Secretary a fine of $4,000, such fine may be reduced by $1,000 for every year of qualifying agricultural employment under this subsection, up to a maximum of 3 years credit.

SA 1320. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for

comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In subsection (c)(4)(A) of section 214A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 622(b), strike ''The provisions of paragraphs (5), (6)(A), (7), and (9) of section 212(a) shall not apply.'' and insert ''The provisions of paragraphs (5), (6)(A), (7), and (9)(B) of section 212(a) shall not apply.''.

SA 1321. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 1, insert the following:

(e) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), not later than 54 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a written certification to the President and Congress that—

(A) the border security and other measures described in subsection (a) are funded, in place, and in operation; and

(B) there are fewer than 1,000,000 individuals who are unlawfully present in the United States.

(2) EFFECT OF LACK OF CERTIFICATION.—If the border security and other measures described in subsection (a) are not funded, are not in place, are not in operation, or if more than 1,000,000 individuals are unlawfully present in the United States on the date that is 54 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, title VI shall be immediately repealed and the legal status and probationary benefits granted to aliens under such title shall be terminated.

SA 1322. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 204. TERRORIST BARS.

(a) DEFINITION OF GOOD MORAL CHARACTER.—Section 101(f) (8 U.S.C. 1101(f)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) an alien described in section 212(a)(3) or 237(a)(4), as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General based upon any relevant information or evidence, including classified, sensitive, or national security information;'';

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking ''(as defined in subsection (a)(43))'' and inserting the following: '', regardless of whether the crime was defined as an aggravated felony under subsection (a)(43) at the time of the conviction, unless—

''(A) the person completed the term of imprisonment and sentence not later than 10 years before the date of application; and

''(B) the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General waives the application of this paragraph; or''; and

(3) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (9), by striking ''a finding that for other reasons such person is or was not of good moral character'' and inserting the following: ''a discretionary finding for other reasons that such a person is or was not of good moral character. In determining an applicant's moral character, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General may take into consideration the applicant's conduct and acts at any time and are not limited to the period during which good moral character is required.''.

(b) PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—Section 204(b) (8 U.S.C. 1154(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''A petition may not be approved under this section if there is any administrative or judicial proceeding (whether civil or criminal) pending against the petitioner that could directly or indirectly result in the petitioner's denaturalization or the loss of the petitioner's lawful permanent resident status.''.

(c) CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 216(e) (8 U.S.C. 1186a(e)) is amended by inserting ''if the alien has had the conditional basis removed pursuant to this section'' before the period at the end.

(2) CERTAIN ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS.—Section 216A(e) (8 U.S.C. 1186b(e)) is amended by inserting ''if the alien has had the conditional basis removed pursuant to this section'' before the period at the end.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF NATURALIZATION APPLICATIONS.—Section 310(c) (8 U.S.C. 1421(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting '', not later than 120 days after the Secretary of Homeland Security's final determination,'' after ''may''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''Except that in any proceeding, other than a proceeding under section 340, the court shall review for substantial evidence the administrative record and findings of the Secretary of Homeland Security regarding whether an alien is a person of good moral character, understands and is attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, or is well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States. The petitioner shall have the burden of showing that the Secretary's denial of the application was contrary to law.''.

(e) PERSONS ENDANGERING NATIONAL SECURITY.—Section 316 (8 U.S.C. 1427) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) PERSONS ENDANGERING THE NATIONAL SECURITY.—A person may not be naturalized if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines, based upon any relevant information or evidence, including classified, sensitive, or national security information, that the person was once an alien described in section 212(a)(3) or 237(a)(4).''.

(f) CONCURRENT NATURALIZATION AND REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—Section 318 (8 U.S.C. 1429) is amended by striking ''the Attorney General if'' and all that follows and inserting: ''the Secretary of Homeland Security or any court if there is pending against the applicant any removal proceeding or other proceeding to determine the applicant's inadmissibility or deportability, or to determine whether the applicant's lawful permanent resident status should be rescinded, regardless of when such proceeding was commenced. The findings of the Attorney General in terminating removal proceedings or canceling the removal of an alien under this Act shall not be deemed binding in any way upon the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the question of whether such person has established eligibility for naturalization in accordance with this title.''.

(g) DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION.—Section 336(b) (8 U.S.C. 1447(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) REQUEST FOR HEARING BEFORE DISTRICT COURT.—If there is a failure to render a final administrative decision under section 335 before the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security completes all examinations and interviews required under such section, the applicant may apply to the district court for the district in which the applicant resides for a hearing on the matter. The Secretary shall notify the applicant when such examinations and interviews have been completed. Such district court shall only have jurisdiction to review the basis for delay and remand the matter, with appropriate instructions, to the Secretary for the Secretary's determination on the application.''.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section—

(1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall apply to any act that occurred on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 204A. FEDERAL AFFIRMATION OF IMMIGRATION LAW ENFORCEMENT BY STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS OF STATES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Law enforcement personnel of a State, or a political subdivision of a State, have the inherent authority of a sovereign entity to investigate, apprehend, arrest, detain, or transfer to Federal custody (including the transportation across State lines to detention centers) an alien for the purpose of assisting in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States in the normal course of carrying out the law enforcement duties of such personnel. This State authority has never been displaced or preempted by Federal law.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require law enforcement personnel of a State or a political subdivision to assist in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States.

SEC. 204B. LISTING OF IMMIGRATION VIOLATORS IN THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER DATABASE.

(a) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (3), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the head of the National Crime Information Center of the Department of Justice the information that the Secretary has or maintains related to any alien—

(A) against whom a final order of removal has been issued;

(B) who enters into a voluntary departure agreement, or is granted voluntary departure by an immigration judge, whose period for departure has expired under subsection (a)(3) of section 240B of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229c), subsection (b)(2) of such section 240B, or who has violated a condition of a voluntary departure agreement under such section 240B;

(C) whom a Federal immigration officer has confirmed to be unlawfully present in the United States; and

(D) whose visa has been revoked.

(2) REMOVAL OF INFORMATION.—The head of the National Crime Information Center shall promptly remove any information provided by the Secretary under paragraph (1) related to an alien who is lawfully admitted to enter or remain in the United States.

(3) PROCEDURE FOR REMOVAL OF ERRONEOUS INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the head of the National Crime Information Center, shall develop and implement a procedure by which an alien may petition the Secretary or head of the National Crime Information Center, as appropriate, to remove any erroneous information provided by the Secretary under paragraph (1) related to such alien.

(B) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO RECEIVE NOTICE.—Under procedures developed under

subparagraph (A), failure by the alien to receive notice of a violation of the immigration laws shall not constitute cause for removing information provided by the Secretary under paragraph (1) related to such alien, unless such information is erroneous.

(C) INTERIM PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding the 180-day period set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary may not provide the information required under paragraph (1) until the procedures required under this paragraph have been developed and implemented.

(b) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER DATABASE.—Section 534(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

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

''(4) acquire, collect, classify, and preserve records of violations of the immigration laws of the United States; and''.

SA 1333. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 78, line 6, strike ''(b)'' and insert the following:

(b) FEDERAL AFFIRMATION OF IMMIGRATION LAW ENFORCEMENT BY STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS OF STATES.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Law enforcement personnel of a State, or a political subdivision of a State, have the inherent authority of a sovereign entity to investigate, apprehend, arrest, detain, or transfer to Federal custody (including the transportation across State lines to detention centers) an alien for the purpose of assisting in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States in the normal course of carrying out the law enforcement duties of such personnel. This State authority has never been displaced or preempted by Federal law.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to require law enforcement personnel of a State or a political subdivision to assist in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States.

(c) LISTING OF IMMIGRATION VIOLATORS IN THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER DATABASE.—

(1) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (C), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the head of the National Crime Information Center of the Department of Justice the information that the Secretary has or maintains related to any alien—

(i) against whom a final order of removal has been issued;

(ii) who enters into a voluntary departure agreement, or is granted voluntary departure by an immigration judge, whose period for departure has expired under subsection (a)(3) of section 240B of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229c), subsection (b)(2) of such section 240B, or who has violated a condition of a voluntary departure agreement under such section 240B;

(iii) whom a Federal immigration officer has confirmed to be unlawfully present in the United States; and

(iv) whose visa has been revoked.

(B) REMOVAL OF INFORMATION.—The head of the National Crime Information Center shall promptly remove any information provided by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) related to an alien who is lawfully admitted to enter or remain in the United States.

(C) PROCEDURE FOR REMOVAL OF ERRONEOUS INFORMATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the head of the National Crime Information Center, shall develop and implement a procedure by which an alien may petition the Secretary or head of the National Crime Information Center, as appropriate, to remove any erroneous information provided by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) related to such alien.

(ii) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO RECEIVE NOTICE.—Under procedures developed under clause (i), failure by the alien to receive notice of a violation of the immigration laws shall not constitute cause for removing information provided by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) related to such alien, unless such information is erroneous.

(iii) INTERIM PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding the 180-day period set forth in subparagraph (A), the Secretary may not provide the information required under subparagraph (A) until the procedures required under this paragraph have been developed and implemented.

(2) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER DATABASE.—Section 534(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

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

''(4) acquire, collect, classify, and preserve records of violations of the immigration laws of the United States; and''.

(d)

SA 1324. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 149, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 150, line 2.

On page 151, line 9, strike ''two additional two-year periods'' and insert ''an indefinite number of subsequent 2-year periods if the alien remains outside the United States for the 12-month period immediately prior to each 2-year period of admission''.

On page 151, strike lines 15 through 29 and insert the following:

''(2) FAMILY MEMBERS.—A Y–1 nonimmigrant—

''(A) may not be accompanied by his or her spouse or other dependants while in the United States under such status; and

''(B) may not sponsor a family member to enter the United States through a 'parent visitor visa' authorized under section 214(s) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 506(b) of this Act.

SA 1325. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 282, strike line 15 and all that follows through ''January 1, 2007'' on page 283, line 14, and insert the following:

''(Z) subject to title VI of the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007, an alien who—

''(i) is physically present in the United States, has maintained continuous physical presence in the United States since January 7, 2004, is employed, and seeks to continue performing labor, services or education;

''(ii) is physically present in the United States, has maintained continuous physical presence in the United States since January 7, 2004, and such alien—

''(I) is the spouse or parent (65 years of age or older) of an alien described in clause (i); or

''(II) was, within 2 years of the date on which the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007 was introduced in the Senate, the spouse of an alien who was subsequently classified as a Z nonimmigrant under this section, or is eligible for such classification, if—

''(aa) the termination of the relationship with such spouse was connected to domestic violence; and

''(bb) the spouse has been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty by the spouse or parent, who is a Z nonimmigrant; or

''(iii) is under 18 years of age at the time of application for nonimmigrant status under this subparagraph, is physically present in the United States, has maintained continuous physical presence in the United States since May 1, 2005, and was born to or legally adopted by at least 1 parent who is at the time of application described in clause (i) or (ii).''.

(c) PRESENCE IN THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The alien shall establish that the alien was not lawfully present in the United States on May 1, 2005

SA 1326. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VI, insert the following:

SEC. 6___. NUMERICAL LIMITATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, not more than 13,000,000 visas authorized to be issued under this title may be issued to aliens described under section 101(a)(15)(Z) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 601 of this Act.

SA 1327. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 302, line 34, strike ''(r)'' and insert the following:

(r) NUMERICAL LIMITATION.—Section 214(g) (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)), as amended by title IV, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) Notwithstanding any provision of the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007, not more than 13,000,000 visas authorized to be issued under title VI of such Act may be issued to aliens described under section 101(a)(15)(Z).''.

(s)

SA 1328. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 342, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

Subtitle D—Self-Sufficiency

SEC. 631. REQUIREMENT FOR GUARANTEE OF SELF-SUFFICIENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 213A the following:

"SEC. 213B. REQUIREMENT FOR GUARANTEE OF SELF-SUFFICIENCY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the eligibility requirements under section 601(e) of the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007, an alien applying for Z nonimmigrant status under section 601 of such Act shall submit a signed a guarantee of self-sufficiency in accordance with this section.

''(b) ENFORCEABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No guarantee of self-sufficiency may be accepted by the Secretary or by any consular officer to establish that an alien is not excludable as a public charge under section 212(a)(4) unless such guarantee is executed as a contract—

''(A) which is legally enforceable against the guarantor of self-sufficiency by the alien seeking immigration benefits, the Federal Government, and by any State (or any political subdivision of such State) providing any means-tested public benefits program during the 10-year period beginning on the date on which the alien last received any such immigration benefit;

''(B) in which the guarantor of self-sufficiency agrees to financially support the alien to prevent the alien from becoming a public charge; and

''(C) in which the guarantor of self-sufficiency agrees to submit to the jurisdiction of any Federal or State court for the purpose of actions brought under subsection (e)(2).

''(2) SCOPE.—A contract under paragraph (1) shall be enforceable with respect to means-tested public benefits (other than the benefits described in subsection (g)) provided to the alien before the alien is naturalized as a United States citizen under chapter 2 of title III.

''(c) FORMS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall develop a form of guarantee of self-sufficiency that is consistent with the provisions under this section.

''(d) REMEDIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Remedies available to enforce a guarantee of self-sufficiency under this section include—

''(A) any of the remedies described in section 3201, 3203, 3204, or 3205 of title 28, United States Code;

''(B) an order for specific performance and payment of legal fees and other costs of collection; and

''(C) corresponding remedies available under State law.

''(2) COLLECTION.—A Federal agency may seek to collect amounts owed under this section in accordance with the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

''(e) NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The guarantor of self-sufficiency shall notify the Secretary and the State in which the guaranteed alien is a resident not later than 30 days after any change of address of the guarantor of self-sufficiency during the period specified in subsection (b)(2).

''(2) PENALTY.—Any person subject to the requirement of paragraph (1) who fails to satisfy such requirement shall be subject to a civil penalty of—

''(A) not less than $25,000 and not more than $50,000; or

''(B) if such failure occurs with knowledge that the alien has received any means-tested public benefit, not less than $50,000 or more than $100,000.

''(f) REIMBURSEMENT OF GOVERNMENT EXPENSES.—

''(1) REQUEST.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon notification that a guaranteed alien has received any benefit under any means-tested public benefits program, the appropriate Federal, State, or local official shall request reimbursement by the guarantor of self-sufficiency equal to the amount of assistance received by such alien.

''(B) RULEMAKING.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out subparagraph (A).

''(2) CIVIL ACTION.—If the appropriate Federal, State, or local agency has not received a response from the guarantor of self-sufficiency within 45 days after requesting reimbursement, which indicates that such guarantor is willing to commence payments, an action may be brought against the guarantor of self-sufficiency to enforce the terms of the guarantee of self-sufficiency.

''(3) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH REPAYMENT TERMS.—If the guarantor of self-sufficiency fails to comply with the repayment terms established by such agency, the agency may, not earlier than 60 days after such failure, bring an action against the guarantor of self-sufficiency pursuant to the affidavit of support.

''(4) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—No cause of action may be brought under this subsection later than 50 years after the alien last received a benefit under any means-tested public benefits program.

''(5) COLLECTION AGENCIES.—If a Federal, State, or local agency requests reimbursement under this subsection from the guarantor of self-sufficiency in the amount of assistance provided, or brings an action against the guarantor of self-sufficiency pursuant to the affidavit of support, the appropriate agency may appoint or hire an individual or other person to act on behalf of such agency acting under the authority of law for purposes of collecting any moneys owed. Nothing in this subsection shall preclude any appropriate Federal, State, or local agency from directly requesting reimbursement from a guarantor of self-sufficiency for the amount of assistance provided, or from bringing an action against a guarantor of self-sufficiency pursuant to an affidavit of support.

''(g) BENEFITS NOT SUBJECT TO REIMBURSEMENT.—A guarantor shall not be liable under this section for the reimbursement of any of the following benefits provided to a guaranteed alien:

''(1) Emergency medical services under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

''(2) Short-term, non-cash, in-kind emergency disaster relief.

''(3) Assistance or benefits under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

''(4) Assistance or benefits under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.).

''(5) Public health assistance for immunizations with respect to immunizable diseases and for testing and treatment of symptoms of communicable diseases whether or not such symptoms are caused by a communicable disease.

''(6) Payments for foster care and adoption assistance under part B of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) for a child, but only if the foster or adoptive parent or parents of such child are not otherwise ineligible pursuant to section 4403 of this Act.

''(7) Programs, services, or assistance (including soup kitchens, crisis counseling and intervention, and short-term shelter) specified by the Attorney General, in the Attorney General's sole and unreviewable discretion after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies and departments, which—'

''(A) deliver in-kind services at the community level, including through public or private nonprofit agencies;

''(B) do not condition the provision of assistance, the amount of assistance provided, or the cost of assistance provided on the individual recipient's income or resources; and

''(C) are necessary for the protection of life or safety.

''(8) Programs of student assistance under titles IV, V, IX, and X of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

''(9) Benefits under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.).

''(10) Means-tested programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–10).

''(11) Benefits under the Job Training Partnership Act (Public Law 97–300).

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) GUARANTOR OF SELF-SUFFICIENCY.—The term 'guarantor' means an individual who—

''(A) seeks a benefit under title IV or VI of the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007, or under any amendment made under either such title;

''(B) is at least 18 years of age; and

''(C) is domiciled in any of the 50 States or in the District of Columbia.

''(2) MEANS-TESTED PUBLIC BENEFITS PROGRAM.—The term 'means-tested public benefits program' means a program of public benefits (including cash, medical, housing, food assistance, and social services) administered by the Federal Government, a State, or a political subdivision of a State in which the eligibility of an individual, household, or family eligibility unit for benefits under the program or the amount of such benefits is determined on the basis of income, resources, or financial need of the individual, household, or unit.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 213A the following:

''Sec. 213B. Requirement for guarantee of self-sufficiency.''.

SA 1329. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 339, line 38, strike ''not''.

SA 1330. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 285, lines 19 through 21, strike ''(6)(B), (6)(C)(i), (6)(C)(ii), (6)(D), (6)(F), (6)(G), (7), (9)(B), (9)(C)(i)(I),'' and insert ''(6)(C)(i), (6)(C)(ii), (6)(D), (6)(G), (7),''.

SA 1331. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER)) to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title VII, add the following:

SEC. _____. EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.

Nothing is this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, may be construed to modify any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which prohibits illegal aliens from qualifying for the earned income tax credit under section 32 of such Code.

SA 1332. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A petition by an employer for any visa authorizing employment in the United States may not be approved until the employer has provided written certification, under penalty of perjury, to the Secretary of Labor that—

(1) the employer has not provided a notice of a mass layoff pursuant to the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (29 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.) during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien is to be hired; and

(2) the employer does not intend to provide a notice of a mass layoff pursuant to such Act.

(b) EFFECT OF MASS LAYOFF.—If an employer provides a notice of a mass layoff pursuant to such Act after a visa described in subsection (a) has been approved, such visa shall expire on the date that is 60 days after the date on which such notice is provided.

(c) EXEMPTION.—An employer shall be exempt from the requirements under this section if the employer provides written certification, under penalty of perjury, that the total number of the employer's employees in the United States will not be reduced as a result of a mass layoff.

SA 1303. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 51, line 37, and insert the following:

SEC. 204. INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF GANG MEMBERS.

(a) DEFINITION OF CRIMINAL GANG.—Section 101(a) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (51) the following:

''(52)(A) The term 'criminal gang' means an ongoing group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons—

''(i) that has, as 1 of its primary purposes, the commission of 1 or more of the criminal offenses described in subparagraph (B); and

''(ii) the members of which engage, or have engaged within the past 5 years, in a continuing series of offenses described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) Offenses described in this subparagraph, whether in violation of Federal or State law or in violation of the law of a foreign country, regardless of whether charged, and regardless of whether the conduct occurred before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, are—

''(i) a felony drug offense (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802));

''(ii) a felony offense involving firearms or explosives, including a violation of section 924(c), 924(h), or 931 of title 18 (relating to purchase, ownership, or possession of body armor by violent felons);

''(iii) an offense under section 274 (relating to bringing in and harboring certain aliens), section 277 (relating to aiding or assisting certain aliens to enter the United States), or section 278 (relating to the importation of an alien for immoral purpose);

''(iv) a felony crime of violence as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code, which is punishable by a sentence of imprisonment of 5 years or more, including first degree murder, arson, possession, brandishment, or discharge of firearm in connection with crime of violence or drug trafficking offense, use of a short-barreled or semi-automatic weapons, use of a machine gun, murder of individuals involved in aiding a Federal investigation, kidnapping, bank robbery if death results or a hostage is kidnapped, sexual exploitation and other abuse of children, selling or buying of children, activities relating to material involving the sexual exploitation of a minor, activities relating to material constituting or containing child pornography, or illegal transportation of a minor;

''(v) a crime involving obstruction of justice; tampering with or retaliating against a witness, victim, or informant; or burglary;

''(vi) any conduct punishable under sections 1028 and 1029 of title 18, United States Code (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents or access devices), sections 1581 through 1594 of such title (relating to peonage, slavery and trafficking in persons), section 1952 of such title (relating to interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises), section 1956 of such title (relating to the laundering of monetary instruments), section 1957 of such title (relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity), or sections 2312 through 2315 of such title (relating to interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicles or stolen property); and

''(vii) a conspiracy to commit an offense described in clause (i) through (vi).''.

(b) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (L); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

''(F) ALIENS ASSOCIATED WITH CRIMINAL GANGS.—Unless the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General waives the application of this subparagraph, any alien who a consular officer, the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Homeland Security knows or has reason to believe participated in a criminal gang (as defined in section 204(a)) knowing or having reason to know that such participation promoted, furthered, aided, or supported the illegal activity of the gang, is inadmissible.''.

(c) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) ALIENS ASSOCIATED WITH CRIMINAL GANGS.—Any alien, in or admitted to the United States, who at any time has participated in a criminal gang (as defined in section 204(a)), knowing or having reason to know that such participation promoted, furthered, aided, or supported the illegal activity of the gang is deportable. The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General may waive the application of this subparagraph.''.

(d) TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.—Section 244 (8 U.S.C. 1254a) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Attorney General'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security'';

(2) in subparagraph (c)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking '', or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) the alien participates in, or at any time after admission has participated in, the activities of a criminal gang as defined in section 204(a).''; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''Subject to paragraph (3), such'' and inserting ''Such''; and

(ii) by striking ''(under paragraph (3))'';

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3); and

(D) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by adding at the end the following: ''The Secretary of Homeland Security may detain an alien provided temporary protected status under this section whenever appropriate under any other provision.''.

(e) INCREASED PENALTIES BARRING THE ADMISSION OF CONVICTED SEX OFFENDERS FAILING TO REGISTER AND REQUIRING DEPORTATION OF SEX OFFENDERS FAILING TO REGISTER.—

(1) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(2)(A)(i) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)), as amended by section 209(a)(3), is further amended—

(A) in subclause (II), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subclause (III), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subclause (III) the following:

''(IV) a violation of section 2250 of title 18, United States Code (relating to failure to register as a sex offender); or''.

(2) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a)(2)(A)(i) (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)(A)(i)) is amended—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking '', and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subclause (II), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) a violation of section 2250 of title 18, United States Code (relating to failure to register as a sex offender).''.

(f) PRECLUDING ADMISSIBILITY OF ALIENS CONVICTED OF SERIOUS CRIMINAL OFFENSES AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, CHILD ABUSE AND VIOLATION OF PROTECTION ORDERS.—

(1) INADMISSIBILITY ON CRIMINAL AND RELATED GROUNDS; WAIVERS.—Section 212 (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by adding at the end the following:

''(J) CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, OR VIOLATION OF PROTECTIVE ORDERS; CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN.—

''(i) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE.—Any alien who has been convicted of a crime of domestic violence, a crime of stalking, or a crime of child abuse, child neglect, or child abandonment, provided the alien served at least 1 year's imprisonment for the crime or provided the alien was convicted of or admitted to acts constituting more than 1 such crime, not arising out of a single scheme of criminal misconduct, is inadmissible. In this clause, the term 'crime of domestic violence' means any crime of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code) against a person committed by a current or former spouse of the person, by an individual with whom the person shares a child in common, by an individual who is cohabiting with or has cohabited with the person as a spouse, by an individual similarly situated to a spouse of the person under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction where the offense occurs, or by any other individual against a person who is protected from that

individual's acts under the domestic or family violence laws of the United States or any State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local or foreign government.

''(ii) VIOLATORS OF PROTECTION ORDERS.—Any alien who at any time is enjoined under a protection order issued by a court and whom the court determines has engaged in conduct that constitutes criminal contempt of the portion of a protection order that involves protection against credible threats of violence, repeated harassment, or bodily injury to the person or persons for whom the protection order was issued, is inadmissible. In this clause, the term 'protection order' means any injunction issued for the purpose of preventing violent or threatening acts of domestic violence, including temporary or final orders issued by civil or criminal courts (other than support or child custody orders or provisions) whether obtained by filing an independent action or as an independent order in another proceeding.

''(iii) APPLICABILITY.—This subparagraph shall not apply to an alien who has been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty and who is not and was not the primary perpetrator of violence in the relationship, upon a determination by the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security that—

''(I) the alien was acting in self-defense;

''(II) the alien was found to have violated a protection order intended to protect the alien; or

''(III) the alien committed, was arrested for, was convicted of, or pled guilty to committing a crime that did not result in serious bodily injury.''; and

(B) in subsection (h)—

(i) by striking ''The Attorney General may, in his discretion, waive the application of subparagraphs (A)(i)(I), (B), (D), and (E) of subsection (a)(2)'' and inserting ''The Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the application of subparagraphs (A)(i)(I), (A)(i)(III), (B), (D), (E), (F), (J), and (K) of subsection (a)(2)''; and

(ii) by inserting ''or Secretary of Homeland Security'' after ''the Attorney General'' each place it appears.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to any acts that occurred on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. INCREASED CRIMINAL PENALTIES RELATED TO DRUNK DRIVING, ILLEGAL ENTRY, PERJURY, AND FIREARMS OFFENSES.

(a) DRUNK DRIVING.—

(1) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (J), as added by section 204(f) the following:

''(K) DRUNK DRIVERS.—Any alien who has been convicted of 1 felony for driving under the influence under Federal or State law, for which the alien was sentenced to more than 1 year imprisonment, is inadmissible.''.

(2) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) DRUNK DRIVERS.—Unless the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General waives the application of this subparagraph, any alien who has been convicted of 1 felony for driving under the influence under Federal or State law, for which the alien was sentenced to more than 1 year imprisonment, is deportable.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 212(h) (8 U.S.C. 1182(h)) is amended—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''SUBSECTION (A)(2)(A)(I)(I), (II), (B), (D), AND (E)'' and inserting ''CERTAIN PROVISIONS IN SUBSECTION (A)(2)''; and

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''and (E)'' and inserting ''(E), and (F)''.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to convictions entered on or after such date.

(b) ILLEGAL ENTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 275 (8 U.S.C. 1325) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 275. ILLEGAL ENTRY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) CRIMINAL OFFENSES.—An alien shall be subject to the penalties set forth in paragraph (2) if the alien—

''(A) knowingly enters or crosses the border into the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security;

''(B) knowingly eludes examination or inspection by an immigration officer (including failing to stop at the command of such officer), or a customs or agriculture inspection at a port of entry; or

''(C) knowingly enters or crosses the border to the United States by means of a knowingly false or misleading representation or the knowing concealment of a material fact (including such representation or concealment in the context of arrival, reporting, entry, or clearance requirements of the customs laws, immigration laws, agriculture laws, or shipping laws).

''(2) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Any alien who violates any provision under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall, for the first violation, be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both;

''(B) shall, for a second or subsequent violation, or following an order of voluntary departure, be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both;

''(C) if the violation occurred after the alien had been convicted of 3 or more misdemeanors or for a felony, shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

''(D) if the violation occurred after the alien had been convicted of a felony for which the alien received a term of imprisonment of not less than 30 months, shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both; and

''(E) if the violation occurred after the alien had been convicted of a felony for which the alien received a term of imprisonment of not less than 60 months, such alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

''(3) PRIOR CONVICTIONS.—The prior convictions described in subparagraphs (C) through (E) of paragraph (2) are elements of the offenses described in that paragraph and the penalties in such subparagraphs shall apply only in cases in which the conviction or convictions that form the basis for the additional penalty are—

''(A) alleged in the indictment or information; and

''(B) proven beyond a reasonable doubt at trial or admitted by the defendant.

''(4) DURATION OF OFFENSE.—An offense under this subsection continues until the alien is discovered within the United States by an immigration officer.

''(5) ATTEMPT.—Whoever attempts to commit any offense under this section shall be punished in the same manner as for a completion of such offense.

''(b) IMPROPER TIME OR PLACE; CIVIL PENALTIES.—Any alien who is apprehended while entering, attempting to enter, or knowingly crossing or attempting to cross, the border to the United States at a time or place other than as designated by immigration officers shall be subject to a civil penalty, in addition to any criminal or other civil penalties that may be imposed under any other provision of law, in an amount equal to—

''(1) not less than $50 and not more than $250 for each such entry, crossing, attempted entry, or attempted crossing; or

''(2) twice the amount specified in paragraph (1) if the alien had previously been subject to a civil penalty under this subsection.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents is amended by striking the item relating to section 275 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 275. Illegal entry.''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 275(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by this Act, shall apply only to violations of section 275(a)(1) committed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) PERJURY AND FALSE STATEMENTS.—Any person who willfully submits any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation (including any document, attestation, or sworn affidavit for that person or any person) relating to an application for any benefit under the immigration laws (including for Z non-immigrant status) will be subject to prosecution for perjury under section 1621 of title 18, United States Code, or for making such a statement or representation under section 1001 of that title.

(d) INCREASED PENALTIES RELATING TO FIREARMS OFFENSES.—

(1) PENALTIES RELATED TO REMOVAL.—Section 243 (8 U.S.C. 1253) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''212(a)'' or after ''section''; and

(ii) in the matter following subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking ''or imprisoned not more than four years'' and inserting ''and imprisoned for not more than 5 years''; and

(II) by striking '', or both'';

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''not more than $1000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both'' and inserting ''under title 18, United States Code, and imprisoned for not more than 5 years (or for not more than 10 years if the alien is a member of any of the classes described in paragraphs (1)(E), (2), (3), and (4) of section 237(a)).''; and

(2) PROHIBITING CARRYING OR USING A FIREARM DURING AND IN RELATION TO AN ALIEN SMUGGLING CRIME.—Section 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', alien smuggling crime,'' after ''any crime of violence'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', alien smuggling crime,'' after ''such crime of violence''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by inserting '', alien smuggling crime,'' after ''crime of violence''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'alien smuggling crime' means any felony punishable under section 274(a), 277, or 278 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a), 1327, and 1328).''.

(3) INADMISSIBILITY FOR FIREARMS OFFENSES.—Section 212(a)(2)(A) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(A)), as amended by sections 204(e) and 209(a)(3), is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting after subclause (IV) the following:

''(V) a crime involving the purchasing, selling, offering for sale, exchanging, using, owning, possessing, or carrying, or of attempting or conspiring to purchase, sell, offer for sale, exchange, use, own, possess, or carry, any weapon, part, or accessory which is a firearm or destructive device (as defined in section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code), provided the alien was sentenced to at least 1 year for the offense,''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''Clause (i)(I)'' and inserting ''Subclauses (I), (IV), and (V) of clause (i)''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to hold a hearing during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 5, 2007, at 10 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The purpose of the hearing is to consider the preparedness of Federal land management agencies for the 2007 wildfire season and to consider recent reports on the agencies' efforts to contain the costs of wildfire management activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing entitled ''Examining the Federal Role to Work with Communities to Prevent and Respond to Gang Violence: The Gang Abatement and Prevention Act of 2007'' on Tuesday, June 5, 2007, at 10 a.m. in Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Witness list

Panel I: The Honorable Barbara Boxer, United States Senator [D–CA].

Panel II: The Honorable Antonio R. Villaraigosa, Mayor, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA; William J. Bratton, Chief of Police, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, CA.

Panel III: Ms. Boni Gayle Driskill, Wings of Protection, Modesto, CA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing entitled ''Preserving Prosecutorial Independence: Is the Department of Justice Politicizing the Hiring and Firing of U.S. Attorneys?—Part V'' on Tuesday, June 5, 2007, at 2 p.m. in Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Witness list

Panel I: Bradley J. Schlozman, Associate Counsel to the Director, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, Former Interim U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Missouri, Former Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General and, Acting Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC

Panel II: Todd Graves, Former U.S. Attorney, Western District of Missouri, Kansas City, MO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Tuesday, June 5, 2007, at 9 a.m. for a hearing entitled ''Executive Stock Options: Should the IRS and Stockholders Be Given Different Information?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 5, 2007 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR-NOMINATIONS DISCHARGED

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar Nos. 109, 113, 142, and 143, and further ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of the following nominations: Ron Silver, PN 80; Judy Van Rest, PN 84; Anne Cahn, PN 317; Kathleen Martinez, PN 319; George Moose, PN 320; and Jeremy Rabkin, PN 321; that the Senate turn to their consideration; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

David George Nalson, of Rhode Island, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

NATIONAL CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK

David George Nason, of Rhode Island, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank for a term of three years.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

James K. Glassman, of Connecticut, to be Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

James K. Glassman, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2007.

''UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE''

Ron Silver, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2009.

Judy Van Rest, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2009.

Anne Cahn, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2009.

Kathleen Martinez, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2011.

George E. Moose, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2009.

Jeremy A. Rabkin, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2009.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of S. Res. 220, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 220) honoring the life of Senator CRAIG THOMAS:

S. RES. 220

Whereas Senator Craig Thomas had a long and honorable history of public service, serving in the United States Marine Corps, the Wyoming State Legislature, the United States House of Representatives, and the United States Senate;

Whereas Senator Craig Thomas represented the people of Wyoming with honor and distinction for over 20 years;

Whereas Senator Craig Thomas was first elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1989;

Whereas Senator Craig Thomas was subsequently elected 3 times to the United States Senate by record margins of more than 70 percent; and

Whereas Senator Craig Thomas's life and career were marked by the best of his Western values: hard work, plain speaking, common sense, courage, and integrity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the United States Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Craig Thomas, a Senator from the State of Wyoming;

(2) the Senate mourns the loss of one of its most esteemed members, Senator Craig Thomas, and expresses its condolences to the people of Wyoming and to his wife, Susan, and his 4 children;

(3) the Secretary of the Senate shall communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of Senator Craig Thomas; and

(4) when the Senate adjourns today, it shall stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of Senator Craig Thomas.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 220) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 2007

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 6; that on Wednesday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1348, as provided for under the previous order; further, that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived with respect to the cloture motion filed this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as a reminder to Members, cloture was filed today, so first-degree amendments need to be filed by 1 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if there is no further business today, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the provisions of S. Res. 220, as a mark of further respect to the memory of our late colleague, Senator CRAIG THOMAS.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:53 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 6, 2007, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 5, 2007:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DOUGLAS A. BROOK, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, VICE RICHARD GRECO, JR., RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARK GREEN, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA.

WANDA L. NESBITT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COTE D'IVOIRE.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DAVID W. HAGY, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE, VICE SARAH V. HART, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Tuesday, June 5, 2007:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DAVID GEORGE NASON, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

NATIONAL CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK

DAVID GEORGE NASON, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

JAMES K. GLASSMAN, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

JAMES K. GLASSMAN, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2007.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

RON SILVER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2009.

JUDY VAN REST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2009.

ANNE CAHN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2009.

KATHLEEN MARTINEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2011.

GEORGE E. MOOSE, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2009.

JEREMY A. RABKIN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2009.

WITHDRAWAL

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE TRANSMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE SENATE ON JUNE 5, 2007 WITHDRAWING FROM FURTHER SENATE CONSIDERATION THE FOLLOWING NOMINATION:

Henry Bonilla, of Texas, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, vice John F. Maisto, resigned, which was sent to the Senate on March 15, 2007.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN STENY HOYER BECOMING LONGEST SERVING MARYLAND REPRESENTATIVE IN HISTORY

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, more than 26 years ago, the voters of Maryland's 5th Congressional District demonstrated their great wisdom in electing STENY HOYER to represent them in Congress. As he has now become the longest-serving member of the House of Representatives in Maryland history, we recognize that their trust has never been misplaced, as STENY HOYER has been a tremendous leader for both his district and for the nation.

This week, STENY continues his history of record breaking: when he was just 27 years old, he was elected to the Maryland Senate, and then subsequently became its youngest ever President. But what sets STENY apart is not the length of his leadership, but the quality of it. On issues crucial to his district, such as standing up for federal employees and protecting the beauty of the Chesapeake Bay, STENY has been a stalwart leader. On issues crucial to all Americans, such as education, the minimum wage, the rights of the disabled, and civil rights, he has achieved great progress.

As House Majority Leader, he plays a crucial role in developing and passing our legislation for a new direction for America. He is a skilled legislator and consensusbuilder. He is respected by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for his savvy, intellect, and integrity.

STENY and I first met more than 40 years ago as interns in the United States Senate. Over the years, it has been a honor to see him as more than just an immensely skilled Member of Congress, but as a loving husband, proud parent, and devoted grandparent and now great-grandparent. It is a personal privilege to call him my colleague and my friend.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE UCSF SCHOOL OF NURSING CENTENNIAL

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to recognize the Centennial Nursing Celebration at the University of California, San Francisco and to honor the University of California at San Francisco School of Nursing, the achievements of its alumni and faculty, and the leadership of nurses at UCSF Medical Center.

Nursing at the University of California began in the spirit of renewal that rebuilt San Francisco after the great 1906 earthquake and fire. Less than a year later, in April of 1907, the University opened its first teaching hospital in San Francisco, along with its first nursing education program. In 1939, the Regents formerly established the University of California, San Francisco School of Nursing—the Nation's first autonomous nursing school at a public university.

Today, the UCSF School of Nursing is consistently ranked among the top nursing schools in the world. UCSF developed the first master's and doctoral nursing programs in the western United States, and currently enrolls more than 600 students in these programs, making them among the largest in the Nation. The school's vision extends far beyond national borders, as exemplified by the scores of international students who come through its doors each year, and the UCSF World Health Organization Collaborating Center for Research and Clinical Training in Nursing.

Over the past century, UCSF has educated more than 10,000 nurses, many of whom have gone on to become health care leaders in California, throughout the country, and around the globe.

UCSF has also established itself as the Nation's preeminent nursing research institution. The school currently ranks first among nursing programs in research funding from the National Institutes of Health. Eight faculty members have been inducted into the Institute of Medicine, a larger number than at any other nursing school. UCSF continues to be on the cutting edge of nursing science—from heart disease and cancer, to pain management and healthy aging.

At UCSF Medical Center and the hospitals and clinics served by UCSF, nurses lead innovations in patient care, translational research, hospital safety, and support for patients and families coping with illness. Beyond the campus, UCSF provides care through a wide range of programs targeting at-risk and underserved populations.

As UCSF celebrates a century of excellence in nursing education, research, and patient care, I urge my colleagues to join me on this auspicious occasion by thanking UCSF nurses for all they have done and continue to do to improve the health care of San Franciscans, of Californians, and of people around the world.

RECOGNIZING MITCHEL WAYNE BUSH FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Mitchel Wayne Bush, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Mitchel has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Mitchel has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Mitchel Wayne Bush for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Mitchel in the United States House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD ROBINSON

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a minute to pay tribute to a friend and staff member who will be leaving my employment soon. His name is Richard Robinson, my Chief of Staff. He is a man possessing great loyalty and integrity.

I first met Richard when he interned for me when I was a State Senator in California. In 1991, he graduated from California Polytechnic State University and came to work for me as a full-time paid employee. It quickly became clear that Richard was a resourceful man whom I could count on for hard work, concise communication and keen strategic thinking. In January, 1991, I was elected to the United States House of Representatives, and I brought Richard with me to my Congressional office as a Field Representative.

In 1994, he married Jennifer Michele Edwards, and today they are the parents of three beautiful girls: Allison, Taylor and Lauryn. Richard is a wonderful father and dedicated husband, and I can understand why, after sixteen years of intense work for me, he has chosen to look to a new career path that may afford him a more predictable and flexible work schedule. Richard will be sorely missed, but knowing Jennifer and the children as I do, I can understand his decision.

I also know Richard to have a big heart. He was a night shift volunteer at the University of California Davis emergency room in 1999; he was a youth pastor of a high school Christian group from 1998 to 2003; and he was Director of Habitat for Humanity's Youth Build program in 1999.

In 2002, Richard graduated from Stanford University, ranking first in his class, with a Master of Arts degree in Education. He also earned a California teaching credential at the same time. I can only imagine how difficult it was for him to attend school and raise a family, but I am not surprised that Richard was successful. His mother, Melinda, tells me that he began reading as early as three years of age and was elected class president in the

sixth grade at Rock Creek Grammar School. At Placer High School, he played soccer, but particularly excelled at basketball, a sport made for a man six feet five inches tall.

Richard's service to me has been notable because he has always been willing to put others ahead of himself. He has seen the benefit of developing a team based on strong relationships and mutual respect. Even at our most trying times, I always knew that Richard was acting with my best interests in mind.

As he looks to new opportunities, (and I know they will be numerous for a man of his talents) I wish him and his family much happiness and success.

IN HONOR OF COLONEL MARY GENE RYAN

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of my friend Colonel Mary Gene Ryan, who is retiring after 31 years of military service.

Colonel Ryan has served at both military bases in my district, Vandenberg Air Force Base and Naval Base Ventura County. She is retiring from the 30th Medical Group at Vandenberg as the Individual Mobilization Augmentee to the Commander.

After graduating with a bachelor's degree in nursing, Colonel Ryan entered the U.S. Air Force as a Second Lieutenant. She earned her master's degree in public health 4 years later as she worked her way up the ranks and gained experience and accreditation as a second flight nurse, a medical crew director and flight nurse instructor in the C–9, C–141 and C–130 while stationed at Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany.

She returned to the states as Officer In Charge of Environmental Health at Wilford Hall Medical Center in Texas, then made her transition to California as Chief of Environmental Health at Edwards Air Force Flight Test Center. By this time she had been promoted to captain and soon after, to major.

When the Air Force dissolved the Environmental Health Nurse career field, Colonel Ryan transferred to the California Air National Guard at what is now Naval Base Ventura County. She served at Naval Base Ventura County as Nurse Executive and Executive Officer and was promoted to Lieutenant Colonel.

She later transferred to the Air Force Reserve and became Chief of Nursing Services at March Air Reserve Base. She was promoted to full Colonel on April 1, 2004.

While pursuing a successful medical military career, Colonel Ryan also worked in the civilian field and co-founded her own business, MGRyan & Co., Inc., a full-service safety and health consulting firm. She also served as Manager of Health & Safety for the County of Ventura and as Director of Occupational Health at Peterson Medical Clinic in Oxnard, California.

And, if that were not enough, Colonel Ryan is also a successful wife and mother. She and Dr. Robert E. Ryan III have three children, 24-year-old Michael, 21-year-old Jessica, and 16-year-old Matthew.

Madam Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in congratulating Colonel Mary Gene Ryan on her retirement from military service and thank her for her many years of dedication to the military and the health and welfare of the men and women who serve in the Air Force, Air Force Reserves, and California Air National Guard.

TRIBUTE TO WEST VIRGINIA SCHOOL OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine as a leader in the study and practice of rural medicine.

The need for primary care physicians in rural areas is of great importance to our Nation's overall health care delivery system. These providers are often on the front lines of health care delivery and provide much needed care to our sick and elderly populations.

Since its first graduating class in 1978, the West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine has countered this need by producing gifted physicians prepared to practice rural medicine.

In fact, nearly half of the school's graduates go on to serve in rural communities that are in desperate need of their care. Often understaffed and covering large geographic areas, these communities require accommodating physicians with a range of services.

Madam Speaker, as today's medical profession is glamorized in the public consciousness by popular television dramas it is the graduates of West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine who go on to serve in rural communities that deserve to be celebrated. I thank the school's students, faculty and staff for their service and wish them continued success in the future.

TRIBUTE TO SHELDON S. CRAMMER

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to sacrifice for our country through military service.

Sheldon S. Crammer of Conyers, Georgia answered the call and served our nation in time of war from 1942–1944.

On the beaches of Normandy and in the French Theater on the European continent, Sheldon S. Crammer displayed valor, determination, and calm and was wounded in the line of duty.

This remarkable and courageous man gave of himself, in defense of this Nation.

Sheldon S. Crammer is a soldier, a warrior, a father, a grandfather, a son, a brother, and a friend.

After many years, long overdue recognition of his service is being duly noted with the granting of the Bronze Star and Purple Heart in a special ceremony attended by his family, friends, and fellow veterans.

I was pleased to proclaim May 19, 2007 as Sheldon S. Crammer Day for his brave service to our country.

RECOGNIZING ROBERT ALEXANDER BORGARDTS FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Robert Alexander Borgardts, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Robert has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Robert has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Robert Alexander Borgardts for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Robert in the United States House of Representatives.

A TRIBUTE TO MILDRED LEIGH GOLD

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mildred Leigh Gold, a compassionate leader, a breast cancer survivor, and an advocate from the Fourth Congressional District. Mrs. Leigh Gold is recognized at the national, regional and local level for her work and achievements in the area of breast cancer awareness and treatment.

Mrs. Leigh Gold came to Milwaukee in 1969. She was immediately hired by Catholic Social Services and worked there for 18 years. She provided counseling, guidance and other assistance to central city youth from 2 community sites: the House of Peace and the Inner City Development Project. In 1989, Mrs. Leigh Gold was diagnosed with breast cancer and this life altering event led to a significant change in her career. She became active with the Breast Cancer Awareness Task Force Board.

In 1990, she accepted the challenge to design and implement the community-focused, City of Milwaukee Breast Cancer Awareness Program. This trailblazing, first-of-its-kind program took breast cancer screening services into underserved neighborhoods with a mobile van. The program has provided breast cancer screening service to over 27,000 women and reached many more women through its education awareness component. Public Health

Nurses were utilized to have one-on-one visits with women presenting with abnormal breast exams; and a network of nurturing physicians and relationships with hospitals were developed to ensure follow-up care. In fact, the rate of follow-up visits in this program with physicians was an impressive 98% compared to the national average of 30%. The program she designed and implemented has been replicated throughout the United States because it has achieved such impressive outcomes. Mrs. Leigh Gold, who is retiring in June, 2007, has guided this nationally recognized program for 17 years.

Mrs. Leigh Gold holds a bachelors degree in Social Welfare from A&T State University in Greensboro, North Carolina, a masters degree in Management from Cardinal Stritch University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, as well as an LPN certificate. She has been married to Joe Gold for over 20 years.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I am honored to pay tribute to Mildred Leigh Gold. Mrs. Leigh Gold's dedication to women's health care and her work to promote awareness and provide access to breast cancer treatment has truly been a life saver for many women in my district.

TRIBUTE TO JOE TRUSSO

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Joe Trusso for his 37 years in public service. He was the representative of the southeast neighborhoods of the City of Jamestown in District 16. Mr. Trusso was first elected to the Chautauqua County Board of Supervisors/Legislature in 1971.

I would like briefly to touch on the many areas of service that Joe gave to our county. During his tenure, Mr. Trusso served as the chairman of the School-to-Work/Scholarship Subcommittee, Manpower Utilization, Finance, and Personnel/Human Services Committees. In addition to his current chairmanship of the Audit and Control Committee and vice chair, former chair, of the Public Facilities Committee, he has been a member of and chaired the Judicial and Public Safety and Public Works Committees. He has served on the Airport Commission, the Southern Tier West Board of Directors and Budget Watch Committees. He was also elected Democratic minority and majority leader. As a legislator, Mr. Trusso has authored Pre-Paid Capitalization Legislation and is the co-author of the Trusso-Beckman Debt Reduction Legislation that eliminated the county's long-standing debt.

I must also acknowledge Mr. Trusso's other interests. Joe served on the Resource Center and Allied Industries Board of Directors since 1967, where he is still serving as a special committee member, and has held several leadership positions. Mr. Trusso was the Assistant Director of the Parks, Recreation and Conservation Department and served on the Jamestown Industrial Development and Commerce Committee. He is a member of St. James RC Church, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, Samuel Derby Post American Legion, Knights of Columbus—Fourth Degree, Moose Club, Marco Polo Club, Lakewood Rod and Gun Club and the UAW Local #338

I am proud to mention that Mr. Trusso served his country from 1952–1956 in the United States Air Force (Korean War Veteran); Medical Field Service School and from 1956–1960 in the United States Air Force Reserves.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in congratulating Joe on his wonderful job well done in the Chautauqua County Legislature. Joe, you will be missed by all of the constituents whose lives you touched. Enjoy your retirement!

HONORING HOWARD JONAS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, Howard Jonas is a very active supporter of several charities nationally and in his community and serves as a trustee on numerous university, hospital, religious, and social service organization boards.

These include New York Presbyterian Hospital, Shaarei Tzedeck Hospital in Jerusalem, Jewish Guild for the Blind, Yeshiva College, AIPAC, Shema Kolainu for Autistic Children, American Friends of Yeshivat B'nei Akiva, Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Newark Public Library, International Rescue Committee, Hebrew Institute of Riverdale, American Friends of Shalva, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark Public Library, Riverdale Y, Digital Freedom Network, Tuoro College, Yeshivat Hoveivei Torah, SAR, Eidah, Yeshivat Shmuel Yaakov, Fairness Committee, Voices and Bar Ilan University.

In addition Mr. Jonas has been the honorary chairman of The Beth Jacob/Beth Miriam Yeshiva for the past thirteen years. This is an incredible record of accomplishment for one person and I personally am in awe.

Howard is a local boy who graduated from Bronx High School of Science and went on to get a B.A. in Economics from Harvard University.

He also went on to revolutionize international telecommunications. At age 33, he found a way to supply the world with a U.S. dial tone and cheap international long distance rates, creating international ''callback'' telephone service, now an over a billion dollar a year industry.

Howard founded IDT in August 1990 and has served as Chairman of the Board and Treasurer since its inception. He was Chief Executive Officer from December 1991 to August 2001. IDT is known as a model of upstart entrepreneurship, continually innovating and looking for the next great cutting edge business opportunity.

He is also the founder and has been President of Jonas Publishing Corporation, a publisher of trade directories, since its inception in 1979.

Howard Jonas is a man who is generous in his help over a wide area and is someone who has made a significant difference in the life of his community.

IN HONOR OF CHRISSIE JAHN

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, Members of the House, I rise today to honor Chrissie Jahn, executive director and head of school for the International School of Monterey. Ms. Jahn has been recognized as the California International Education Advocate of the Year, a most deserving tribute to the important work she has done on behalf of Monterey County students.

Ms. Jahn is dedicated to providing a demanding curriculum to area families, offering her students an international education designed to prepare them for success in today's global economy. Ms. Jahn strives to supply her students with the skills necessary to succeed in life, and she approaches that role with an infectious energy.

Ms. Jahn excels at challenging her students, instilling in them a love of learning and a strong sense of self-motivation and respect. Her school is a tuition-free public charter school with a strong focus on language education, with instruction beginning in kindergarten. Her work fostering skills integral to student success on a global stage is a valuable lesson to educators around the country.

The award was presented to Ms. Jahn by the Visiting International Faculty Program, the largest international-exchange program connecting U.S. schools and teachers around the world.

Madam Speaker, please allow me to convey to Ms. Jahn this body's gratitude for her hard work and dedication.

TRIBUTE TO OUR VETERANS

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women who have fallen in service to our country. This weekend, as we return home to celebrate Memorial Day with our friends and families, let us take time to reflect on the countless sacrifices that have been made by our men and women in uniform.

Since the founding of our nation, the men and women in our armed forces have served this country with honor. They have fought to defend and preserve our nation from forces that have threatened to divide our country and destroy our way of life. America is a better place for their courage and their service.

As a grateful nation, we cannot ignore our responsibility to repay those who have served in defense of our country. This means doing everything we can to provide our veterans with comprehensive health care that is affordable, accessible, and available for life.

Instead of honoring our promises to our veterans, this Administration has tried to turn a blind eye to their problems. This Administration has attempted to push the increasing costs of veterans' health care onto veterans by charging higher premium and deductibles and reducing the number of veterans eligible

for healthcare. It's absolutely unacceptable to propose forcing a greater financial burden on our nation's veterans. That's why I'm a proud cosponsor of H.R. 579, the Military Retirees Health Care Protection Act, which would protect our veterans from these unnecessary TRICARE fee increases. Our promise of affordable health care for our veterans is one that we must keep.

Additionally, the generation of veterans returning home from combat areas in Iraq and Afghanistan requires new resources to treat their medical needs. However, rather than reinvesting in treatments for traumatic brain injuries (TBI), the Administration has barely scratched the surface of addressing the mental health needs of our veterans. That's why I'm a cosponsor of H.R. 1944, the Veterans Traumatic Brain Injury Treatment Act, which would require the Department of Veterans' Affairs (VA) to actively screen and develop long-term care programs for veterans suffering from TBI.

Furthermore, we must not allow the substandard care, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and dilapidated conditions at Walter Reed to symbolize our dedication to our veterans. I was I pleased that the House unanimously passed H.R. 1538, the Wounded Warrior Assistance Act, which will reduce much of the bureaucracy that prevents veterans from receiving quality healthcare, require more caseworkers to be hired, improve the system enabling wounded soldiers to transition from active duty to the VA system, and create a system of patients advocates to hold the VA accountable for problems.

We cannot allow this Administration's record of broken promises to our veterans become an accepted standard of treatment. We can do better. I have introduced H.R. 508, the Bring the Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act, which would require sufficient funding for veterans' health care every year and would guarantee broad physical and mental healthcare for our veterans.

Memorial Day reminds us that meeting the needs of our service men and women requires sustained commitment and determination. We have a moral obligation to ensure that our veterans have the benefits they need. Their profound dedication and patriotism deserve no less.

IN MEMORY OF RALPH BERING BUSCH, JR.

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Speaker, I rise in memory of my friend Ralph Bering Busch, Jr., MD, who passed away on May 23 at age 84.

Dr. Busch was a medical pioneer in Ventura County, California. In the 1960s, Dr. Busch and his partner, M. Kathleen Belton, MD, became the first anesthesiologists to practice in Ventura County. They covered St. John's Hospital in Oxnard, Santa Paula Memorial Hospital, Community Memorial Hospital in Ventura, and occasionally Ojai Valley Community Hospital. Dr. Busch served at Santa Paula Memorial Hospital for twenty years and retired from Community Memorial Hospital in 1989.

Dr. Busch came to California after serving in the South Pacific with the U.S. Navy for four years, after graduating from high school, college, and medical school in the Midwest. He interned at University of Southern California, Los Angeles County Hospital and then practiced at St. Joseph's Hospital in Burbank for the next ten years.

In 1959, he married Deborah ''Deedee'' Bennett of Palm Springs. As their family grew, they decided to seek the country life of Ventura County. It was a good choice for them and for Ventura County. Ralph and Deedee have been blessed with six children and eighteen grandchildren.

In addition to his dedication to his practice and his family, Dr. Busch dedicated himself to the greater medical community and the community in which he lived. He was a past member of the California and American Societies of Anesthesiology, Ventura County Medical Society, Community Memorial Hospital Board of Directors, Ventura County Museum of History and Art Board of Directors, and Berry Petroleum Co. Board of Directors. He was a forty-five-year member of Saticoy Country Club.

Madam Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in remembering Dr. Ralph Bering Busch, Jr., as a good friend, a loving family man, a pioneer in Ventura County medicine, and one who worked to make his community stronger. In addition, I know my colleagues join me in extending our condolences to Deedee and their family and to all who called Ralph a friend.

Godspeed, Ralph.

TRIBUTE TO MR. ROBERT M. STEPTOE

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the passing of a great patriot, public citizen, and revered member of his community, Mr. Robert M. Steptoe.

Born in Clarksburg, West Virginia on May 15, 1920, Mr. Steptoe grew up in north central West Virginia and thereafter attended Episcopal High School in Alexandria, Virginia. He continued his studies at Haverford College in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and Shepherd College in Shepherdstown, West Virginia.

At the outbreak of World War II, Mr. Steptoe served in the United States Navy as the commanding officer of two ships in the sub-chaser class. Mr. Steptoe was involved in the invasions of Sicily, Anzio, southern France, and a brief stint in the Southern Pacific. He retired from the United States Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander.

Following his service during World War II, Mr. Steptoe graduated from the University of Virginia School of Law in February 1949 and began a career in law that spanned over 50 years of distinguished legal practice in Martinsburg, West Virginia. A member of the West Virginia State Bar, the West Virginia Bar Association, the Berkeley County Bar Association, and the United States Judicial Conference for the Fourth Circuit; Mr. Steptoe was awarded the Award of Merit by the West Virginia Bar Association in 2003 in recognition of his years of service.

Mr. Steptoe was also an active public servant who was elected to the West Virginia House of Delegates for four terms and the West Virginia Senate for two terms. He also served as a judge of the West Virginia Court of Claims.

In addition to his professional activities, Mr. Steptoe was an active member of the Rotary, Trinity Episcopal Church, and a member of the Elks Club. Above all, Mr. Steptoe was a proud and dedicated husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather.

Mr. Steptoe's life and accomplishments are truly representative of the courage, character and altruism that is often associated with members of our ''Greatest Generation.'' West Virginia was well served by this great American and he will be sorely missed by those who knew him.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD L. BOUIE, SR. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, many schools strive to excel in competition on the national level.

Ten years ago, the DeKalb County School system gave birth to Edward L. Bouie, Sr. Elementary School and named this extraordinary school for an extraordinary man.

For 10 years now under the leadership and guidance of the past and present principals, teachers, staff, parents, and students, this school has met and exceeded national standards.

The Edward L. Bouie, Sr. Elementary School family constantly demonstrates the will to win, the courage to win, the mechanics of teamwork and the astounding spirit of triumph gained from educating students to be the very best in leadership, scholarship, and service.

Our beloved county, children, and community will benefit from the fruits of that labor insuring that our district, our state and our nation will always be prosperous and productive.

This extraordinary school is celebrating the milestone of their 10th anniversary and I was pleased to proclaim May 18, 2007 as Edward L. Bouie, Sr. Elementary School Day in the 4th Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING COLBY JOHN BUEHLER FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Colby John Buehler, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Colby has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Colby has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Colby John Buehler for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Colby in the United States House of Representatives.

IN TRIBUTE TO NICK TOPPING

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life and work of Nick Topping, a highly respected, social justice activist, music impresario and business owner. Mr. Topping died on May 9, 2007, at the age of 89.

Mr. Topping earned a degree in history and communications from the University of Wisconsin—Madison. During World War II, he was drafted and served in Army intelligence. When he returned, he founded a store named Topping and Company International House that he ran for over 50 years. The store stocked Greek and Middle Eastern food, books, and records from all over the world.

Mr. Topping was one of nine children born to Greek immigrant parents who ran a grocery store at South 4th Street and West National Avenue. Mr. Topping was born Nick Topitzes and changed his name at the age of 18 because of the discrimination Greeks faced at that time.

Nick Topping spent much of his lifetime working for peace and social justice. He marched with Father James Groppi over the 16th Street Viaduct during Milwaukee's civil rights struggle and took his daughters along on the marches with him. He belonged to the NAACP and became an early local protestor against the Vietnam War. Mr. Topping was also active in the growing south side Latino community and in the Chicano rights movement.

Mr. Topping was a promoter of ethnic and folk music concerts in the 1950s and '60s including singers such as: Miriam Makeba, from South Africa; Pete Seeger; Josh White; Peter, Paul & Mary; Bob Dylan; and Greek composer, Mikis Theodorakis, music composer for the movie *Zorba the Greek*. Nick Topping secured his place in modem Milwaukee history by securing the Beatles for their one and only Milwaukee concert on September 4, 1964. The concert quickly sold out with the most expensive ticket selling for $5.50.

Nick Topping is survived by his wife of 56 years, Harriet; two daughters, Adele Fatemi-Topping and Alexandra Topping; a brother, Agamemnon (Memo); and a sister, Sandra Topitzes Brown, all of Milwaukee.

Madam Speaker, Milwaukee has experienced a profound loss with the passing of Nick Topping. Today, I thank him and his family for their immeasurable achievements. I mourn his loss and I salute his legacy.

TRIBUTE TO FRAN LUS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Fran Lus for his 12 years of service to Chautauqua County. Mr. Lus is a wonderful example of what public service should be.

I would like briefly to touch on the many areas of service that Fran has been involved with. Fran was first elected to the Chautauqua County Legislature in 1995 as a representative of district 23 in Portland. He served as the Chairman of the Public Safety Committee. Mr. Lus is also a member of the Public Facilities Committee and serves as a delegate to the Inter-County Association of Western New York and is a member of the Cornell Co-operative Extension Board of Directors.

I must also acknowledge Mr. Lus' other interests. He serves as a member of the Stop DWI Committee, the Southern Tier Extension Rail Authority Board, is a life long member of the Southwestern N.Y. Volunteer Firemen's Association and an exempt fireman of the Brocton Fire Department. He was also a member of the Portland Volunteer Fire Department for 3 years. Fran was recently elected to the Brocton Central School Hall of Fame.

I am proud to mention that Mr. Lus served his country during the Korean Conflict from 1950 to 1954 as a member of the United States Air Force and is a life member and former commander of the John W. Dill post 434.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in congratulating Fran on his wonderful job well done in the Chautauqua County Legislature. Fran, you will be missed by all of the constituents whose lives you touched. Enjoy your retirement!

HONORING DR. SPENCER FOREMAN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, for more than two decades Dr. Spencer Foreman's leadership has made Montefiore Medical Center (MMC) one of the most forward thinking and academic medical centers in the country. He is a national health leader, and a respected expert in hospital administration and medicine. Dr. Foreman is a member of the National Academy of Science's Institute of Medicine, a former chairman of the Association of American Medical Colleges and a past trustee of the American Hospital Association. Annually, MMC treats more than 60,000 new patients, has more than 400,000 home visits, and 1.8 million outpatient visits. That, plus an annual budget of more than $1.9 billion, makes it one the largest academic medical centers in the country.

For more than a century, MMC has had a long and distinguished history of meeting the healthcare needs of New Yorkers and patients from around the world.

MMC is one of the most innovative medical centers in the country with a staff of brilliant doctors, nurses and associates on all levels dedicated to giving every patient the highest quality care and service.

This did not happen by accident. The leadership of Dr. Foreman for over two decades led MMC to the top of its class.

I have always been proud to tell people that Montefiore Medical Center is in my Congressional district. It is a mainstay of health care in the Bronx which is famous throughout the world.

But more than that, I have always been delighted to say that Dr. Foreman has been my friend. Dr. Foreman took charge at Montefiore about the same time I came to Congress. For over 18 years we have worked together to better the healthcare system. I count him among my trusted advisors on the state of healthcare in our Nation.

What he has accomplished will continue for generations. He has created a model of health care efficiency to which it can truly be said that thousands owe their lives and well-being. I am proud of the work of Montefiore Medical Center. I am proud of the accomplishments of Dr. Foreman but even more so I am proud of my friend Spike.

IN HONOR OF THE SAINT FRANCIS SOUP KITCHEN

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the achievements of the Saint Francis Soup Kitchen, which recently celebrated its 25th year of service in the Santa Cruz community. St. Francis is an organization founded and run by volunteers who love to help others. In the 25 years that it has been around, St. Francis has fed and clothed countless people who are in need. The city of Santa Cruz has approximately 400 people who are homeless, yet St. Francis is one way in which the community is trying to help the problem.

Father Peter Carota deserves special recognition as the founder of the St. Francis Soup Kitchen. In 1981, when still a layman, Peter sold his home and used the money to start St. Francis. Feeding the poor out of the back of a van, Peter Carota began his dream of running a soup kitchen to feed the homeless. A few years later, in 1983, Peter and some volunteers purchased the property of the current soup kitchen and St. Francis was born. Peter has since become a priest, but his work at St. Francis is carried on by devoted volunteers.

The soup kitchen was founded to help people in need and that is exactly what it does. The kitchen never turns a hungry person away and feeds up to 180 people at lunch every weekday. St. Francis not only provides free lunch every day to the homeless, it also operates a clothing room that provides donated clothes free of charge to guests. However, St. Francis could not function without the support of the dedicated volunteers and the help drawn from churches, high schools, UC Santa Cruz, and the broader community.

Madam Speaker, the St. Francis Soup Kitchen has contributed so much to the city of Santa Cruz and the surrounding community; I have only scratched the surface of its beneficial and compassionate dedication. I commend the St. Francis Soup Kitchen for all that

it has done in its 25 years, and I hope that it will continue for another 25 with the same service, attitude, and contribution to the community.

TRIBUTE TO JUSTICE JOSEPH RATTIGAN

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. SUSAN DAVIS, Ms. ANNA G. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BARBARA LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA SÁNCHEZ, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MIKE THOMPSON, Ms. MAXINE WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HENRY WAXMAN, we rise with sadness today to honor our good friend and respected mentor, Justice Joseph Rattigan, who passed away after a long illness on May 12, 2007, in Santa Rosa, California. He was 87 years old.

Joe Rattigan is a legend in Sonoma County and in California. During a long career as an activist, a civic leader, a state legislator, and a jurist, he earned respect from all whose lives he touched, whether political ally or rival. Known for his eloquence, wit, intelligence, and passion, this remarkable man always had time for people and their concerns. He mentored other lawyers and judges as well as generations of Democratic politicians.

Born in 1920, Joe grew up in politics in Washington, DC, where his father was a law partner with Senator O'Mahoney from Wyoming. He attended Catholic University and, after graduating in 1940, worked briefly for the Department of Agriculture before joining the Navy to fight in WW II. He served as an intelligence officer and then commanded a PT boat in the Pacific, earning a decoration for heroism in combat.

After the war, Joe enrolled in Stanford Law School, graduating in 1948. He was part of a post-war generation of young lawyers who settled in California at that time and made their mark on a booming state. He soon joined a Santa Rosa law firm and plunged into local affairs and Democratic politics. He served as president of the Sonoma County Bar Association, county chairman for Adlai Stevenson's 1956 Presidential bid, and a member of the Santa Rosa Board of Public Utilities.

Joe jumped into electoral politics on his own behalf in 1958. He became the youngest state senator in the county's history at age 38, as the Democrats took back the legislature and Edmund G. ''Pat'' Brown became governor, ushering in a new golden era for California. He served two terms, authoring or co-authoring several key bills, including measures establishing medical care services for the elderly (a model for the Federal Medicare program), the Department of Rehabilitation, and the state university system. In 1960, his last-minute maneuvering created Sonoma State College (later University), which is now an integral part of the county as well as of the state's education system.

During his time in the legislature and his subsequent 18 years as a justice on the Court of Appeals for Northern California, Joe fought for the oppressed. Having grown up in a segregated city, he was fiercely opposed to discrimination. He supported the controversial Rumsford Fair Housing Act which ended the use of restrictive covenants in housing. He also carried the one-man, one-vote reapportionment measure that altered the way state senators were elected even at a personal cost. This measure split Sonoma County into two districts, causing Joe to lose his seat.

Principle always came before politics with Joe Rattigan. He fought against the death penalty, attempting to save convicted felon Caryl Chessman when he was a freshman Senator. It is widely believed that his principled opposition cost him a seat on the state Supreme Court. During his time as an appellate justice, however, he continued to make a mark on California; for example, he supported separation of church and state (despite his Catholic upbringing), championed a first in the nation requirement for cities and counties to adopt general plans, and wrote a decision overturning Black Panther Party leader Huey Newton's murder conviction, which was later upheld.

Joe is survived by Elizabeth (Betty), his wife of 65 years, whom he met in the second grade, by his six children—daughters Catharine Kalin and Anne Paine and sons Michael, Thomas, Patrick, and Timothy Rattigan—as well as 12 grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, this week Sonoma County residents and people throughout California mourn the passing of Joseph Rattigan. Whether people agreed with him or not—and many in the far more conservative Sonoma County of the 50s and 60s did not—he was respected for his integrity, his political acumen, his sharp legal mind, and a heart as big as the Golden State. In 1997, the State Building in downtown Santa Rosa was named the Joseph Rattigan State Building. We would hope that those who pass through its doors into the bright sunlit foyer will stop for a moment and consider the greatest legacy of Joseph Rattigan: a life that demonstrated that good government isn't only desirable, it is possible.

SUPPORT FOR JWOD

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, people with disabilities are the largest minority group in the nation. They comprise 20 percent of the American population and represent every ethnicity, gender, and age. Given the breadth and depth of this group of citizens, it is startling that they suffer from a 65-percent unemployment rate. People with disabilities have the ability and desire to work, yet face many barriers to employment. I think it is incredibly important that we give people with disabilities equal opportunity and support for employment.

To that end, I am proud to support employment opportunities for people with disabilities, particularly through the Javits-Wagner-O'Day (JWOD)/AbilityOne Program. The JWOD/AbilityOne Program uses the purchasing power of the Federal Government to buy products and services from participating, community-based nonprofit agencies dedicated to training and employing individuals with disabilities. Through this program, people with disabilities enjoy full participation in their community and are able to become self-sufficient wage earners and tax payers.

In the United States, the program serves approximately 43,000 people with disabilities and generated approximately $360 million in wages earned and nearly $1.8 billion in products sold. In Georgia alone, some 938 people with disabilities earned nearly $9 million in wages last year as a result of JWOD/AbilityOne. I am particularly proud that the 4th Congressional District is home to a JWOD contract for switchboard services. This dedicated workforce of people with disabilities provides excellent 24/7 service to the Atlanta VA Medical Center for nearly 15 years.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize the great contributions of American workers with disabilities. I commend the JWOD Program, its supporters, and its participants for making a difference where it is needed most. America truly works best when all Americans work.

PARKER EVAN LONG FOR THE AWARD OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Parker Long, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 444, and by earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Parker has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the years Parker has been involved in scouting, he has earned 30 merit badges and held numerous leadership positions, serving as Assistant Patrol Leader, Patrol Leader, and Senior Patrol Leader. Parker is also a member of the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and will become a Warrior this summer.

For his Eagle Scout project, Parker constructed a new fire pit at the Parkhill Christian Church in Kansas City, Missouri.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Parker Long for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO SALLIE PULLANO

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Sallie Pullano for her years of service to Chautauqua County. Mrs. Pullano is a wonderful example of what public service should be.

I would like to briefly touch on the many areas of service that Sallie has been involved with. Since January 2000 she has served as

the Human Services Chair in the County Legislature. This committee oversees the Departments of Social Services, Youth, Aged, Health, Veterans, and Mental Health, and the County Home. There is no doubt that she will be missed in each of these areas. Sallie also has a special place in her heart for children and senior citizens.

I must also acknowledge Mrs. Pullano's other interests. She not only served as an integral member of the Chautauqua County Legislature for many years but she is actively involved in a leading role in the Dunkirk-Fredonia Breast Cancer Support Group and holds membership in the Partners for Prevention Coalition. She also serves on the boards of directors for Hospice Chautauqua and Chautauqua Opportunities, Inc., and is on the Chautauqua County Health Network Advisory Board.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in congratulating Sallie on her wonderful job well done in the Chautauqua County Legislature. Sallie, you will be missed by all of the constituents whose lives you touched. Enjoy your retirement!

HOME INFUSION THERAPY COVERAGE ACT OF 2007

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues KAY GRANGER, TAMMY BALDWIN, CHIP PICKERING and RANDY KUHL in introducing the ''Home Infusion Therapy Coverage Act of 2007''. This bill would correct long-standing gaps in Medicare coverage for home infusion therapy, and will enable thousands of beneficiaries to obtain these often life-saving therapies in the most convenient and cost-effective setting—their homes.

Currently, most beneficiaries who have severe infections, cancer, congestive heart disease or numerous other diagnoses for which infusion therapy is the clear state-of-the-art treatment must be admitted into hospitals or nursing homes to receive this care. This is most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. The private sector recognizes the clinical value and cost-effectiveness of home infusion therapy, and as a result full and proper coverage of home infusion therapy is commonplace among private payers. Medicare stands virtually alone in its antiquated coverage policies that discourage the use of a therapy that in actuality should be promoted for its cost savings and convenience.

Home infusion therapy requires the coordination of professional services, supplies and equipment to safely and effectively administer infusion drugs. Part D, the outpatient prescription drug benefit, covers most infusion drugs, but does not cover these services, supplies and equipment necessary to provide infusion therapy in the home. As a result, Part D coverage of home infusion falls far short of its potential to keep patients out of hospitals and nursing homes. Many beneficiaries must pay for the infusion services, supplies and equipment with out-of-pocket funds and most cannot afford this expense. Their only other realistic option is to obtain their care in a hospital or nursing home at a much higher cost burden to our Nation's healthcare system. The clear result is that access to home infusion therapy, despite its potential for cost savings and good clinical outcomes, is needlessly limited.

Our bill is very simple in its approach. It would institute coverage for the home infusion-related services, supplies and equipment under Part B, while maintaining coverage of the drugs themselves under Part D. Medicare Part B clearly is the most appropriate part of the Medicare program for coverage of the non-drug components of the therapy. In addition, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services would apply quality standards that are consistent with the private sector's community standard of care. Both beneficiaries and the Medicare program itself would reap the benefits of broader access to these important medical treatments in the home.

I would like to note that this legislation is strongly supported by a broad coalition of infusion therapy stakeholders, including patient organizations, infusion pharmacies, infectious disease physicians, and manufacturers of infusion drugs. Along with my colleagues, I urge early consideration of this long-overdue bill.

HONORING THE CHRISTIAN REFORMED CHURCH IN NORTH AMERICA ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. VERNON J. EHLERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the Christian Reformed Church in North America, which is celebrating the 150th anniversary of its founding. The church is in the midst of a year-long series of observances and services centered on the theme ''Grace Through Every Generation,'' in three phases of emphasis: Remembering, Rejoicing, and Rededicating.

The Christian Reformed Church (CRC) is a group of nearly a thousand Protestant churches in the United States and Canada. The CRC has its roots in the Reformation of the 16th century. In 1517, the Reformation divided the Christian church, and several Protestant denominations were born. One branch developed under the influence of theologians Ulrich Zwingli and John Calvin. The ''Presbyterian'' church flourished in Scotland and the ''Reformed'' church in northern Europe, particularly in the Netherlands, with an emphasis on the sovereignty of God, faith in Him alone for salvation, and the preeminence of Scripture in worship.

Dutch Protestants brought their deep faith and their practical piety with them when they emigrated to the United States in the 1800s. My district in West Michigan has some of the deepest roots of Dutch-American history and heritage in the country. Dutch explorers, traders and settlers were a significant part of the earliest European exploration of the New World, especially in New York and New Jersey. However, the first major wave of Dutch immigration began in the 1840s with the Calvinists. Like so many of the original settlers here in America, they wanted more religious liberty than they experienced in their home country. They dared to journey across the Atlantic to New York and then moved across northern New York and finally settled near the shores of Lake Michigan. Waves of Dutch settlers soon found Grand Rapids and Holland, Michigan, to be the places of stability and religious liberty they were seeking. In 1857, a group of four churches—about 130 families—officially broke from the Dutch Reformed Church and formed the Christian Reformed Church in North America.

Throughout its 150 years, the CRC has maintained a commitment to the teachings of John Calvin as well as the great Dutch theologian, Abraham Kuyper, who called the church not only to holy living but to assert Jesus Christ's lordship over all of creation. This means that every aspect of life belongs to God, and every sphere of life—from schools to homes to businesses to government—can be a forum for learning more about God and helping to make the world a better place.

Throughout its 150 years, the CRC has wrestled with many of the same social issues faced by other churches and the country in general. The church's worldview has shaped its level of accommodation of different lifestyles and cultures, its discussions of ways to combat racism, its debates over the place of women in church leadership, and its consideration of the appropriate response to war and other international conflicts.

Throughout its 150 years, several CRC programs and ministries have developed and grown to reflect this worldview. This includes The Back to God Hour, the church's worldwide radio and Internet ministry program; Christian Reformed World Missions, supporting more than 300 missionaries in 30 countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia; the Christian Reformed World Relief Committee, which provides financial assistance and recovery workers in response to disasters and establishes long-term self-promotion and sustainable living projects around the world; and Calvin College and Calvin Theological Seminary, the church's educational institutions that help equip students for lives of work in God's service in every field.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to be a member of this church denomination, which has helped me and millions of others through the last 150 years to worship God faithfully, to experience fellowship with other believers, and to provide spiritual and physical care to those in need. I commend its members during this special time of remembering, rejoicing and rededicating. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the CRC on its 150 years of service.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OF SERGEANT IOSIWO URUO, UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, some men become heroes on the battlefield; some are heroes in their communities, even before they go off to battle. With much sadness, I rise to say that Guam and the island of Chuuk in the Federated States of Micronesia have lost such a hero. Army SGT Iosiwo Uruo, who died on May 24, 2007 in Buhriz, Iraq, in support of

Operation Iraq Freedom, was well known and well liked in his home village of Agana Heights for his friendly but quiet, and humble nature.

Fondly known to family and friends as ''Siwo,'' Sergeant Uruo was born in Chuuk on November 29, 1979. His family moved to Guam in 1987 and they were befriended by Agana Heights Mayor Paul McDonald and his family, and the two families became close friends. Siwo's passing deeply grieves both families.

Sergeant Uruo attended Agana Heights Elementary School and Agueda Johnston Middle School. He graduated from George Washington High School in 2000, the first in his family to earn a diploma. Siwo was involved in the high school's ROTC Program and played football for GWHS for several years. In Agana Heights, Iosiwo participated in sporting events such as baseball and softball; he was part of the Mayor's Youth for Hire Program, to help village youths earn money by doing yard work or general cleaning, and the Agana Heights ''Fun In The Sun'' Summer Program, as youth worker. He also was a member of Troop 22 of the Boy Scouts of America, Agana Heights.

Sergeant Uruo was the proverbial 'good son,' hardworking, respectful, and obedient. He enlisted in the Army after graduating from high school because he wanted to serve his country.

On behalf of the People of Guam and a grateful nation, I extend heartfelt condolences and profound sympathy to Sergeant Uruo's parents, Isaoshy and Iosita; his sisters, Isabel and Josephine; his brothers, Iosiro, Joshua, Alanser, and Ivan; his sisters-in-law, Fatima and Jonea; and nephew Iverson; as well as to his all of his extended family and friends, especially Mayor Paul and Elaine McDonald and their family. Siwo was a caring son, a loving brother, and a proud American patriot.

RECOGNIZING HEATHER KNUDSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize the outstanding achievement of Heather Knudson on winning the National Associated Christian Schools International (ACSI) Spelling Bee.

Heather placed second in the regional ACSI Spelling Bee, which took place February 24, in Dallas Texas. Heather then went on to win first place in the National Spelling Bee on May 12, 2007 in Washington, D.C. The contest brought in 46 of the top spellers from around the country, which was narrowed down from 15,000 participants.

By correctly spelling the word, ''syzygy'' which means, an alignment of three celestial objects, as the sun, the earth, and either the moon or a planet, Heather won a laptop computer, a $200 saving bond and the distinct honor of placing a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Heather is an outstanding and bright young woman. She has recently completed the eighth grade at Life Christian Academy in Kansas City. Extremely dedicated, she studied approximately 2,500 words in preparation for the contest. She was able to remember her winning word, which she studied years ago, because it is such an unusual word.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in congratulating the achievement of Heather Knudson on winning first place in the National Associated Christian Schools International Spelling Bee. It is an honor to represent her in the United States Congress.

TRIBUTE TO PHILIP M. KAISER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the late Philip M. Kaiser, an extraordinary public servant, diplomat, husband, father, grandfather, and a friend of mine.

Mr. Kaiser was born in Brooklyn on July 12th, 1913. He attended the University of Wisconsin and was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship to study at Oxford University upon graduation.

Mr. Kaiser first served his country under President Truman as Assistant Secretary of Labor. He went on to represent the United States as Ambassador to Senegal, Austria, and Hungary under Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Carter. During this period, Mr. Kaiser became well-known for his diplomatic abilities, successfully fostering U.S. relations with Hungary and Senegal at a time when communism was on the rise across the globe.

More recently, Mr. Kaiser contributed to the new Democratic majority through his support of 4 successful Democratic congressional candidates, including myself, in 2006.

Phil Kaiser was the type of man who held strong convictions and followed through on his beliefs. He made the most of any position he accepted, and always stayed true to himself and his values. Mr. Kaiser's life is a model of patriotism and dedication.

Phil Kaiser was the patriarch of a beautiful family. He is survived by his wife of 67 years, Hannah, his sons Charles, Robert, and David, and his 4 grandchildren.

I am honored to have known such an incredible, dedicated, passionate, and patriotic man. His contributions to his country, his love for his family, and his spirit will remain an inspiration.

NATIONAL HUNGER AWARENESS DAY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate National Hunger Awareness Day and to honor the Arlington Food Assistance Center (AFAC), which is located in my congressional district.

National Hunger Awareness Day was established to help inform individuals, communities, corporations and policy makers that hunger is a severe domestic issue and deserves our critical attention. It is part of a grassroots effort to raise awareness about the solvable problem of hunger in America.

AFAC's sole mission is to feed the hungry. AFAC obtains food at no cost from local bakeries, supermarkets, food drives and private donors. This important work allows their clients to make other necessary purchases, such as paying for rent and utilities, without having to sacrifice their health and nutritional needs.

Despite the fact that Arlington County is one of the wealthiest areas in the country, too many local residents do not have enough to eat. AFAC seeks to remedy this problem by distributing bread, vegetables, meat, milk, eggs and other food items to those families in Arlington who cannot afford these dietary. Volunteers at AFAC currently distribute groceries to nearly 700 families each week. Nearly half of the people getting food from AFAC are children.

I would like to commend the staff and volunteers of the Arlington Food Assistance Center who work hard to provide needy families in Arlington with groceries each week. I urge my constituents to donate food to AFAC through a food drive on June 5th.

TRIBUTE TO DOROTHY WALSH

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend, Dorothy Walsh. Dorothy is the owner of Dorothy Walsh Fine Clothes, in Northport New York. Dorothy Walsh Fine Clothes is a women's boutique known for an exclusive inventory that runs the gamut, from bridal gowns and dresses for special occasions to trendy sportswear.

The very special shop has the distinction of being one of Main Street's oldest businesses, opened in 1950 under the name of Esther Stevens Fine Clothes. Dorothy said she responded to an ad in the newspaper and her first responsibilities as an employee there included bookkeeping and checking in merchandise. Dorothy took over this business in 1994. She will be retiring from this business in August of this year.

We, as clientele, have reaped the benefit of her flair for fashion and meticulous attention to detail, captured in the eye-catching store displays juxtaposing the right colors and accessories. The store became the place to go, not only because Dorothy's taste was impeccable but also because she gave us, her customers, the unparalleled experience of feeling as if we were shopping with a knowledgeable and reassuring friend. I have been shopping with Dorothy for 10 years and would always find the perfect blouse for my suits, a special scarf for a holiday or a gift for my daughter-in-law. (Wrapped, by Dorothy, of course.)

Time spent in the store always was sprinkled with local news and general discussion of political and national events. During the stressful time debating gun violence in this country, we would get a call from Dorothy with encouraging words to keep up the good fight. How grateful I am for her kindness and thoughtfulness.

Dorothy Walsh is a member of the Northport family. She has lived there for more than 30 years and was recently acknowledged by the Northport Historical Society and Museum for years of commitment. She has always supported the community and never said ''no''.

For the last four years, as a member of the Northport Chamber of Commerce, Dorothy has orchestrated Operation Warmth, calling upon the community to donate gently used coats, jackets, gloves and scarves to be distributed to the needy. She has been an integral part of the beautification projects throughout the seasons—bringing her special and tasteful touch to Main Street's outdoor displays.

Madam Speaker, those people who have been lucky enough to know Dorothy and shopped at her store, will miss this special place. We are happy to know that Dorothy will still be in Northport, active in the chamber, her community and her church. Most particularly, Dorothy will be able to have more time for herself and her beloved family. Lucky for us she will still be in Northport. I am grateful to have Dorothy as my friend. I ask that you, and all my colleagues wish Dorothy great success in her next adventure and praise her as a great citizen.

U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' CARE, KATRINA RECOVERY, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 2007

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2206, the "U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Act of 2007." I concur in House Amendment No.1 to the Senate Amendment because I believe in doing all we can to support our troops. But I cannot concur in House Amendment No. 2 to the Senate Amendment because there is a limit to the patience of the American people. They have been waiting for more than four years for the Bush Administration to develop a successful policy in Iraq and for the Iraqi Government to take responsibility for the security of the Iraqi people.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us makes emergency supplemental appropriations for the Iraq War and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007.

This emergency supplemental provides $120 billion primarily for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and for improving the health care for returning soldiers and veterans. It also provides for the continued recovery of the Gulf Coast from the devastation wrought by Hurricane Katrina and fills major gaps in homeland security.

Specifically, the agreement provides $99.5 billion for the Defense Department for continued military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The legislation includes a $1 billion increase for the National Guard and Reserve equipment and $1.1 billion for military housing. The supplemental legislation provides $3 billion ($1.2 billion more than the President's request) for the purchase of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles (MRAP)—vehicles designed to withstand roadside bombs.

Mr. Speaker, included in the bill is $4.8 billion to ensure that troops and veterans receive the health care that they have earned with their service and another $6.4 billion to rebuild the Gulf Coast and help the victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. There is also emergency funding for the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) totals more than $650 million. Finally, Homeland security investments total more than $1 billion, including funds for port security and mass transit security, for explosives detection equipment at airports, and for several initiatives in the 9/11 bill that recently passed the Senate.

Most important, Mr. Speaker, this legislation includes the benchmarks and reporting requirements that were contained in the Warner Amendment in the Senate, which specifies 18 benchmarks for measuring progress by the Iraqi government, including the benchmarks that President Bush laid out on January 10. But they do not include the timelines included in prior versions of the supplemental that Americans approve, support, and demand.

The Warner Amendment requires the President to submit *two reports* to Congress on the progress of the Iraqi government on meeting the 18 benchmarks—one by July 15, 2005 and the second by September 15, 2007. If the President fails to certify progress on each of the 18 benchmarks in the September report, the Iraqi government would lose the economic aid being provided by the United States unless the President exercises his authority to waive the certification requirement in accordance with the procedures set forth in the bill. The amendment also requires *an independent report* from the General Accounting Office by September 1, 2007 on the progress of the Iraqi government in meeting the 18 benchmarks.

Mr. Speaker, in vetoing the previous emergency supplemental, the President claimed it will "undermine our troops and threaten the safety of the American people here at home." Coming from an Administration that has been wrong on every important question relating to the decision to launch the Iraq War as well the conduct of it, this claim is laughable. It is nearly as ridiculous as the President's often stated claim of "progress" in Iraq. The facts, of course, are otherwise.

The U.S. death toll in Iraq reached 83 in just the first 7 days of May—making it the deadliest month of the year and one of the deadliest of the entire war. It is therefore little wonder that nearly 70% of Americans disapprove of the way the President is handling the war. But more important, the President's claim that the Iraq Accountability Act undermines our troops and threatens the safety of the American people here at home is simply not true.

Mr. Speaker, to date, the war in Iraq has lasted longer than America's involvement in World War II, the greatest conflict in all of human history. But there is a difference. The Second World War ended in complete and total victory for the United States and its allies. But then again, in that conflict America was led by FDR, a great Commander-in-Chief, who had a plan to win the war and secure the peace, listened to his generals, and sent troops in sufficient numbers and sufficiently trained and equipped to do the job.

As a result of the colossal miscalculation in deciding to invade Iraq, the loss of public trust resulting from the misrepresentation of the reasons for launching that invasion, and the breath taking incompetence in mismanaging the occupation of Iraq, the Armed Forces and the people of the United States have suffered incalculable damage.

The war in Iraq has claimed the lives of 3,431 brave servicemen and women. More than 25,378 Americans have been wounded, many suffering the most horrific injuries. American taxpayers have paid nearly $400 billion to sustain this misadventure.

By vetoing the bipartisan Iraq Accountability Act last week, the President vetoed the will of the American people. The President vetoed a responsible funding bill for the troops that would have provided more funding for our troops and military readiness than even the President requested.

By vetoing the Iraq Accountability Act, the President rejected a bill that reflects the will of the American people to wind down this war. By vetoing the Iraq Accountability Act, the President turned a deaf ear to the loud message sent by the American people last November.

That is why I will proudly vote for H.R. 2206. This legislation places the responsibility for bringing peace and security where it clearly belongs and that is squarely on the shoulders of the Iraqi government. The legislation crafted by the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee in consultation with the leadership and the members of the Democratic Caucus moves us closer to the day when we end the misguided invasion, war, and occupation of Iraq. It puts us on the glide path to the day when our troops come home in honor and triumph and where we can "care for him who has borne the battle, and for his widow and orphan."

Mr. Speaker, in passing H.R. 2206, this House will be doing the business and expressing the will of the American people. In the latest CBS News/New York Times poll, 64 percent of Americans favor a timetable that provides for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq in 2008. In the same poll, 57 percent of Americans believe that Congress, not the President, should have the last say when it comes to setting troop levels in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, in passing H.R. 2206, Congress is fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities and exercising the first check on the President's power in six years. As Iraq Study Group Co-Chairman Lee Hamilton has pointed out, "The founders of our nation never envisioned an unfettered president making unilateral decisions about American lives and military power. They did indeed make the president the commander in chief, but they gave to Congress the responsibility for declaring war, for making rules governing our land and naval forces, for overseeing policy, and of course the ability to fund war or to cease funding it."

Mr. Speaker, the President demands a blank check to escalate the war in Iraq against the will of the Congress and the American people. The Constitution does not require it, he certainly has not earned it, and I am not prepared to give it to him. That is why I cannot concur in House Amendment No. 2 to the Senate Amendment. I do concur in House Amendment No. 1 and I urge all members to join me.

HONORING DR. FRED P. CARTER

HON. RON LEWIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Fred P. Carter, a resident of my congressional district who recently announced his plans to retire as Superintendent of the Glasgow Independent School District.

For the past 34 years, Dr. Carter has made educating the children of the Commonwealth his top priority. The Glasgow School District has experienced remarkable growth during his tenure resulting in steady student grade improvement. Student performance on Kentucky's CATS test has improved each of the five years he was in charge, climbing into the state's top ten three years ago. Dr. Carter also oversaw the construction of the Highland Elementary School in Glasgow and the instillation of interactive classroom technology in every school across the district.

In retirement, Dr. Carter plans to concentrate on other aspects of his life including his faith and his family. On behalf of countless friends and neighbors in the Glasgow area, I would like to thank Dr. Carter for his many selfless years of service to Kentucky school children.

It is my great privilege to recognize Dr. Fred P. Carter today, before the entire House of Representatives, for his indelible contributions to the Barren County community. He is an outstanding American worthy of our collective honor and appreciation. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Dr. Carter a very happy and healthy retirement.

BRAVO TO THE AUSSIES

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, one of my constituents, Rip Kirby, sent me the following article and asked that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Kirby was the Founder of the Baseball Chapel for the minor leagues of professional baseball. He is a respected Christian leader and an outstanding American.

Many people in this Country and really all over the world are becoming fed up with "political correctness."

I would like to call this article to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

BRAVO TO THE AUSSIES

I had seen this before, but felt it worth sending again and again to see if our government can have the guts to follow suit.

If anyone has a link to the White House, send it. Though doubt that anything will be done. But maybe in time we can make a difference with as many decent politicians we can elect.

This country needs to get God and human decency back into our society and stop letting others take advantage of our freedoms.

I and most Americans see nothing wrong with the stance that Australia has taken. They deserve our applause.

Muslims who want to live under Islamic Sharia law were told on Wednesday to get out of Australia, as the government targeted radicals in a bid to head off potential terror attacks.

A day after a group of mainstream Muslim leaders pledged loyalty to Australia and her Queen at a special meeting with Prime Minister John Howard, he and his Ministers made it clear that extremists would face a crackdown. Treasurer Peter Costello, seen as heir apparent to Howard, hinted that some radical clerics could be asked to leave the country if they did not accept that Australia was a secular state, and its laws were made by parliament. "If those are not your values, if you want a country which has Sharia law or a theocratic state, then Australia is not for you", he said on National Television.

"I'd be saying to clerics who are teaching that there are two laws governing people in Australia: one the Australian law and another Islamic law, that is false. If you can't agree with parliamentary law, independent courts, democracy, and would prefer Sharia law and have the opportunity to go to another country, which practices it, perhaps, then, that's a better option", Costello said.

Asked whether he meant radical clerics would be forced to leave, he said those with dual citizenship could possibly be asked to move to the other country. Education Minister Brendan Nelson later told reporters that Muslims who did not want to accept local values should "clear off. Basically people who don't want to be Australians, and who don't want to live by Australian values and understand them, well then, they can basically clear off', he said.

Separately, Howard angered some Australian Muslims on Wednesday by saying he supported spy agencies monitoring the nation's mosques.

Quote: "IMMIGRANTS, NOT AUSTRALIANS, MUST ADAPT. Take It or Leave It. I am tired of this nation worrying about whether we are offending some individual or their culture. Since the terrorist attacks on Bali, we have experienced a surge in patriotism by the majority of Australians."

"However, the dust from the attacks had barely settled when the 'politically correct' crowd began complaining about the possibility that our patriotism was offending others. I am not against immigration, nor do I hold a grudge against anyone who is seeking a better life by coming to Australia." "However, there are a few things that those who have recently come to our country, and apparently some born here, need to understand." "This idea of Australia being a multi-cultural community has served only to dilute our sovereignty and our national identity. And as Australians, we have our own culture, our own society, our own language and our own lifestyle." "This culture has been developed over two centuries of struggles, trials and victories by millions of men and women who have sought freedom" "We speak mainly English, not Spanish, Lebanese, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Russian, or any other language. Therefore, if you wish to become part of our society . . . Learn the language!"

"Most Australians believe in God. This is not some Christian, right wing, political push, but a fact, because Christian men and women, on Christian principles, founded this nation, and this is clearly documented. It is certainly appropriate to display it on the walls of our schools. If God offends you, then I suggest you consider another part of the world as your new home, because God is part of our culture." "We will accept your beliefs, and will not question why. All we ask is that you accept ours, and live in harmony and peaceful enjoyment with us."

"If the Southern Cross offends you, or you don't like "A Fair Go", then you should seriously consider a move to another part of this planet. We are happy with our culture and have no desire to change, and we really don't care how you did things where you came from. By all means, keep your culture, but do not force it on others. "This is Our Country, Our Land, and Our Lifestyle, and we will allow you every opportunity to enjoy all this. But once you are done complaining, whining, and griping about Our Flag, Our Pledge, Our Christian beliefs, or Our Way of Life, I highly encourage you take advantage of one other great Australian freedom, 'The Right To Leave'."

"If you aren't happy here then Leave. We didn't force you to come here. You asked to be here. So accept the country You accepted."

Maybe if we circulate this amongst ourselves, American citizens will find the backbone to start speaking and voicing the same truths!

NICOLAS E. BENNETT FOR THE AWARD OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nicolas E. Bennett, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 444, and by earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nicolas has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the years Nicolas has been involved in scouting, he has earned 30 merit badges and held numerous leadership positions, serving as Troop Quartermaster, and Patrol Leader. Parker is also a member of the Tribe of Mic-O-Say, he chose the name of Fast Cheetah, and achieved the rank of Fire Builder.

For his Eagle Scout project, Nicolas helped with the re-construction of a Rosary Garden for St. Andrew the Apostle Catholic Church of Gladstone, MO.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nicolas Bennett, for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE LAS VEGAS SPRINGS PRESERVE PROJECT

HON. SHELLEY BERKLEY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, today I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Las Vegas Springs Preserve project, and how this one-of-a-kind interactive, historical and educational facility will forever preserve and sustain the original springs where Las Vegas was established.

When it opens in June, this $250 million non-gaming cultural and historical attraction will offer a fun, educational and recreational gathering place to commemorate Las Vegas' dynamic history and provide a vision for a sustainable future. The Preserve will feature a series of historic museums, galleries, outdoor

concerts, events, an interpretive trail system, a botanical garden and the Nevada State Museum and Historical Society where Nevadans and tourists alike will find a unique, educational experience about the history of Las Vegas.

Seeking the rich California coast, Spanish traders of the early 19th Century forged a path west that became known as the Old Spanish Trail. Upon discovering a vale of sanctuary, they named it ''Las Vegas''—Spanish for ''The Meadows.'' In the years that followed, the Las Vegas Springs welcomed weary travelers, explorers, traders, settlers and Mormon missionaries—all of them drawn here by one common denominator—water from the springs.

Enticing many to remain and make use of its waters, land near the springs was purchased by the railroad, which created the Las Vegas town site. It was water from the natural springs that powered the railroads' steam locomotives. In later years, the Nevada Legislature created the Las Vegas Valley Water District. Among the Water District's inherited holdings was the Las Vegas Springs property.

In 1978, the 180-acre Springs Preserve, located approximately three miles west of downtown Las Vegas, was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The site represents one of the richest and most unique cultural and biological resources in Southern Nevada. As the largest commercial straw-bale construction project in the United States, the Preserve is erecting seven new green buildings intended to join an elite list of buildings nationwide that have achieved ''Platinum'' Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification from the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC).

Today, the Springs Preserve site is still owned by the Water District—a steward of water resources in the Valley for more than 50 years. During this time, human progress has surrounded this timeless plot of land, but operational wells and water distribution facilities saved the site from development. The Las Vegas Valley Water District and the Springs Preserve Foundation have formed a public-private partnership that will serve as a unique model for teaching cultural and environmental sustainability. Beginning next month, the story of the Las Vegas Springs will be told through both guided and self-guided tours, interpretive stations and several museum galleries.

As the representative of Nevada's First Congressional District, it gives me immense pride to recognize this outstanding and unique educational facility in the heart of my congressional district. With this example of pioneering preservation, sustainable construction and innovative education, visitors to the Las Vegas Springs Preserve will be inspired by what they see and be motivated to implement the ideals of preserving our past, while simultaneously creating a livable future.

Again, I proudly urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this outstanding public-private educational facility.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL ANDREW WEATHERSTONE

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Major Andrew Weatherstone on the occasion of his promotion to Lieutenant Colonel on June 1, 2007. Andy is an Army Fellow in my Congressional office this year, and he is an extraordinary soldier and human being.

He is a great leader, a motivator of men and women in his command, a seeker of creative solutions . . . an officer uniquely suited to the United States Army at a moment we need all the great soldiers and officers we can get.

We were lucky to get Andy this year; his last assignment was in Iraq. So my team and I have had the benefit of his counsel at a pivotal moment in our history, as we seek solutions to the ongoing conflict in Iraq and the many readiness issues Iraq has highlighted.

A graduate of the University of Tennessee, with a Masters from the University of Central Michigan, Andy is a soldier's soldier. He came up through the ranks, starting as a platoon leader and battery officer in 1993, to operating a 1,200 strong Task Force and a Forward Operating Base in Taji, Iraq, in 2004.

Andy understands the needs of a battlefield soldier; and he understands the political machinations that surround the conduct of our military policy. He may not be patient with that, but few of us are these days.

He understands that democracy must be defended; and he knows that democracy means involving everybody and all opinions in determining policy.

He knows that freedom is not free, and in wearing the uniform of the United States he is one of those paying the price for all our freedoms on battlefields around the world.

Andy's story would not be complete without including his wife, Jennifer, his ''champ,'' and their daughters Lauren and Elizabeth. Andy got to be home when Elizabeth was born this year.

For all that he has learned in the field, in combat, in training, and in teaching other soldiers . . . LTC Andy Weatherstone will be a remarkable leader in the U.S. Army.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Andy—and his family—on the occasion of his promotion to Lieutenant Colonel.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, May 22, 2007, I was unavoidably detained on official business.

I request that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 395: ''No.'' On motion to recommit with instructions (H.R. 1427).

IN LASTING MEMORY OF HAROLD VENABLE

HON. MIKE ROSS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Harold Venable, of Grady, AR, who passed away June 4, 2007, at the age of 78.

Mr. Venable had two passions—farming and public service. He served on the Lincoln County Quorum Court for 24 years and was a member of the Grady City Council. Mr. Venable was a retired farmer recognized as an accomplished agriculturist who won multiple awards at the Arkansas State Fair and was a past recipient of the Farm Family of the Year Award.

Mr. Venable spent a lifetime giving back to his community and his dedication and numerous contributions to agriculture will never be forgotten. Anyone who ever knew him will always remember his smile and good-natured spirit as he always made time for anyone who wanted to talk.

Perhaps most important was Mr. Venable's gracious nature which he bestowed upon his fellow man, something that was deep-seated in his strong faith. He was an active, lifelong member of the First Baptist Church of Grady where he served as a Deacon. In addition, his humble influence and natural ability to lead was evident in all he did. He was a charter member and past President of the Grady Lion's Club, a member of the Long Lake Drainage Board, the Lincoln County Farm Bureau, and the Big Island Hunting Club.

My deepest condolences go to his beloved wife of 59 years, Charlene Venable of Grady; his two daughters, Sondra Ashcroft of Pine Bluff and Billie Issacs of Grady; his three grandchildren Lee Drake of Star City, Christian Ashcraft of Pine Bluff and Britten Ashcraft of Pine Bluff; and to his three brothers Clyde Venable of Grady, Leonard Venable of Little Rock, and Robert Venable of Grady. Harold Venable will be greatly missed in Grady, Lincoln County, and throughout the state of Arkansas.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2317, LOBBYING TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2007 AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2316, HONEST LEADERSHIP AND OPEN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 2007

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, today we stand on the verge of passing two pieces of lobby reform legislation that mark an important step toward greater transparency and accountability for Congress. This is a welcome and much-needed response to the growing dissatisfaction of the American people, who do not approve of the increasing role and influence that special interests have on our democracy. There is, however, much more that Congress must do.

In the November 2008 election, the American people made it clear that the corruption that has been seeping into government cannot be tolerated. It is now the task of Congress to raise the standards of ethics in lobbying and campaign finance in order to meet the expectations of the public. We must take action now to remove the grip that private money has on our democracy. I urge my colleagues to support these lobbying reform measures on the floor today, but believe our work is not yet done.

We must break the link between private financing of campaigns and the electoral process. During the 109th Congress, Chairman OBEY introduced legislation to do just that. His bill would have set specific expenditure limitations for general elections, established the Grassroots Good Citizenship Fund to provide public funding for House candidates' expenditures, and banned independent expenditures in House elections. This bill would take money laden with strings and political debts out of House elections. I cosponsored this bill last Congress, and I hope Chairman OBEY will be reintroducing it soon.

We must also take the job of reorganizing districts out of the realm of partisan politics and special interests. H.R. 543, the Fairness and Independence in Redistricting Act of 2007, introduced by Representative JOHN TANNER, would establish an independent commission for the purpose of doing the work of redistricting. I am a cosponsor of this legislation, and hope that this Congress will look very seriously at passing it.

We must utilize the public airways to make campaigns less costly. Most of what is spent in an election is spent on advertising. We can change this. By fairly utilizing publicly owned airways to run campaign ads, the exorbitant cost of campaigns can be reduced, and the associated fundraising, and perceived corruption could be curbed.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. WESS STAFFORD'S 30 YEAR ANNIVERSARY AT COMPASSION INTERNATIONAL

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Wess Stafford's 30th anniversary with Compassion International. A widely respected child advocacy organization, Compassion International has helped over one and a half million children since its inception in 1952 and currently operates in 24 developing countries worldwide.

Dr. Stafford began his work with this worthy group on May 1, 1977 and was elected its president in 1993. Raised by missionary parents in a poverty-stricken town in the Ivory Coast, Dr. Stafford witnessed first hand, immense suffering and tragedy. This experience led him to become a passionate advocate for children all over the world. An admirable Christian, Dr. Stafford believes that all human life is precious and deserves to be protected and cherished; a value he extols in his book Too Small to Ignore.

The mission of Compassion is to ''release children from poverty in Jesus' name,'' and Dr. Stafford has tried to do just that. Today, the organization not only provides a child sponsorship program, it has also put into action an AIDS Initiative, Child Survival Program, and Leadership Development Program. Since becoming its leader, Dr. Stafford has increased the number of children served by Compassion from 180,000 to over 800,000.

Dr. Stafford's evident enthusiasm for his work and selfless dedication to the service of others are a true inspiration. He and those with whom he works are undeterred by the enormity of the problems they seek to solve. Rather than feeling that the mission is an insurmountable challenge, they understand that victory is achieved when one life is saved. Today I offer Dr. Stafford my congratulations on this milestone and appreciation for his work. I am proud and humbled by the privilege of representing him, and all of those who are a part of Compassion International.

TRIBUTE TO JIM BURGER

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Jim Burger, Vice President of Sales and Marketing at Helsel Lumber, who has been named the Small Business Association's Regional Exporter of the Year. Jim was presented with this award at the SBA's annual awards luncheon on May 25th in Pittsburgh, PA, and will also be recognized at the St. Francis University Small Business Development Center's annual luncheon on June 12th.

The SBA Exporter of the Year is chosen from companies in Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia and Washington, DC. This award recognizes exceptional business professionals whose business has seen an increase in sales and profits as well as growth in the number of employees as a result of exporting. Jim was nominated by the St. Francis University Small Business Development Center.

Mr. Burger began his career with Helsel Lumber, an exporting company in Duncansville, PA, at the age of 16 as an after-school job, returning to the mill full time after graduating from Penn State University and working his way up to vice president and co-owner of the facility in 2001. As vice president, Jim has worked tirelessly to lead the business to become an active and successful exporting company. His efforts have paid off, as Helsel Lumber has grown to include export sales to Europe and Asia and has recently done significant work in China. Helsel Lumber received an Export Achievement Award from the U.S. Commercial Service in 2006.

Jim has made a significant contribution not only to the betterment of Helsel Lumber, but to the region's economic growth and success as well. Our small business leaders are key to the continued economic vitality and success of our communities. The company and the community are lucky to have such a devoted leader, and the members of our community who have benefited from the efforts of Helsel Lumber and Jim Burger would certainly join me in thanking him for his contributions to the community and economy.

BREAST CANCER AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH ACT

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, more than three million American women are currently living with breast cancer. The American Cancer Society estimates that this year, approximately 179,000 new cases of breast cancer will be diagnosed among women in the United States and that 41,000 women will die from the disease. According to the National Institutes of Health (NIH), breast cancer will affect one in eight women over the course of their lifetime. Although important advances have been made in screening for and treating breast cancer, we still do not know what causes this disease, or how to prevent it.

There is currently a dearth of studies providing conclusive evidence regarding the effects of environmental factors such as pesticides and other toxins on the development of breast cancer. Further study of these and many other factors, suspected of playing a role but not yet comprehensively examined, could be invaluable in helping to prevent breast cancer.

Many of us have voiced our support for this critical research by co-sponsoring the Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Act over several Congresses. The legislation, H.R. 1157 in the 110th Congress, would authorize $40 million a year for five years for the National Institutes of Health to make grants on a competitive, peer-reviewed basis, for the creation of multi-disciplinary Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Centers of Excellence. The Centers would be the first federally funded entities established specifically to study the potential links between breast cancer and the environment. The Centers would be required to collaborate with community organizations such as those representing women with breast cancer.

Breast cancer is a disease that has unfortunately touched the lives of almost every family in our country. Those of us who have supported programs such as the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program and the DOD Breast Cancer Research program must be equally willing to support efforts to uncover the causes of this terrible disease. H.R. 1157 is an important piece of legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it.

TRIBUTE TO THIRLEE SMITH, SR.

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Thirlee Smith, Sr., one of the preeminent role models of our community. A man of great repute and high standing who enriched the lives of so many community members throughout Miami, Thirlee Smith, Sr. lived a meaningful and fulfilling life dedicated to the betterment of our society through acts of good will.

We have lost an outstanding leader, but we are blessed to have been touched by his greatness. It is our collective responsibility to carry forward and continue the good works and deeds that Thirlee Smith, Sr. practiced on a daily basis.

Thirlee Smith, Sr. led voter registration drives throughout the community, because he understood that voting is a civil right. Thirlee Smith, Sr. stood at the forefront of this civil rights voter registration fight. Our democracy is more vibrant, our community is better represented, and our voices are now heard thanks to his tireless efforts.

Thirlee Smith, Sr. was born in Timpson, Texas on June 2, 1912, the second oldest of six children born to his loving parents. In the late 1930s, Thirlee Smith, Sr. married Beulah Finley, and built a three bedroom home in Liberty City which still stands to this day. Together Thirlee, Sr. and Beulah raised three outstanding children, who contributed to our community in their own right: Odessa S. Felder Cook, a retired Miami-Dade County Public School teacher; Thirlee Smith, Jr., a former Miami-Dade County Public School administrator and the first Black reporter for The Miami Herald; and the Honorable Frederica Wilson, my Florida State Senator.

Thirlee, Sr. was a 20-year member of the Revival Tabernacle Assembly of God under the leadership of retired Rev. Selwyn Scott, and served there as a deacon for many years, mentoring children and young adults. Thirlee, Sr. left this world a better place, and now, he returns home to a greater place in God's heavenly kingdom alongside his beloved Beulah Finley Smith.

It is only appropriate that on Friday, March 2, 2007, the city of Opa-Locka held a street naming ceremony in honor of Thirlee Smith, Sr. across the street from the billiard parlor where he registered members of the Black community to vote, led a community drive that resulted in the sanitation workers of Opa-Locka being issued uniforms and pay raises, and dispensed sage-like political and personal advice to friends who were also his patrons.

A husband, father, grandfather, great-grandfather, brother, uncie and friend, Thirlee, Sr. was a family man who leaves behind his devoted daughters; Odessa Felder Cook (Carliss), and Frederica S. Wilson; five loving grandchildren, Chandra Stephens (Clyde), Kimberly Emmanuel (Nicholas), Lakesha Wilson-Rochelle (Shelly) and Paul Wilson, Jr. (Farrah); five great-grand children, Cailey and Clifford Stephens, Najee and Chelsey Emmanuel, and Triston Paul Wilson; and nieces, nephews, cousins, and friends in Miami, Milwaukee, California, Texas and the Bahamas.

A man of great faith and spirituality who was the patriarch of a family that continues to serve our community with the highest levels of distinction, Thirlee Smith, Sr. left our world a better place than the world in which he entered.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7017–S7096

Measures Introduced: Fourteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1539–1552, and S. Res. 220. **Page S7070**

Measures Reported:

S. 1547, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. (S. Rept. No. 110–77)

S. 1142, to authorize the acquisition of interests in undeveloped coastal areas in order better to ensure their protection from development. (S. Rept. No. 110–78)

S. 1548, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year.

S. 1549, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military construction.

S. 1550, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for defense activities of the Department of Energy. **Page S7070**

Measures Passed:

Honoring Senator Craig Thomas: Senate agreed to S. Res. 220, honoring the life of Senator Craig Thomas. **Pages S7095–96**

Measures Considered:

Comprehensive Immigration Reform: Senate continued consideration of S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, and taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S7036–63**

Adopted:

By 71 yeas to 22 nays (Vote No. 183), Durbin/Grassley Amendment No. 1231 (to Amendment No. 1150), to ensure that employers make efforts to recruit American workers. **Pages S7036, S7039–41, S7041–42**

By 67 yeas to 26 nays (Vote No. 185), Feingold Amendment No. 1176 (to Amendment No. 1150), to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having achieved 60 affirmative votes, be agreed to). **Pages S7036, S7058–59, S7062**

Rejected:

By 31 yeas to 62 nays (Vote No. 182), Cornyn (for Allard) Amendment No. 1189 (to Amendment No. 1150), to eliminate the preference given to people who entered the United States illegally over people seeking to enter the country legally in the merit-based evaluation system for visas. **Pages S7036–39, S7041**

Withdrawn:

By 41 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 184), McConnell Amendment No. 1170 (to Amendment No. 1150), to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require individuals voting in person to present photo identification. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, be withdrawn). **Pages S7036, S7057–58, S7059–62**

Pending:

Reid (for Kennedy/Specter) Amendment No. 1150, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7036**

Cornyn Modified Amendment No. 1184 (to Amendment No. 1150), to establish a permanent bar for gang members, terrorists, and other criminals. **Page S7036**

Dodd/Menendez Amendment No. 1199 (to Amendment No. 1150), to increase the number of green cards for parents of United States citizens, to extend the duration of the new parent visitor visa, and to make penalties imposed on individuals who overstay such visas applicable only to such individuals. **Page S7036**

Menendez Amendment No. 1194 (to Amendment No. 1150), to modify the deadline for the family backlog reduction. **Page S7036**

Sessions Amendment No. 1234 (to Amendment No. 1150), to save American taxpayers up to $24 billion in the 10 years after passage of this Act, by preventing the earned income tax credit, which is, according to the Congressional Research Service, the

largest anti-poverty entitlement program of the Federal Government, from being claimed by Y temporary workers or illegal aliens given status by this Act until they adjust to legal permanent resident status. **Page S7036**

Sessions Amendment No. 1235 (to Amendment No. 1150), to save American taxpayers up to $24 billion in the 10 years after passage of this Act, by preventing the earned income tax credit, which is, according to the Congressional Research Service, the largest anti-poverty entitlement program of the Federal Government, from being claimed by Y temporary workers or illegal aliens given status by this Act until they adjust to legal permanent resident status. **Page S7036**

Lieberman Amendment No. 1191 (to Amendment No. 1150), to provide safeguards against faulty asylum procedures and to improve conditions of detention. **Page S7036**

Cornyn Amendment No. 1250 (to Amendment No. 1150), to address documentation of employment and to make an amendment with respect to mandatory disclosure of information. **Page S7036**

Salazar (for Clinton) Modified Amendment No. 1183 (to Amendment No. 1150), to reclassify the spouses and minor children of lawful permanent residents as immediate relatives. **Page S7036**

Salazar (for Obama/Menendez) Amendment No. 1202 (to Amendment No. 1150), to provide a date on which the authority of the section relating to the increasing of American competitiveness through a merit-based evaluation system for immigrants shall be terminated. **Page S7036**

DeMint Amendment No. 1197 (to Amendment No. 1150), to require health care coverage for holders of Z nonimmigrant visas. **Pages S7047–49**

Bingaman/Obama Modified Amendment No. 1267 (to Amendment No. 1150), to remove the requirement that Y–1 nonimmigrant visa holders leave the United States before they are able to renew their visa. **Pages S7049–53**

A motion was entered to close further debate on Reid (for Kennedy/Specter) Amendment No. 1150 (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, June 7, 2007. **Page S7063**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, June 7, 2007. **Page S7063**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, June 6, 2007, that there be 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled between Senators Kennedy and Cornyn, or their designees; with the time to run concurrently on Cornyn Modified Amendment No. 1184 (to Amendment No. 1150) (listed above), and a Kennedy amendment relating to the same subject; and that there be no amendments in order to either amendments prior to the vote, that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on or in relation to Kennedy amendment, to be followed by a vote on or in relation to Cornyn Amendment No. 1184 (to Amendment No. 1150), with 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the second vote. **Page S7058**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Ron Silver, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2009. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

Judy Van Rest, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2009. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

David George Nason, of Rhode Island, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank for a term of three years.

David George Nason, of Rhode Island, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Anne Cahn, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2009. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

Kathleen Martinez, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2011. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

George E. Moose, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2009. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

Jeremy A. Rabkin, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2009. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

James K. Glassman, of Connecticut, to be Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

James K. Glassman, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2007. **Pages S7095, S7096**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Douglas A. Brook, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Mark Green, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania.

Wanda L. Nesbitt, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cote D'Ivoire.

David W. Hagy, of Texas, to be Director of the National Institute of Justice. **Page S7096**

Nomination Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nomination:

Henry Bonilla, of Texas, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, which was sent to the Senate on March 15, 2007. **Page S7096**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S7068**

Executive Communications: **Pages S7068–70**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7070–73**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S7073–77**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7067–68**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7077–95**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7095**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—185) **Pages S7041, S7042, S7061–62, S7062**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Craig Thomas, United States Senator, from the state of Wyoming, in accordance with S. Res. 220, at 8:53 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 6, 2007. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7096.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

EXECUTIVE STOCK OPTIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concluded a hearing to examine executive stock options, focusing on the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and stockholders information, after receiving testimony from Kevin M. Brown, Acting Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury; John W. White, Director, Division of Corporation Finance, and Lynn E. Turner, former Chief Accountant, Broomfield, Colorado, both of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission; Stephen F. Bollenbach, KB Homes, and John S. Chalsty, Occidental Petroleum Corporation, both of Los Angeles, California; William Y. Tauscher, Safeway Inc., Pleasanton, California; Jeffrey P. Mahoney, Council of Institutional Investors, Washington, D.C.; and Mihir A. Desai, Harvard University Business School, Boston, Massachusetts.

GANG ABATEMENT AND PREVENTION ACT OF 2007

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the federal role to work with communities to prevent and respond to gang violence, focusing on S. 456, to increase and enhance law enforcement resources committed to investigation and prosecution of violent gangs, to deter and punish violent gang crime, to protect law-abiding citizens and communities from violent criminals, to revise and enhance criminal penalties for violent crimes, to expand and improve gang prevention programs, after receiving testimony from Senator Boxer; Mayor Antonio R. Villaraigosa, and William J. Bratton, Los Angeles Police Department, both of Los Angeles, California; Boni Gayle Driskill, Wings of Protection, Modesto, California; District Attorney James P. Fox, Redwood City, California, on behalf of the National District Attorneys Association; Claude A. Robinson Jr., Uhlich Children's Advantage Network, Chicago, Illinois; Gregg Croteau, United Teen Equality Center, Lowell, Massachusetts; and Patrick Word, Gaithersburg City Police Department, Gaithersburg, Maryland, on behalf of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Gang Investigators Network.

PRESERVING PROSECUTORIAL INDEPENDENCE

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Department of Justice and politicizing the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, focusing on preserving prosecutorial independence, after receiving testimony from Bradley J. Schlozman, Associate Counsel to the Director, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, Department of Justice; and Todd P. Graves, Graves Bartle and Marcus LLC, Kansas City, Missouri.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 2557–2574; 1 private bill, H.R. 2575; and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 164; and H. Res. 451–452, 454–458, were introduced.

Pages H6006–07

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6007–09**

Reports Filed: A report was filed on May 30, 2007 as follows:

H.R. 2446, to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (H. Rept. 110–170).

Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 632, to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish monetary prizes for achievements in overcoming scientific and technical barriers associated with hydrogen energy, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–171);

H.R. 1467, to authorize the National Science Foundation to award grants to institutions of higher education to develop and offer education and training programs (H. Rept. 110–172);

H.R. 1716, to authorize higher education curriculum development and graduate training in advanced energy and green building technologies, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–173); and

H. Res. 453, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (H. Rept. 110–174).

Page H6006

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Lincoln Davis to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5931**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Jefferson wherein he temporarily resigned from the Committee on Small Business. **Page H5931**

Investigative Subcommittees—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House of Representatives to be available for service on investigative subcommittees of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct during the 110th Congress: Representatives Baldwin, Crowley, Ellison, Honda, Inslee, Lee, Meeks (NY), Napolitano, Rothman, and Snyder.

Page H5931

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Supporting the goals and ideals of National Trails Day: H. Res. 401, to support the goals and ideals of National Trails Day; **Page H5933**

Expressing the sense of Congress that the National Museum of Wildlife Art, located in Jackson, Wyoming, shall be designated as the "National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States": H. Con. Res. 116, to express the sense of Congress that the National Museum of Wildlife Art, located in Jackson, Wyoming, shall be designated as the "National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States"; **Pages H5933–34**

Encouraging the elimination of harmful fishing subsidies that contribute to overcapacity in commercial fishing fleets worldwide and that lead to the overfishing of global fish stocks: H. Con. Res. 94, amended, to encourage the elimination of harmful fishing subsidies that contribute to overcapacity in commercial fishing fleets worldwide and that lead to the overfishing of global fish stocks;

Pages H5934–36

Supporting the goals and ideals of "American Eagle Day", and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the American bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States: H. Res. 341, to support the goals and ideals of "American Eagle Day", and to celebrate the recovery and restoration of the American bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; **Pages H5936–37**

Expressing the support of Congress for the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in Southwest Louisiana: H. Con. Res. 54, to express the support of Congress for the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in Southwest Louisiana;

Pages H5937–39

Recognizing the importance of the Ouachita National Forest on its 100th anniversary: H. Res. 390, to recognize the importance of the Ouachita National Forest on its 100th anniversary;

Pages H5939–40

Riverside-Corona Feeder Water Supply Act: H.R. 1139, amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, design and construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, and other uses from the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin, Santa Ana River, California; **Pages H5940–41**

Amending the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to provide for conjunctive use of surface and groundwater in Juab County, Utah: H.R. 1736, to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to provide for conjunctive use of surface and groundwater in Juab County, Utah; **Pages H5941–42**

Amending the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the ceiling on the Federal share of the costs of phase I of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project: H.R. 1175, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the ceiling on the Federal share of the costs of phase I of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project; **Page H5942**

Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2007: H.R. 361, to amend the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize additional projects and activities under that Act; **Pages H5942–44**

Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act of 2007: H.R. 1469, amended, to establish the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation under the authorities of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961; **Pages H5944–48**

Relating to the 40th anniversary of the reunification of the City of Jerusalem: H. Con. Res. 152, amended, relating to the 40th anniversary of the reunification of the City of Jerusalem; **Pages H5948–52**

Condemning violence in Estonia and attacks on Estonia's embassies in 2007, and expressing solidarity with the Government and the people of Estonia: H. Res. 397, amended, to condemn violence in Estonia and attacks on Estonia's embassies in 2007, and to express solidarity with the Government and the people of Estonia, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 412 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 426; **Pages H5952–54, H5976–77**

Expressing gratitude to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, for their State Visit to the United States and reaffirming the friendship that exists between the United States and the United Kingdom: H. Res. 412, amended, to express gratitude to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, for their State Visit to the United States and to reaffirm the friendship that exists between the United States and the United Kingdom; **Pages H5954–55**

Calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop genocide and violence in Darfur, Sudan: H. Res. 422, to call on the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop genocide and violence in Darfur, Sudan, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 410 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 427; and **Pages H5955–63, H5977–78**

Calling on the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to immediately release Dr. Haleh Esfandiari: H. Res. 430, amended, to call on the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to immediately release Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 411 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 428; and **Pages H5963–66, H5978**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "Calling for Iran to immediately release five dual Iranian-American citizens currently being held unjustly." **Page H5978**

Directing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to respond to the indictment of, or the filing of charges of criminal conduct in a court of the United States or any State against, any Member of the House of Representatives by empaneling an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations not later than 30 days after the date the Member is indicted or the charges are filed: H. Res. 451, to direct the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to respond to the indictment of, or the filing of charges of criminal conduct in a court of the United States or any State against, any Member of the House of Representatives by empaneling an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations not later than 30 days after the date the Member is indicted or the charges are filed, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 387 yeas to 10 nays, with 15 voting "present", Roll No. 429. **Pages H5971–76, H5978–79**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:55 p.m. and reconvened at 6:02 p.m. **Page H5966**

Privileged Resolution: The House agreed to H. Res. 452, raising a question of the Privileges of the House, by a yea-and-nay vote of 373 yeas to 26 nays, with 13 voting "present", Roll No. 430. **Pages H5966–71, H5979–80**

In Memory of the late Honorable Craig Thomas: The House agreed by unanimous consent to H. Res. 454, expressing the condolences of the House on the death of the Honorable Craig Thomas, a Senator from the State of Wyoming. **Page H5980**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H5931.

Senate Referrals: S. 231 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, S. 398 was referred to the Committees on Natural Resources and the Judiciary, S. Con. Res. 32 was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and S. 1537 was held at the desk. **Page H6003**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5976–77, H5977–78, H5978, H5979, and H5979–80. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and at midnight, pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 454, it stands adjourned in memory of the late Honorable Craig Thomas.

Committee Meetings

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS; SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FISCAL YEAR 2008; REVISED SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FISCAL YEAR 2007

Committee on Appropriations: Ordered reported, as amended, the Homeland Security Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2008.

The Committee also approved the following: Report on the Suballocation of Budget Allocations Fiscal Year 2008; and the Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations Fiscal Year 2007.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government approved for full Committee action the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2008.

STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs approved for full Committee action the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2008.

PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE COOPERATION ACT OF 2007

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor and Pensions held a hearing on Ensuring Collective Bargaining Rights for First Responders: H.R. 980, Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007. Testimony was heard from Representative Kildee; Wayne Seybold, Mayor, Marion, Indiana; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS OCEANS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans held a hearing on the following bills: H. Con. Res. 147, Recognizing 200 years of research, service to the people of the United States, and stewardship of the marine environment by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and its predecessor agencies; H. Res. 186, Supporting the goals and ideals of National Clean Beaches Week and recognizing the considerable value of American beaches and their role in American culture; H.R. 1834, To authorize the national ocean exploration program and the national undersea research program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and H.R. 2400, Ocean and Coastal Mapping Integration Act. Testimony was heard from Craig McLean, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Programs and Administration, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, NOAA, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM AND SECURITY SUPPORT ACT OF 2007

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a voice vote, a structured rule providing 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 2446, Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI and provides that the bill shall be considered as read.

No amendments shall be in order except those printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against such amendments except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Finally, the rule provides that the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker. Testimony was heard from Chairman Lantos and Representatives Jackson-Lee of Texas, Costa, Terry and Franks of Arizona.

ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY IN REDUCING ILLEGAL FILESHARING

Committee on Science and Technology: Held a hearing on the Role of Technology in Reducing Illegal Filesharing: A University Perspective. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SARBANES-OXLEY COMPLIANCE SMALL BUSINESS COSTS

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing on Sarbanes-Oxley Section 404: Will the SEC's and PCAOB's New Standards Lower Compliance Costs

for Small Companies? Testimony was heard from Christopher Cox, Chairman, SEC; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 2007

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine cracks in the system, focusing on one tuberculosis patient's international public health threat, 9:45 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine paying for a college education, focusing on the role of private student lending, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power, to hold hearings to examine the impact of climate change on water supply and availability in the United States, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider S. 506, to improve efficiency in the Federal Government through the use of high-performance green buildings, H.R. 1195, to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make technical corrections, H.R. 798, to direct the Administrator of General Services to install a photovoltaic system for the headquarters building of the Department of Energy, S. 635, to provide for a research program for remediation of closed methamphetamine production laboratories, and S. 1523, to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide from the Capitol power plant, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine patent reform, focusing on the future of American innovation, 10 a.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Specialty Crops, Rural Development, and Foreign Agriculture, to consider H.R. 2419, Farm Bill Extension Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, to consider the following appropriations for Fiscal Year 2008: Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies; and Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to mark up appropriations for Fiscal Year 2008, 3 p.m., H–144 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on the Department of Defense body armor programs, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces, hearing on procurement of Navy boat barriers, 2:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on legislation to Improve Consumer Product Safety for Children, H.R. 2474, To provide for an increased maximum civil penalty for violations under the Consumer Product Safety Act; H.R. 1699, Danny Keysar Child Product Safety Notification Act; H.R. 814, Children's Gasoline Burn Prevention Act; and H.R. 1721, Pool and Spa Safety Act, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, hearing entitled "U.S. Interests in Reform of China's Financial Services Sector," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, hearing entitled "Reauthorization of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act," 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, hearing on U.S. Policy Challenges in North Africa, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, hearing entitled "The XDR Tuberculosis Incident: A Poorly Coordinated Federal Response to an Incident with Homeland Implications," 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology, to mark up H.R. 1717, To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a National Bio and Agro- defense Facility, 2:30 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, Border Security, and International Law, to continue hearings on Comprehensive Immigration Reform: Business Community Perspectives, 10 a.m., to meet to Adopt Rules of Procedure and Statement of Policy for Private Immigration Bills, Rules of Procedure for Private Claims Bills. and Adopt the Subcommittee's Policy on the Granting of Federal Charters; followed by continuation of hearings on Comprehensive Immigration Reform: Government Perspectives on Immigration Statistics, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, to mark up H.R. 2337, Energy Policy Reform and Revitalization Act of 2007, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, hearing on FDA's Role in the Evaluation of Avandia's Safety, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, to consider the following: S. 5, Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007; and H.R. 65, Lumbee Recognition Act, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 906, Global Change Research and Data Management Act of 2007; H.R. 2304, Advanced Geothermal Energy Research and Development Act of 2007; and H.R. 2313, Marine Renewable Energy Research and Development Act of 2007, 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, hearing on STEM Education Programs, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Finance and Tax, hearing on Data Security, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on the National Transportation Safety Board's Most Wanted Aviation Safety Improvements, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 6

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 1348, Comprehensive Immigration Reform, and vote on or in relation to certain amendments.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, June 6

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the following suspensions: (1) H.R. 964—Securely Protect Yourself Against Cyber Trespass Act; (2) H.R. 1467—10,000 Trained by 2010 Act; (3) H. Res. 421—Honoring the trailblazing accomplishments of the ''Mercury 13'' women, whose efforts in the early 1960s demonstrated the capabilities of American women to undertake the human exploration of space; (4) H. Res. 446—Honoring the life and accomplishments of Astronaut Walter Marty Schirra and expressing condolences on his passing; (5) H.R. 1716—Green Energy Education Act of 2007; and (6) H.R. 632—H–Prize Act of 2007. Consideration of H.R. 2446—Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Berkley, Shelley, Nev., E1194
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1191
Capito, Shelley Moore, W.Va., E1186, E1188
Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E1196
Doolittle, John T., Calif., E1185
Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E1194
Ehlers, Vernon J., Mich., E1191
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1187, E1189, E1191
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1187, E1189
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E1186, E1188
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1185, E1186, E1188, E1190, E1192, E1194
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1187, E1189, E1190
Jackson-Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1193
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E1186, E1188, E1190
Lamborn, Doug, Colo., E1196
Lewis, Ron, Ky., E1194
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E1192
Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E1196
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1186, E1189
Moran, James P., Va., E1192
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E1195
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E1185, E1185
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1192
Ross, Mike, Ark., E1195
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E1195
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E1196
Udall, Tom, N.M., E1195
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1187, E1190

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.