United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 2007 No. 94

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 12, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN P. SARBANES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) for 2 minutes.

HONORING DR. FRED BASSETT

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work and dedication of a great leader and great educator from northern Kentucky, Dr. Fred Bassett. Since 1996, Dr. Bassett has served as superintendent of the Beechwood School District in Fort Mitchell, Kentucky.

Working as a parole and probation officer early in his career, Fred wondered how he could make a difference in the lives of young people before they got off track. He decided that the answer was in education, and he dedicated his life and his future to investing in children and future generations of this community.

Rising through the ranks in the Beechwood School District, Fred served as a teacher, assistant principal and principal before being named to his current position of superintendent. His success is the fruit of his character, his commitment and his vision.

Fred helped make Beechwood School District an institution known statewide as a leader in academics and as a perennial powerhouse in high school football. I am proud of the success he has had in helping our students excel both in and out of the classroom. I thank him for his service and wish him the best of his luck in his new career at the University of Cincinnati.

Fred Bassett's leadership has planted the seeds of success in thousands of children which will bear fruit for our community, our commonwealth and our country in the decades ahead.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Michael D. Pfingsten, St. Paul Lutheran Church, Harvard, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, You have given us this good land as our heritage. Grant that we remember Your generosity and constantly do Your will.

Bless our land with honest industry, truthful education, and an honorable way of life. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil act.

Grant that we, who came from many nations with many different languages, may become a united people. Support us in defending our liberties, and give those to whom we have entrusted the authority of government the spirit of wisdom, that there may be justice and peace in our land. Especially do we ask You to bless this House in all its doings this day.

When times are prosperous, may our hearts be thankful, and in troubled times do not let our trust in You fail; this I ask through Your son Jesus Christ, my Lord.

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 Florida (Mr. STEARNS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. STEARNS 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.

Printed on recycled paper.

WELCOMING REVEREND MICHAEL D. PFINGSTEN

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Michael D. Pfingsten, the U.S. House of Representatives guest chaplain for today.

Mike is a Lutheran pastor of 19 years; and he and his family have joined us from Harvard, Illinois, where Rev. Pfingsten is pastor of St. Paul Lutheran Church.

Rev. Pfingsten earned his B.A. in History at Concordia College and Masters of Divinity in History at Concordia Theological Seminary.

On this day in 325 A.D., Christian bishops gathered to discuss the essentials of the Christian faith at the first Council of Nicaea. I am delighted that Rev. Pfingsten, a man who can truly appreciate the significance of this day, was able to lead us in prayer.

DEMOCRATS FUND RIGHT PRIORITIES

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider the 2008 Homeland Security Appropriations bill, which addresses our most pressing security needs in America.

This legislation makes many of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission a reality. It puts new emphasis on protecting our ports and our rail and transit systems. Aviation security is also strengthened with improvements to baggage screenings and a requirement that doubles the amount of cargo screened for explosives on passenger aircraft.

And the bill makes critical investments into border and immigration security as well, by increasing the number of Border Patrol agents to a record 17,800 agents in all.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides for the protection of our Nation while ensuring that taxpayer dollars are well spent by acquiring accountability of our tax dollars.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

(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, this week Democrat leaders will begin pushing their appropriations bills through the House without proper analysis or consideration.

Less than a year ago, the Democrats' top House leader proclaimed that her caucus was committed to restoring integrity to Congress. Specifically, she stated that ''Democrats would bring full accountability and transparency to all earmarks, those in the authorization bills as well as those in appropriations bills.'' Yet today, even Democrat CNN has editorialized that promised reform is not happening.

Last year, Republicans passed legislation to identify all earmarks by the sponsoring Members' names and Members being allowed to challenge individual earmarks on the House floor.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and we will never forget September 11. We will always appreciate the courage of Ronald Reagan who declared 20 years today, ''Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall,'' promoting freedom in Berlin and victory over communism.

NAFTA IS FAILED TRADE MODEL

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, NAFTA held a great promise to provide workers in Mexico and the United States a livable wage. It simply hasn't lived up to that promise. Illegal immigration has increased.

The number of undocumented Mexican workers who live in the United States has skyrocketed in the NAFTA era from an estimated 1 million in the mid-1990s to about 6 million today.

While many people talk about closing down the U.S.-Mexico border, few care to confront the root cause of this issue: the failure of the NAFTA model to provide sustainable livelihoods for workers in Mexico. Over 1 million Mexican farmers lost their livelihoods due to NAFTA-mandated agricultural policy changes. Wages declined for workers.

These are just some of the reasons why one in ten Mexican citizens have made an often dangerous border crossing to the United States.

NAFTA is a failed model. It is time that we change the model. We can't afford to keep approving models based on the same old NAFTA model. And that is what Peru and Panama are, agreements based on the same flawed principles.

IRAQI NATIONAL ASSEMBLY 2-MONTH RECESS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Iraqi National Assembly plans to take its regularly scheduled 2-month summer recess starting in July. Taking such an extended break demonstrates a lack of urgency on their part and political will on the part of the Iraqi parliament.

Defense Secretary Gates told a Senate hearing last month, ''I'll be blunt: I told some of the Iraqis with whom I met that we are buying them time for political reconciliation, and that every day we buy it with American blood. For this group to go out for 2 months, it would, in my opinion, be unacceptable.''

Accordingly, I have introduced H. Res. 469, which expresses the sense of the House that the Iraqi National Assembly should cancel or postpone its 2-month recess and work towards meeting political, social and military benchmarks. I urge my colleagues to join with me in sending a message to the Iraqi parliament that they must work to fulfill their obligations.

OPPOSE COLOMBIAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the pending Colombian free trade agreement. Since 1991, over 2,000 labor organizers have been murdered in Colombia. Many of these cases are never investigated, and the perpetrators go unpunished, ready to strike again.

For 13 years I served as the union leader for UNITE HERE Local 617. If I had born in Colombia, there is a strong possibility that I would not be here today fighting for working class people. My effort for higher wages, better working conditions, and a secure pension could have cost me my life.

Many will argue that the labor rights ''fixes'' in the May 10 agreement between the USTR and congressional leadership will be enough to prevent the deaths of union workers, but no worker protection provision comes close to addressing the brutal violations of workers' rights that we see in Colombia.

Mr. Speaker, in good conscience, I cannot support a free trade agreement that rewards Colombia with prized access to American markets as its workers live in constant fear.

□ 1010

SECURE THE BORDERS FIRST

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the American people overwhelmingly support border security, but for some reason, some political pandering pundits in Washington, D.C., want to pursue an unwise, open house amnesty policy before dealing with the real first important issue of national security.

It's an issue of trust. I don't think Americans believe our government will really ever secure the border, no matter how many empty promises are made. The reason is too many special interest groups want lax border enforcement for their own political agenda.

Those who want cheap plantation labor and those who want greater political power seem to want the border

laws we have ignored. The motives appear to always be about money or power.

However, our government would do well to assume its constitutional responsibility to protect America. The government has the ability, but not the will, to protect the border.

Congress needs to provide adequate resources for border security. The government has the responsibility then to enforce the law and not give in to special interest groups. Then we can deal with the people that are here illegally after the government proves it has the will to secure our homeland.

And that's just the way it is.

ENDING THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this Democratic Congress has been successful in raising the minimum wage with help from people on the other side of the aisle, and the President signed that into law.

It has also passed stem cell research with some help from people on the other side of the aisle. The President has threatened to veto that bill and that's unfortunate.

The biggest issue hanging over this Congress is the war in Iraq; and while this Congress has made moves to have timetables and benchmarks, it hasn't achieved a consensus that the President will agree to and effectuate policy that brings our troops home.

It will take colleagues on the other side of the aisle, people who have been wedded to this war, President Bush's war, and have been unable to get themselves derailed from that train that's on a collision course. Until Republicans come forward and heed America's call to bring our troops home, more and more Americans will die in Iraq, more and more American dollars will be spent in Iraq where they shouldn't be.

We need to redeploy our troops to fight terrorists in Afghanistan and other places and keep our country safe. I ask my Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join us.

SENATE BILL IS NOT THE ANSWER TO IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, today the President of the United States will come to the Capitol Building to revive a deeply flawed immigration bill being considered in the U.S. Senate.

One year ago, the President challenged this Congress to find an answer to the crisis of illegal immigration, and, Mr. President, amnesty is not the answer. The core fallacy of the Senate bill would grant unlimited Z visa amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants who simply pay a fine and submit to a background check.

While the Senate bill is not the answer, there is a way forward, Mr. Speaker. I truly believe that after the Senate bill goes away, the House of Representatives would do well to come together across party lines and find a way forward that puts border security first, rejects amnesty and creates a new guest worker system that requires illegal immigrants to leave the country to apply and to learn English once they're here.

There is a way forward. We can achieve immigration reform in this Congress, but the Senate bill is not that way.

CROSS-BORDER PILOT PROGRAM BY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

(Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today dismayed by the Department of Transportation's decision to rush dangerous Mexican trucks onto American roads.

In the last month, this House voted twice to impose severe restraints on any cross-border trucking program. Three weeks ago, we passed my Safe American Roads Act by an overwhelming, bipartisan 411–3 margin. The supplemental appropriations bill included similar language. It passed both Houses, and it was signed into law by the President of the United States.

But although we have twice loudly and unambiguously rebuked the Department of Transportation, they are simply ignoring the American people. On Friday, they announced plans to launch a cross-border pilot program anyway, in clear violation of both Houses and the will of the American people.

Their actions are deceptive, and they are intolerable. The people's House cannot be sidestepped through bureaucratic trickery. I urge the DOT to put the brakes on this profoundly undemocratic course of action. The safety of our highways is at stake.

HONORING DR. HARLON CRIMM

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Harlon Crimm, who last week announced his retirement as president of Chattahoochee Technical College.

In the past 24 years, Dr. Crimm's contributions to Chattahoochee Tech have been profound. He quadrupled enrollment, making Chattahoochee the largest technical institution in the State of Georgia. He oversaw the college's accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. He instilled a sense of mission and pride in the institution, helping it gain national prestige.

But Harlon has been molding Georgia's young minds for nearly half a century. He began his career as a high school teacher in Mississippi, later becoming the principal of Lockheed Elementary School in Marietta and director of personnel for Marietta City Schools. My four children attended Marietta, and they benefited greatly from their exposure to Dr. Crimm.

Now in retirement, Dr. Crimm will be able to spend more time with his wife, Jo Ann, a retired Ph.D. educator, and his children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in thanking Dr. Harlon Crimm for his years of service educating Georgia's young minds. In fact, Dr. Crimm eloquently summed up his own work when he referred to his past 44 years in education not as a job or a career, but as a calling.

DEMOCRATS LIVE UP TO THE PROMISES OUR NATION MADE OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, after years of funding cuts by Republican Congresses and the Bush administration to key education, veterans, college aid and transportation programs, this House is now bringing appropriations bills to the floor that invest in the right priorities, while also remaining fiscally responsible.

This week, Democratic leadership will pass the largest increase in veterans health care funding in history, a critical step in fulfilling our Nation's obligation to our service men and women, their families and our veterans.

The Veterans Health Administration estimates that they will treat 54,000 more troops in 2008 than they did over the last year, including more than 263,000 veterans of the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. This House is going to provide our veterans the health care services they are entitled to.

We also add 1,000 new claims processors to reduce the backlog of benefit claims so that our veterans will get the services they need in a timely way.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is dedicated to fulfilling our commitment to our veterans in a fiscally responsible way.

SECRET EARMARKS

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for months we have heard the Democrats' promises that they would make this the most transparent and ethical Congress that our Nation has ever seen, and of course, we all want to

see Congress held accountable. We all want the legislative process to be open and be accessible to the American people.

So this week the Democrats get to take a swing at making good on their promises of transparency and accountability, and they're already striking out with their secret slush funds.

By deciding not to include any earmarks in the appropriation bills and instead to slip them in by the dark of night into conference reports, preventing anyone from questioning or challenging their earmarks, they have completely shut off the legislative process to the American people.

Now, let me make it clear that I am not against earmarks. I am more than willing to get up here on the floor and defend each and every earmark that I have ever gotten or tried to get for my district. And I think that all Members should have the opportunity to defend their projects and their requests, but more importantly, tax paying citizens have the right to know exactly how their hard-earned dollars are being spent.

To make this process closed is an insult to taxpayers, and if Democrats have nothing to hide, they should live up to their promise and open the process back up to the American people and hold themselves accountable for their spending.

□ 1020

DEMOCRATS ARE FOCUSED ON THE RIGHT PRIORITIES AND ARE FULFILLING OUR PROMISE TO VETERANS

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

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this year and in years past, the Bush administration has neglected the needs of America's veterans. In his annual budget request, the President did not propose enough funding for the Veterans Administration to meet the growing needs of our veterans.

Fortunately, the new Democratic Congress did not forget about our veterans. This week, we will bring a Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs Appropriations bill to the floor that provides the largest increase in veterans' health care funding in history. Our bill includes $600 million for a new initiative for mental health and post-traumatic stress syndrome, so that we can ensure that our veterans and returning soldiers have the facilities and the care they need. The funding bill also provides essential services that will allow these veterans to transition back into their communities.

Democrats know that the Federal Government must keep its promises to the men and women who have defended our Nation. This bill, I am proud to say, lives up to that promise.

INDEPENDENCE PRIZE

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the disastrous effects of our Nation's dependence on foreign oil are being seen in every new tank of gas and every cent we send overseas to pay for Middle Eastern oil. Rising gas prices are a product of rising demand and not enough supply.

The time is now to revolutionize the way we produce and consume energy. That's why I am proposing a 21st Century Manhattan Project to spur the ingenuity of our American private sector, to deliver free market solutions for our Nation's energy problem.

I am introducing legislation to create a $1 billion prize, the Independence Prize, as I call it, that will go to Americans who develop revolutionary products that substantially reduce our dependence on foreign oil, eliminating our dependence on foreign oil. The Independence Prize provides incentives to American entrepreneurs to get transformational innovation to consumers, and more importantly, put Americans on a path to energy independence. Independence is the key.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

DEMOCRATIC HOUSE WORKING ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN PEOPLE WHILE PRESIDENT OBSTRUCTS PROCESS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats have been working in a bipartisan manner to approve important legislation which will have a real impact on the lives of hardworking American families. Unfortunately, President Bush has expressed his opposition to a majority of the bipartisan legislation we have passed.

Last week, Congress sent the President a stem cell research bill that would provide hope for millions of Americans suffering from diseases like cancer, diabetes and Alzheimer's. The final bill promotes lifesaving embryonic stem cell research by increasing the number of stem lines that are eligible to be used for federally funded research.

I would hope the President would not stand in the way of real medical progress and would reconsider his veto threat to this vitally important legislation. The President also opposes legislation passed by the House that would make prescription drugs more affordable for America's seniors. And he also opposes legislation making more affordable student loans for America's teenagers.

Congress cannot move this Nation in a new direction on its own. It's time for the President to join us, creating a meaningful change for the American people.

LACK OF BORDER FENCE FUNDING

(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, we are hearing illegal immigration is a big debate. There is a lot of passion on this issue.

Last year, Congress took the right step in passing the Secure Fence Act. It was the right thing to do. It puts 800 miles of fencing in place, both physical and electronic borders, on our southern border.

Now, authorizing it is one thing, but paying for it is another matter. That duty has fallen to the new liberal leadership here in the House. Even though they have increased Homeland Security spending by $2.4 billion, a lot of that is going to go into global warming.

They have cut funding for the fence by $187 million, compared to last year's budget. You are going to hear a lot about this as we begin our appropriations process today.

As we work on this Homeland Security bill, they will claim to have budgeted $1 billion for the fence, but they are withholding $700 million of that while we go through bureaucratic red tape. We have got to be certain we don't hurt the environment, all the while 4,500 illegal immigrants cross the southern border every day.

It is disgraceful. Do not delay the fence. Fund it. Take action in the appropriate matter. The hold-on-to-your-wallet Congress is at it. Stand up for the fence.

PRESIDENT REFUSES TO CHANGE COURSE IN IRAQ DESPITE INCREASING VIOLENCE

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

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, last week the President's new war czar told the Congress that the troop escalation plan is failing and that the American people should expect sectarian violence in Iraq to continue.

Finally someone in the administration is making sense of the situation on the ground in Iraq, but honesty does not make up for the fact that President Bush continues to stubbornly oppose any change in war policy.

In the wake of the deadliest 2-month period in the war, 231 U.S. service men and women were killed in April and May. The facts on the ground show an increasingly grim picture.

In fact, a recent internal military assessment shows that the U.S. military's plan to secure Baghdad against a rising insurgency is falling far short of its goal. To date, according to the document, only one-third of the Baghdad

neighborhoods are under the control of American and Iraqi security forces. The administration's goal was to have the entire city under control by next month. Clearly, that is no longer possible.

Despite the continued stubbornness of this President, the Democratic Congress will continue to demand that we move this war in a new direction.

HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, health savings accounts are one of the best ways to put families back in control of their health care destiny. HSAs have expanded coverage, but Congress needs to make them more practical for working families and patients in poor health, and also remove rules that discriminate against veterans and seniors in Medicare.

This week, I introduced H.R. 2639 to permit larger contributions, allow coverage below the deductible for prescription drugs, and provide tax relief for premiums. The bill removes barriers that make it illegal for families to deposit their own money in an HSA after they receive care through Medicare or the VA. It also helps working families to build intergenerational ''wealth for health'' by allowing adult children to inherit a Medicare HSA in the same way that a spouse may now do.

It makes sense to help Americans save for future medical costs, especially when we consider our Nation's negative savings rate and Medicare's looming financial problems.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, to expand consumer choice and control it.

DEMOCRATIC HOUSE AND PRESIDENTIAL VETOES

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic House listened to the American people and has begun moving our Nation in a new direction by passing more than 45 key measures over the last 5 months, most with bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, the President has been a stubborn opponent of progress for the American people. He has threatened to veto much of the House's work this year. This House voted to implement the unfulfilled recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission, but the Bush administration opposes the bill in its current form.

This House overwhelmingly supported a 3.5 percent pay increase for our troops who are serving in combat, but the President has threatened a veto saying a 3 percent pay raise would be sufficient.

We passed strong price-gouging legislation that sets tough criminal penalties for wholesalers and retailers who attempt to gouge the public. The President's response? Another veto threat.

More often than not, the President is obstructing our efforts to move this Nation in a new direction.

TAX INCREASE PREVENTION ACT

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, this week I am introducing the Tax Increase Prevention Act, legislation that would make permanent tax relief passed in 2001 and 2003.

My bill simply takes away all the sunset provisions of these tax relief packages that passed Congress and provided American families and job creators the certainty to provide for the future. This tax relief passed by Congress is working, and States are much more likely to take fiscally responsible moves and tighten their belts instead of hiking taxes. States that were once in recession are now brimming with tax revenue.

The few States that are struggling, such as my home State of Michigan, have hope for a turnaround in the future because these tax cuts are creating jobs and leaving more money in the pockets of taxpayers.

Unfortunately, Democrats in Congress are choosing to ignore the advancements made possible by these tax cuts. In their most recent budget bill, the House Democrats' budget plan included a $400 billion tax increase that will cripple current progress in our economy.

By making tax cuts permanent and continuing to grow our economy, this Congress can go a long way in restoring the trust of the American people and build a better, brighter future for our country.

□ 1030

ELECTING MEMBER TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 478) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 4718

Resolved, That Mrs. Davis of California is hereby elected to the Joint Committee on Printing, to rank after Mr. Capuano.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF ROTUNDA FOR CEREMONY TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO DR. NORMAN E. BORLAUG

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 164) authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 164

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on July 17, 2007, for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H. Con. Res. 164, which authorizes use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug.

Through a lifetime of research and development aimed at curing world hunger, Dr. Borlaug has exemplified how science and humanitarianism can intersect to address the needs of developing countries that have been ravaged by the effects of hunger and poverty. By introducing high-yield, disease-resistant varieties of wheat to India, Mexico and Pakistan, Dr. Borlaug developed sustainable, renewable food sources that are frequently estimated to have saved over a billion lives.

The results of Dr. Borlaug's research were remarkable, yet not surprising given the commitment of this man of science to find practical, applicable solutions to the world's problems, not, as he put it, chase academic butterflies. Dr. Borlaug's efforts to apply science to stimulate agricultural yield have been frequently credited as being a major milestone of the Green Revolution, and he himself has often been cited as the father of that movement.

In 1970, Dr. Borlaug was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his work in India and Pakistan, and for his role in the Green Revolution. When he was advised in October of that year that he had won the enormous honor, Dr. Borlaug was where he spent many of his hours—in the farm fields of Mexico. When his wife drove an hour to reach him in the fields and advise him that the media was waiting for his reaction, Dr. Borlaug declined to return to the house, saying that he and his assistants still had much more work to do, as he continued to record data on his test plots. It was there that the TV camera crews found him 2 hours later.

In addition to the Nobel Prize, Dr. Borlaug has been recognized with the 1977 U.S. Presidential Medal of Freedom, the 2002 Public

Welfare Medal from the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, the 2002 Rotary International Award for World Understanding and Peace, and the 2004 National Medal of Science. He has also received numerous honorary degrees from around the world.

Though he has received many accolades, Dr. Borlaug has been quick to point out that his work alone will not be enough to cure world hunger. In 1986, Dr. Borlaug created the World Food Prize, an international award recognizing the achievements of individuals who have advanced human development by continuing to improve the quality, quantity and availability of food in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to support H. Con. Res. 164 to authorize use of the Capitol rotunda to honor Dr. Norman E. Borlaug as he receives the Congressional Gold Medal. It is fitting that such an honor be bestowed upon a man who has done so much, for so many.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

DISMISSING ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM 21ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 459) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty-first Congressional District of Florida.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 459

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty-first Congressional District of Florida is dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISMISSING ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM 24TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 461) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of Florida.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 461

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of Florida is dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISMISSING ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 462) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 462

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana is dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISMISSING ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 463) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Florida.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 463

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Florida is dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the four election contest resolutions just considered.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

NATIVE AMERICAN $1 COIN ACT

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2358) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins in commemoration of Native Americans and the important contributions made by Indian tribes and individual Native Americans to the development of the United States and the history of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2358

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 ''Native American $1 Coin Act''.

SEC. 2. NATIVE AMERICAN $1 COIN PROGRAM.

Section 5112 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(r) REDESIGN AND ISSUANCE OF CIRCULATING $1 COINS HONORING NATIVE AMERICANS AND THE IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY INDIAN TRIBES AND INDIVIDUAL NATIVE AMERICANS IN UNITED STATES HISTORY.—

''(1) REDESIGN BEGINNING IN 2008.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning January 1, 2008, notwithstanding subsection (d), in addition to the coins to be issued pursuant to subsection (n), and in accordance with this subsection, the Secretary shall mint and issue $1 coins that—

''(i) have as the designs on the obverse the so-called 'Sakakawea design'; and

''(ii) have a design on the reverse selected in accordance with paragraph (2)(A), subject to paragraph (3)(A).

''(B) DELAYED DATE.—If the date of the enactment of the Native American $1 Coin Act is after July 31, 2007, subparagraph (A) shall be applied by substituting '2009' for '2008'.

''(2) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—The $1 coins issued in accordance with paragraph (1) shall meet the following design requirements:

''(A) COIN REVERSE.—The design on the reverse shall bear—

''(i) images celebrating the important contributions made by Indian tribes and individual Native Americans to the development of the United States and the history of the United States;

''(ii) the inscription '$1' ; and

''(iii) the inscription 'United States of America'.

''(B) COIN OBVERSE.—The design on the obverse shall—

''(i) be chosen by the Secretary, after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts and review by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee; and

''(ii) contain the so-called 'Sakakawea design' and the inscription 'Liberty'.

''(C) EDGE-INCUSED INSCRIPTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The inscription of the year of minting and issuance of the coin and the inscriptions 'E Pluribus Unum' and 'In God We Trust' shall be edge-incused into the coin.

''(ii) PRESERVATION OF DISTINCTIVE EDGE.—The edge-incusing of the inscriptions under clause (i) on coins issued under this subsection shall be done in a manner that preserves the distinctive edge of the coin so that the denomination of the coin is readily discernible, including by individuals who are blind or visually impaired.

''(D) REVERSE DESIGN SELECTION.—The designs selected for the reverse of the coins described under this subsection—

''(i) shall be chosen by the Secretary after consultation with the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, the Congressional Native American Caucus of the House of Representatives, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Congress of American Indians;

''(ii) shall be reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee;

''(iii) may depict individuals and events such as—

''(I) the creation of Cherokee written language;

''(II) the Iroquois Confederacy;

''(III) Wampanoag Chief Massasoit;

''(IV) the 'Pueblo Revolt';

''(V) Olympian Jim Thorpe;

''(VI) Ely S. Parker, a general on the staff of General Ulysses S. Grant and later head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

''(VII) code talkers who served the United States Armed Forces during World War I and World War II; and

''(iv) in the case of a design depicting the contribution of an individual Native American to the development of the United States and the history of the United States, shall not depict the individual in a size such that the coin could be considered to be a '2-headed' coin.

''(3) ISSUANCE OF COINS COMMEMORATING 1 NATIVE AMERICAN EVENT DURING EACH YEAR.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each design for the reverse of the $1 coins issued during each year shall be emblematic of 1 important Native American or Native American contribution each year.

''(B) ISSUANCE PERIOD.—Each $1 coin minted with a design on the reverse in accordance with this subsection for any year shall be issued during the 1-year period beginning on January 1 of that year and shall be available throughout the entire 1-year period.

''(C) ORDER OF ISSUANCE OF DESIGNS.—Each coin issued under this subsection commemorating Native Americans and their contributions—

''(i) shall be issued, to the maximum extent practicable, in the chronological order in which the Native Americans lived or the events occurred, until the termination of the coin program described in subsection (n); and

''(ii) thereafter shall be issued in any order determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, after consultation with the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, the Congressional Native American Caucus of the House of Representatives, and the National Congress of American Indians.

''(4) ISSUANCE OF NUMISMATIC COINS.—The Secretary may mint and issue such number of $1 coins of each design selected under this subsection in uncirculated and proof qualities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(5) QUANTITY.—The number of $1 coins minted and issued in a year with the Sakakawea-design on the obverse shall be not less than 20 percent of the total number of $1 coins minted and issued in such year.''.

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 5112 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (n)(1)—

(A) by striking the paragraph designation and heading and all that follows through ''Notwithstanding subsection (d)'' and inserting the following:

''(1) REDESIGN BEGINNING IN 2007.—Notwithstanding subsection (d)'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(C) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately;

(2) in subsection (n), by striking ''Sacagawea-design'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Sakakawea-design''; and

(3) in paragraphs (3)(C) and (5) of subsection (p), by striking ''Sacagawea-design'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Sakakawea-design''.

SEC. 4. REMOVAL OF BARRIERS TO CIRCULATION OF $1 COIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to remove barriers to circulation, the Secretary of the Treasury shall carry out an aggressive, cost-effective, continuing campaign to encourage commercial enterprises to accept and dispense $1 coins that have as designs on the obverse the so-called ''Sakakawea design''.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress an annual report on the success of the efforts described in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2358, the Native American $1 Coin Act, requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins commemorating Native Americans and the important contributions they have made, both as individuals and collectively as tribes to the history and growth of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman FRANK for his hard work in making this legislation a priority and recognizing the importance of memorializing Native Americans who have been instrumental in the evolution of the United States.

I also want to thank Mr. KILDEE for his work on this legislation.

H.R. 2358 calls upon the government to recognize and pay long overdue tribute to Indian tribes and individual Native Americans for their significant contributions to the progression of the United States. This bill would allow for the acknowledgment of such important events as the Pueblo Revolt and the creation of the Cherokee written language; in addition, individuals such as the code talkers, who so valiantly served in our Armed Forces during World War I and II, and Olympian Jim Thorpe who will forever be engraved in the minds of all Americans.

H.R. 2358 ensures that we recognize the many individual Native Americans and Indian tribes who have so significantly contributed to the history and development of the United States.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2358, the Native American $1 Coin Act, and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

The Native American $1 Coin Act directs the Treasury Department to mint and issue $1 coins to celebrate the important contributions made by Indian tribes and Native Americans to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a terrific complement to the Presidential $1 Coin Act that I worked to pass last Congress with the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY). Like that program and the very popular 50-state quarter program, this bill will provide an enormous educational opportunity for parents and teachers, while at the same time recognizing the immense and important contributions of Native Americans to the history of the United States.

Implementation of this legislation will save taxpayers more than half a billion dollars over the next decade. When Congress passed the Presidential $1 Coin Act in December of 2005, the bill required one-third of all dollar coins minted each year to bear the design of the Sakakawea coin that was first issued in 2000. The requirement was intended to keep the image and memory of Sakakawea in the public's mind at the same time the Mint produced and issued coins bearing the images of the Presidents.

Unfortunately, through no fault of the design or its subject, there is not a large demand for a dollar coin with a static design. It is that problem we sought to overcome with the Presidential dollar by creating a constantly

changing design that encourages the public to look for new coins.

The current law requires the Mint to issue 300 to 350 million of the current design Sakakawea dollars every year, for which there is no evident demand. That would be about $60 million worth of material and labor costs per year, not including the high cost of storing the unused coin yearly.

The innovative legislation was introduced by Mr. KILDEE, Chairman FRANK, Mr. COLE and Mr. RENZI. The bill would keep the Sakakawea design on the front of the coin, but would change the design on the reverse side each year to represent Native American contributions to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will both honor Native Americans and create demand for the coins similar to the Presidential dollars. Instead of the Mint spending $50 million or more a year to make coins for which there is no demand, the legislation has the potential to save the Treasury $150 million a year or more. It is rare that we can do something so cost effective this easily. I support the goals of this bill and urge its immediate passage.

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

□ 1040

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from the fine State of Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), home to 12 federally recognized tribes.

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

As Democratic chairman of the Congressional Native American Caucus, I am honored to speak in support of H.R. 2358, the Native American $1 Coin Act. I am pleased to be the chief sponsor of this bipartisan legislation.

I would like to extend a special thank-you to my friend and colleague, Chairman BARNEY FRANK, for his support of this legislation.

I would also like to acknowledge the other original cosponsors of this legislation: Congressman BOREN, Congressman RENZI, Congressman COLE, and Congressman CASTLE.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will honor the strength and wisdom of Indian country by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins that commemorate and honor the outstanding contributions of Native Americans by changing the design annually on the reverse of the Sakakawea dollar coin.

This bill establishes a process for selecting designs for the reverse side of this coin. These designs will take the American people through a journey of different experiences of native peoples by exposing them to their unique histories while preserving the memory of Sakakawea, the young Shoshone woman who assisted Lewis and Clark on their expedition to the Pacific Northwest more than 200 years ago.

It is my hope that this coin will one day depict the contributions of the 12 tribes of my own State of Michigan whose historical roots lie with the Chippewa, Ottawa, and Pottawatomi Nations. I can think of no better way to pay tribute to the Native American people than to honor their contribution to the development of the United States and her history.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished Congresswoman from Michigan, CANDICE MILLER.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 2358, the Native American $1 Coin Act, and I applaud my colleague and fellow Michiganian (Mr. KILDEE) for cosponsoring this legislation, and the other cosponsors as well, and for bringing it to the House floor this morning.

Native Americans have played an important role throughout the history of our Nation, so it is certainly appropriate that we honor them and their accomplishments as well. In fact, were it not for some great Native Americans, America as we know it today might look quite a bit different.

Think about Squanto and Somerset, who helped the Pilgrims survive their very first winter in the New World; or Sakakawea, who guided Lewis and Clark across the unexplored North American continent; or Jim Thorpe, the athlete who thrilled millions, really, across the globe with his exploits in baseball and football and the Olympics, where he won a gold medal; or the Navajo code talkers who broke the Japanese code, which was a key moment in the Allied forces prevailing over Japan during World War II.

These individuals and many others like them have made invaluable contributions to the survival and to the character of these United States.

This legislation will require the Secretary of Treasury to mint and issue coins in commemoration of Native Americans and the important contributions made by Indian tribes and individual Native Americans to the development and the history, the very rich history, of the United States.

These coins will serve as an important reminder to all Americans of the important role that Native Americans have played in our Nation's history, the things they are achieving today, and the goals that they will meet in the future. Native Americans will be involved in the design selection process as well, which will also remind them of their important historical contributions.

So I applaud the sponsors and the cosponsors of this legislation for their efforts. And I urge all of my colleagues to support the Native American $1 Coin Act.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I also would like to thank all of the sponsors of this legislation. I would like to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for the managing of it here, Mr. KILDEE, for his interest in this, and Mrs. MILLER for coming to the floor and speaking to it.

I think this is a very worthwhile piece of legislation which will move forward something which otherwise would not move forward, and will save the Federal Government a lot of money and make it far more interesting to those who are collecting these coins out around the country.

So for all these reasons, I hope we would all support this legislation.

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent a State that is home to nearly 40 federally recognized Indian tribes. But Native Americans are not only engrained in Oklahoma's history, they are also richly embedded in the history of the United States and in the history of each individual State.

H.R. 2358 requires the government to do its part to recognize the importance of Native Americans to our country's history and development.

Again, I want to thank the chairman, Mr. FRANK, for recognizing the importance of H.R. 2358 and also Mr. KILDEE for all of his efforts.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2358.

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.

CONGRATULATING BARTON COLLEGE MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2007 NCAA DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 329) congratulating the Barton College men's basketball team for winning the 2007 NCAA Division II Men's Basketball National Championship.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 329

Whereas the Barton College Bulldogs of Wilson, North Carolina, defeated Winona State University of Rochester, Minnesota, the undefeated and defending NCAA Division II Men's Basketball National Champions, 77–75 on March 24, 2007, to become the 2007 NCAA Men's Basketball National Champions;

Whereas Anthony Atkinson of Barton College, the Elite Eight most valuable player, scored 10 points in the final 39 seconds of the

game, including a layup at the buzzer, to give Barton College the NCAA Division II men's basketball title and its first NCAA championship in any sport;

Whereas Barton College played and won 9 overtime games during the 2006–2007 season to finish the season 31–5, including winning its last 21 games, a school record;

Whereas Barton College, a school with just 1,000 students, defeated teams during the Elite Eight from schools with much larger student bodies (Grand Valley State, Michigan, 23,000 students, Cal State San Bernardino, 17,000 students, and Winona State University, 8,000 students);

Whereas Coach Ron Lievense of Barton College, who had served as a graduate assistant at Winona State University, summed up the Barton College victory: ''I don't see how any ending could be any better for any team—ever'';

Whereas Barton College continues the long tradition of North Carolina schools winning NCAA basketball championships;

Whereas Barton College was founded in 1902 as Atlantic Christian College and changed its name in 1990; and

Whereas Barton College was named a ''Best Southeastern College'' for 2006 by the Princeton Review: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the Barton College men's basketball team for winning the 2007 NCAA Division II Men's Basketball National Championship.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to House Resolution 329 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Barton College Bulldogs for their win in the 2007 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II Men's Basketball Tournament.

On March 24, 2007, Barton College won the NCAA Division II Elite Eight Tournament by defeating the defending champions, Winona State University of Rochester, Minnesota. College basketball fans, student athletes, and the general public were treated to an exciting national championship game with one of the greatest rallies in Elite Eight Tournament history.

Barton College had an extraordinary year. The team won all nine of its overtime games, an NCAA Division II record. The team also had a season record of 31–5 and won their last 21 games, which is a school record.

I want to extend my congratulations to Head Coach Ron Lievense, Athletic Director Gary Hall, Barton College President Dr. Norval Kneten, and Barton's student athletes for winning the national championship.

I also want to extend my congratulations to Winona State University of Rochester, Minnesota, on an excellent season. Winona State finished their season with only one loss, which happened to be the national championship game.

Winning the national championship in such a courageous fashion has brought attention to the outstanding athletic program at Barton College. I know the fans of the university will remember this very special moment for many years to come.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing House Resolution 329, congratulating the Barton College men's basketball team.

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

□ 1050

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Democratic side and the Republican side and my dear friend, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I join my friend, Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina, and many of my colleagues to support H. Res. 329, a resolution to congratulate the Barton College men's basketball team for winning the 2007 NCAA Division II men's basketball national championship.

Years ago, I attended Atlantic Christian College, which changed its name to Barton College in 1990. Mr. Speaker, I, like many of my colleagues in Congress, have had the fortunate opportunity of playing on a championship team. More than 40 years later, I can still vividly recall in my mind the wonderful memory of the night my prep school basketball team at Hargrave Military Academy won the military league championship. No matter what level, winning a championship is something an individual will remember all of his or her life. My prep school basketball team claimed its championship with a final score of 81–79, so I know the firsthand experience of a close game.

How exciting it was to see Barton College basketball make a miraculous comeback from seven points behind in the final 40 seconds to defeat Winona State University of Rochester, Minnesota, an undefeated team and last year's Division II champion, by a score of 77–75. Senior All-American point guard Anthony Atkinson scored the Bulldogs' final 10 points, including a layup at the buzzer; but I am sure that Anthony Atkinson would tell you that the win was a team effort.

In David and Goliath fashion, Barton College, a school with just 1,000 students, defeated teams during the Elite Eight from schools with much larger student bodies, Grand Valley State, Michigan, 23,000 students; Cal State San Bernardino, 17,000 students; and Winona State University, 8,000 students, to claim the school's first NCAA championship in any sport. Again, a student body of 1,000.

The team's confidence and calm under pressure helped it play and win nine overtime games during the 2006/2007 season to finish the season 31–5 and break a school record by winning its last 21 games.

Barton College is located in Congressman BUTTERFIELD's district, yet I share part of the county with Congressman BUTTERFIELD. I join him in congratulating the coaches and all the members of the 2006/2007 Barton College men's basketball team.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I will submit for the RECORD the names of the coaches and the players.

COACHES

Ron Lievense (head), Joel Zimmerman, John Skinner, Mark Pounds.

PLAYERS

Sam Pounds, Jerrett Eason, Brandon Barton, Isaiah Cromwell, Errol Frails, Anthony Atkinson, Bobby Buffaloe, Spenser Briggs, Jeff Dalce, Brandon Raffel, Travis Johnson, Charles Gamble, Darrius Lee, Bobby McNeil, Brian Leggett, Alejo Barovero, David King, Mark Friscone, L.J. Dunn, Mike Flowers.

Mr. Speaker, Barton College is proud of its college basketball history. Now, Barton College is part of North Carolina's rich basketball heritage.

I close by asking my colleagues to support this resolution. And I again congratulate the Barton College Bulldogs for this great victory.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from Illinois for giving me this time to speak on this resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join my friend, Congressman Walter Jones, and me in recognizing and congratulating this year's NCAA Division II men's college basketball champions from my hometown of Wilson, North Carolina, Barton College.

As Congressman JONES said a moment ago, he and I share Wilson County. And the campus is technically in my district, even though we both legitimately hold claim to that great institution.

In one of the most exciting basketball games that I have ever seen in my life, Mr. Speaker, the Barton College Bulldogs captured its first national title after senior guard Anthony Atkinson scored his team's final 10 points, including a layup at the buzzer, to rally Barton from a 74–67 deficit with just 45 seconds remaining. The improbable come-from-behind 77–75 victory was against a previously undefeated and defending national champion, Winona State University.

Mr. Speaker, the game capped a tournament full of last-second heroics for Barton College, as they won the semifinal game by one point on a last-second freethrow, and the quarterfinal

game on a buzzer-beating overtime three-pointer.

The tournament followed an equally exciting 31–5 season in which Barton College became the first team in the history of the NCAA basketball to win four consecutive overtime games. Throughout the tournament and the season, the team showed heart, toughness and tenacity and determination by finding ways to win no matter what the circumstances were. They have had tremendous and deserved support from a community that is so proud of this college and this team. As I was leaving Wilson yesterday, I stopped by the BB&T branch on West 9th Street and there was a large banner in front of the bank congratulating the Bulldogs. We are so proud of this team, and we want our Nation to know of our proud feeling for this team.

It is a great honor, therefore, Mr. Speaker, for me to recognize the success, efforts and achievements of these outstanding young student athletes, and their head coach, a great individual, Ron Lievense, and his staff. Their hard work and dedication to team work is something that we are all proud of in Wilson County and northeastern North Carolina.

I ask my colleagues to rise and join me in paying tribute to the Barton College basketball team.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 329.

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.

CHILD LABOR PROTECTION ACT OF 2007

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2637) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, with respect to civil penalties for child labor violations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2637

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 ''Child Labor Protection Act of 2007''.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e)(1)(A) Any person who violates the provisions of sections 12 or 13(c), relating to child labor, or any regulation issued pursuant to such sections, shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed—

''(i) $11,000 for each employee who was the subject of such a violation; or

''(ii) $50,000 with regard to each such violation that causes the death or serious injury of any employee under the age of 18 years, which penalty may be doubled where the violation is a repeated or willful violation.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'serious injury' means—

''(i) permanent loss or substantial impairment of one of the senses (sight, hearing, taste, smell, tactile sensation);

''(ii) permanent loss or substantial impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty, including the loss of all or part of an arm, leg, foot, hand or other body part; or

''(iii) permanent paralysis or substantial impairment that causes loss of movement or mobility of an arm, leg, foot, hand or other body part.

''(2) Any person who repeatedly or willfully violates section 6 or 7, relating to wages, shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $1,100 for each such violation.

''(3) In determining the amount of any penalty under this subsection, the appropriateness of such penalty to the size of the business of the person charged and the gravity of the violation shall be considered. The amount of any penalty under this subsection, when finally determined, may be—

''(A) deducted from any sums owing by the United States to the person charged;

''(B) recovered in a civil action brought by the Secretary in any court of competent jurisdiction, in which litigation the Secretary shall be represented by the Solicitor of Labor; or

''(C) ordered by the court, in an action brought for a violation of section 15(a)(4) or a repeated or willful violation of section 15(a)(2), to be paid to the Secretary.

''(4) Any administrative determination by the Secretary of the amount of any penalty under this subsection shall be final, unless within 15 days after receipt of notice thereof by certified mail the person charged with the violation takes exception to the determination that the violations for which the penalty is imposed occurred, in which event final determination of the penalty shall be made in an administrative proceeding after opportunity for hearing in accordance with section 554 of title 5, United States Code, and regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary.

''(5) Except for civil penalties collected for violations of sections 12 or 13(c), sums collected as penalties pursuant to this section shall be applied toward reimbursement of the costs of determining the violations and assessing and collecting such penalties, in accordance with the provision of section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Department of Labor to make special statistical studies upon payment of the cost thereof and for other purposes' (29 U.S.C. 9a). Civil penalties collected for violations of sections 12 or 13(c) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert materials relevant to H.R. 2637 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2637, the Child Labor Protection Act of 2007.

This bipartisan legislation is designed to address the most serious child labor violations, deter repeat occurrences, and strengthen the enforcement of laws to protect our Nation's most vulnerable workers.

This bill would increase the maximum penalty for child labor violations that lead to the death or serious injury of a minor from the current cap of $11,000 to $50,000 per violation. The bill would also permit the penalty to be doubled to $100,000 if it is determined that the violation was repeated or willful.

Additionally, the legislation amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to reflect the increases in penalties for child labor violations and for minimum wage and overtime violations.

The current language in the FLSA provides limits of $10,000 for child labor violations, $1,000 for minimum wage and overtime violations. These penalties were increased to $11,000 and $1,100, respectively, by the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Act of 1990, as amended by the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996. The legislation before us today would simply conform the language of the FLSA to reflect these changes.

The increase in maximum penalties for violation of child labor laws is an important first step in our efforts to protect the health and safety of the estimated 3.2 million workers under the age of 18. The National Institute For Occupational Safety and Health Administration estimates that every year 230,000 youth under the age of 18 sustain workplace injuries, and between 60 and 70 die from occupational accidents.

□ 1100

This translates into a youth worker injury every 2 days and a fatality every 5 days.

Current penalties do not communicate an adequate level of governmental concern for the health and safety of the working young and do not provide sufficient motivation for employers to ensure a safe and legal workplace for youth.

Given the pervasiveness of youth employment and injuries and the fact that the current maximum penalties are too low to demand compliance with child labor laws, this legislation represents an important improvement in our laws that will help provide a safer occupational environment for young workers

Mr. Speaker, the Child Protection Act of 2007 was proposed by the administration and is supported by Education and Labor Committee Chairman MILLER and Ranking Republican MCKEON, as well as Chairwoman WOOLSEY and Ranking Republican JOE

WILSON of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections. This bill represents an important first step in improving working conditions for our Nation's youth, and I urge all Members to support the legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2637, the Child Labor Protection Act of 2007, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. I appreciate the work of Chairman MILLER and Chairwoman WOOLSEY, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) in crafting this legislation.

There is no one more vulnerable in our workforce than its youngest members. While the employment of young workers is essential to instilling in them the work ethic and the value of a dollar, their collective safety must be the highest priority of our Nation's employers and, indeed, the Nation as a whole.

With this in mind, the measure before us would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by increasing to $50,000 the civil penalty for any type of child labor violation that causes a death or serious injury of an employee under the age of 18. The current maximum civil penalty is $11,000, and it is low by any reasonable estimation. So this update is both prudent and necessary.

Moreover, the legislation would allow the $50,000 penalty to be doubled up to a maximum of $100,000 for the willful and repeat violations that cause the death or serious injury of any child employed in violation of the Federal child labor standards. Once again, such an increase is both prudent and necessary.

The measure before us is essential for the continuation of the Department of Labor's ongoing focus on workplace safety for youth, and I commend President Bush for his work in this issue.

Earlier this year, the Department submitted draft legislation similar to H.R. 2637, and before that, the Department proposed new labor standards rules to cover nonagricultural occupations for employment of 14- and 15-year-olds, as well as occupations that place the well-being of employees under 18 years of age at risk.

Mr. Speaker, we are making undeniable, bipartisan progress on updating our child labor laws. As the Bush administration continues its work, the Child Labor Protection Act would provide it with additional tools to address serious child labor violations, decrease repeat occurrences and strengthen the overall enforcement of critical child labor laws.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their work on this measure and urge passage of this bill in the House.

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

MR. HARE. Mr. Speaker at this time I am honored to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), the sponsor of this very important piece of legislation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and thank our ranking member for making this possible this morning.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and as Chair of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I truly am proud to have brought H.R. 2637 to the floor today.

The Child Labor Protection Act of 2007 is a narrowly drafted, bipartisan bill that increases penalties substantially for violations of child labor protection provisions that actually cause death or serious injury. Although this legislation does not make the imposition of penalties mandatory, it leaves the decision of whether or not to assess penalties up to the Secretary of Labor, and it provides the Department with an additional enforcement tool to address the most serious labor violations.

There is much more that must be done, Mr. Speaker, to strengthen our child labor laws, but this bill is a small first step. It is a beginning.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2637.

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.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF FATHERS IN THE HEALTHY DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 474) recognizing the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 474

Whereas fathers factor significantly in the lives of children;

Whereas fathers play an important role in teaching their children life lessons and preparing them to succeed in school and in life;

Whereas children with involved fathers are more likely to do well in school, have a better sense of well-being, and have fewer behavioral problems;

Whereas supportive fathers promote the positive physical, social, emotional, and mental development of children;

Whereas promoting responsible fatherhood can help increase the chances that children will grow up with two caring parents;

Whereas, when fathers are actively involved in the upbringing of children, the children demonstrate greater self-control and a greater ability to take initiative;

Whereas responsible fatherhood can help reduce child poverty;

Whereas responsible fatherhood strengthens families and communities; and

Whereas Father's Day is the third Sunday in June: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the millions of fathers who serve as a wonderful, caring parent for their children;

(2) calls on fathers across the United States to use Father's Day to reconnect and rededicate themselves to their children's lives, to spend Father's Day with their children, and to express their love and support for their children;

(3) urges men to understand the level of responsibility fathering a child requires, especially in the encouragement of the moral, academic, and spiritual development of children; and

(4) encourages active involvement of fathers in the rearing and development of their children, including the devotion of time, energy, and resources.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the lives of children, especially as we prepare to celebrate Father's Day this Sunday, June 17. While the amount of time a father spends with his child can be quantified, the total contribution to his child's healthy development cannot. Children with involved fathers tend to do better in school, have fewer behavioral problems and demonstrate greater self-control.

Supportive fathers also promote the positive physical, social, emotional, and mental development of their children. Responsible fatherhood can increase the chances children will grow up with two caring parents. Additionally, it can lead to reduction in child poverty and strengthen families as well as communities.

So as we come upon Father's Day, we would like to recognize and thank the fathers throughout this country who play an active role in the lives of their children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass House Resolution 474, recognizing the contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children.

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

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as a proud father of two, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 474, recognizing the immeasurable contribution of fathers in the healthy development of

children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day.

William Shakespeare wrote, ''It is a wise father that knows his own child.'' The truism of these words is exceedingly relevant today. The presence of two committed, involved parents contributes directly to better academic performance, reduced substance abuse, less crime and delinquency, fewer emotional and other behavioral problems, less risk of abuse and neglect and lower risk of teen suicide.

The research is clear: Fathers factor significantly in the lives of their children. There is simply no substitute for the love, involvement and commitment of a responsible father.

The fathers of yesteryear thought that merely being a good provider meant that they were good fathers. Fathers today have the responsibility to set aside quality time for their children in ways that may contribute to happy memories that last a lifetime. Fathers realize that their time with children is really an investment in them.

Being an involved father is good for children and good for fathers. And while each father is a unique person who parents in his own way and style, there are some characteristics that good fathers have in common. Good fathers are involved in the lives of their children. They attend their children's school events, games and activities. They also involve their children in their lives and the adult world by taking them to see the workplace, taking them along when the car needs to be repaired or involving them in decisions that affect the family.

□ 1110

Good fathers set limits and are firm. They let their children know their beliefs and expectations but rely on explanations and reasoning rather than force. Indeed, today's lifestyles are changing. More and more fathers are effectively balancing their personal, work, and family times. Both children and fathers are realizing the importance of the father's role, and there are ever-increasing amounts of research being conducted on the father's role in today's families. These findings document the importance of the father's role, the profound influence of fathers in children's growth and development, and the characteristics that good fathers have in common.

Fathers play a significant role in shaping the character of their children. By spending time with their sons and daughters, being stern yet fair disciplinarians, and listening to their experiences, fathers mold and shape their children into the men and women they will become. As advisers and role models, fathers help their children to understand the difference between right and wrong and to recognize how the decisions they make today can affect the rest of their lives. Fathers instill important values that prepare their children for the challenges and opportunities ahead by demonstrating true leadership. Their love and devotion inspire the future generation of Americans to achieve their dreams and demonstrate the true spirit of our country.

A father is one of the most important influences in a child's life. On Father's Day and every day, we honor our fathers and celebrate the special bond between a father and a child. I am honored to rise today in support of this resolution and in honoring all of our fathers for the roles that they play and for the love they give.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert materials relevant to House Resolution 474 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, my good friend, Representative DAVIS from Illinois.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. First of all, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, for yielding time, and I also want to commend him for the tremendous leadership that he continues to play, even as a new Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 474 and take this opportunity to congratulate all of my colleagues who hold the honor and privilege of fatherhood. It is widely understood and acknowledged that the benefits of an actively involved father in the lives of children not only helps but plays a vital role in the formation of successful youth and in the development of contributing members of society. It should come as no surprise that, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, fatherless children are at a dramatically greater risk of drug and alcohol abuse. We know that fatherless children are twice as likely to drop out of school. Just over 41 percent of fatherless families with children are poor, while only 7 percent of children headed by a married couple are considered poor. Furthermore, over two-thirds of mother-only families live twice below the poverty line.

Our work today and our work in Congress should not only focus on acknowledging fatherhood but it should focus on empowering fathers to have the capabilities and incentives to be more responsible for their children. Barriers to employment, such as a lack of high school or college degree, as well as criminal histories and substance abuse, all contribute to the lack of fathers in the household and the lack of a regular source of income and the ability to contribute to the family. It is not enough to fill this room with words. The only way to improve the ever-increasing number of families without fathers is through targeting the problems that fathers face by going to the source. One way of doing this is through support of the Responsible Fatherhood and Healthy Families Act. Removing employment barriers for noncustodial parents, which mostly tend to be fathers, would be of tremendous benefit. By funding grants to promote reasonable fatherhood, we are directly promoting the futures of innocent children while concurrently strengthening the family.

Social scientists have for years debated the role of the father in the family. It is consistently among the top interest of psychologists. Leading professionals indicate that fathers provide role models for their sons to learn how to be a man, whereas girls need fathers to learn how to relate to a man in significant ways. Fathers also tend to constrain and correct violent and antisocial behavior better than anyone else, as well as challenge and promote such characteristics as independence, assertiveness, and achievement. But this is not a new phenomenon. George Herbert, the famous medieval poet and orator, understood. He said that one father is more than a hundred schoolmasters. How true that word is today.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by remembering the fact that every year I give away scholarships, money that we go out and kind of find for kids to go to college. And on the form, there is an application that says, put down the name of your mother and father, what they do. I must confess that I have been most disheartened, because in some instances children have written on the application form, DNA, meaning that the name of the father does not apply. In some instances they have even written ''unknown.'' Or in other instances they have written ''irrelevant.'' Or ''does not matter.'' If we are to strengthen families, if we are to strengthen our society, then we must find a way to help so many of the individuals who have been out of the picture to cop back in and take on their responsible role of fatherhood.

I thank the gentleman again from Illinois for yielding time. I thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I also use this moment to say thank you to my own father who died 2 years ago, 92 years old. Much of the reason that I stand here today is because of him.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to my good friend and fellow Tennessean, Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN. I want to first thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding me this time. I want to also commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) for bringing

this resolution before us today and commend all of the cosponsors, Mr. DAVIS and others.

Mr. Speaker, some people might think this is an insignificant resolution. I think there is probably very little that we could talk about today that would be more important than fatherhood and the important role it plays in the life of this Nation. This was brought home to me most vividly in January 1981 when I became judge of the criminal court in Knox County, Tennessee, trying felony criminal cases, the murders, rapes, armed robberies, the most serious cases. I was told that first day by Gary Tullock, the chief probation counselor for east Tennessee, 16 counties in east Tennessee, that 98 percent of the defendants in felony cases came from father-absent households. I'm not sure that it is quite that high, but I know it's well over 90 percent. It's the entire crime problem.

I hasten to say that I know many good people have come from father-absent households, but I also know that children cannot raise themselves. And because 96 or 97 percent of the people plead guilty in criminal cases and then apply for probation, I went through over 10,000 cases in the 7½ years that I served as judge. I cannot tell you how many times I read over and over and over and over again: ''Defendant's father left home to get pack of cigarettes and never came back.'' ''Defendant's father left home when defendant was 2 and never returned.''

And so I can say this, that father-absent households not only are the root of our crime problem, all the things like drugs and alcohol and all of that come secondary. I know there are exceptions to everything that you say, but we need to get into the minds of our young people and teach them how important it is that fathers don't desert their children as so many millions of fathers have unfortunately over the years and have gone out of the lives of their children much to the detriment of those young people and to the detriment of this Nation.

I support this resolution and I commend all of those who have brought this to the floor today.

□ 1120

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE).

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today in strong support of H. Res. 474, recognizing the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of our children, especially on this coming Father's Day.

I want to thank Chairman GEORGE MILLER, Ranking Member MCKEON, and all of the members on the Education and Labor Committee. And I would like to thank Mr. HARE for supporting this resolution and helping to bring it to the floor this week. I also want to thank the staff of the National Fatherhood Initiative for their assistance with this resolution and their tireless efforts on a year-around basis to promote responsible fatherhood across this great Nation.

Father's Day was first conceived in 1909 by Sonora Dodd in Spokane, Washington. In 1966, President Lyndon Johnson issued a Presidential proclamation designating the third Sunday in June as Father's Day. And in 1972, President Richard Nixon signed a public law making that public designation permanent.

Here in Congress I am grateful we have an opportunity to have a task force on fatherhood promotion that also works on a year-round basis with the National Fatherhood Initiative and with many Members of Congress on a bipartisan basis to support the positive initiatives of involving fathers in their children's lives and honoring those fathers on a national basis who have been upheld for making a difference in children's lives everywhere.

This is a task force that Congressman JOE PITTS and I started 11 years ago when we first came to Congress, and I am thrilled that over the last decade and past year that it has gone well, and we have an opportunity each year to come to the floor with a resolution such as this one.

This Sunday, June 17, Americans will celebrate Father's Day once again. We use this day to honor the contributions made by the estimated 64.3 million fathers in the United States. We also use this day to encourage all fathers to reflect on the responsibility fathering a child requires and the importance of their involvement in the lives of their children.

With two sons of my own, Joshua and Stephen, who have been here often on this floor, I know firsthand the rewards and responsibilities of being a father; and I am grateful, indeed, to my own father, Dr. Douglas McIntyre, back home in Lumberton, North Carolina, for his impact upon my life.

It is only appropriate that Father's Day be a tribute, that we here in the U.S. House of Representatives pass this resolution in recognition of the contributions of fathers everywhere. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to support this.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in honor of my own father, Lawrence Davis, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to briefly close by saying something about my own father.

As the gentleman from Tennessee was talking about his dad, I have three sisters, and I can remember my dad having to work three jobs to make ends meet for our family. I wouldn't be here today if it weren't for him. I miss him terribly. He has been gone a number of years, but today, as we honor fathers, I remember him and thank him.

One thing my dad did every night when we had dinner, when he could make it, was to tell a joke to my three sisters and myself. He said this world is such a serious place to live in, every now and then you need to laugh and smile. I remember that each and every day. I hope my father gave me sense of humor that sometimes people find a little annoying.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 474. As we approach Father's Day weekend, it is appropriate for us to recognize the importance of fathers in the lives of their children. Children who live with their fathers do better in school, are less likely to use drugs or engage in other criminal behavior, and are less likely to experience health, emotional, or behavioral problems. In so many ways, involved fathers provide needed support for their children and serve as role models as they develop.

Unfortunately, too many children today do not live with or even frequently see their fathers. This has forced millions of young mothers across the Nation to single-handedly raise their children, struggling to provide them with the love and support needed to succeed in today's world. It is a sad reality that for millions of children, their mother has to play the role of both mom and dad, a task that is not only difficult for the mother but which despite her efforts far too often results in that child living in poverty, among other challenges.

To help address this situation, the 1996 welfare reform law included promoting marriage and family formation and the maintenance of two-parent families as key purposes of welfare programs.

Under the direction of the Ways and Means Committee on which I serve, legislation reauthorizing the 1996 welfare reform law in the last Congress included specific funding for healthy marriage and fatherhood grant programs to improve the well-being of children. These fatherhood grants were designed to promote responsible fatherhood by funding projects developed by public, private, and often faith-based groups to help fathers establish positive relationships with their children and the children's mothers, improve job skills, increase child support payments, and promote marriage among parents. Activities can include counseling, mentoring, providing information about the benefits of marriage and two-parent involvement for children and the prevention of domestic violence and child abuse, financial planning seminars, and education on good parenting practices.

Last October, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services announced $119 million in awards to 225 grantees for promotion of healthy marriages and responsible fatherhood. These grants are designed to make a difference in the lives of children, fathers, and families by supporting groups already at work trying to help men become better fathers.

As we honor our own fathers this week, we should also thank those who are working every day to help more men become better fathers. The last Congress took concrete steps to support them. In the congressional district I represent, a recent fatherhood event took place that is described in the June 11 Catholic News Service article, provided below. As efforts such as this and those supported by the recent Federal grants take hold, we will be watching for evidence that more children are

spending every day, and not just Father's Day, with an involved and supportive father.

[From the Catholic News Service, June 11, 2007]

FATHERS' INVOLVEMENT KEY IN LIVES OF CHILDREN, SAYS CATHOLIC CHARITIES CONFERENCE

(By Paul Storer)

JOLIET, IL. (CNS).—A convicted drug dealer, 28-year-old Exulam Holman knows his actions have caused pain to those closest to him. The father of three young children, former gang member and ex-addict was released three months ago from prison. Today, he is desperately trying to put his life in order.

Holman's painstaking quest to reclaim his life spurred him to take part in a fatherhood conference sponsored by Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Joliet. ''I want to make things right for my kids,'' he told the Catholic Explorer, Joliet diocesan newspaper, during the June 2 event.

''I've messed up,'' he said. ''But I've asked God to help me. I have to get myself right with God.''

About 100 people attended the third annual conference, aimed at getting fathers more involved in the lives of their children, said Ronald Roseboro, site supervisor of early childhood services for Catholic Charities and coordinator of the event.

Fathers of children in the agency's early childhood programs were encouraged to attend the gathering, said Roseboro. Other fathers from Joliet and surrounding communities were also invited to attend.

The presence of two nurturing parents minimizes the possibility their children will abuse drugs or alcohol, join gangs or involve themselves in other dangerous situations, said Roseboro. A father's leadership and guidance has a definite impact on his children's lives, he continued. ''It's like dropping a pebble into a pond and watching the ripples it makes.''

Guest speakers from diverse backgrounds led various workshops during the conference.

A father of five, Rev. Eugene Fears, pastor of Joliet's Redeem Church of God in Christ, spoke of healthy relationships. The no-nonsense preacher relied on his own experiences to build a case for sound communication and devotion between spouses.

''A commitment pushes through adversity,'' he told conference participants. He urged the men to ''learn to make adjustments'' and to avoid ''self-centered'' attitudes. ''We need to learn to give of ourselves,'' Rev. Fears said.

Fathers who leave and don't compensate their families are often called ''deadbeat dads,'' but the reality is they are often simply ''dead broke,'' Warren Cottrell, director of the Joliet branch of the Illinois Child Support Enforcement program, said in an interview with the Explorer. He was on hand to field questions from participants during the conference.

Most fathers understand their responsibilities. They choose to turn their backs on their families, however, when they realize they cannot adequately provide for them. ''It's the male ego,'' said Cottrell.

Applauding Catholic Charities for broaching the topic with the conference, the administrator noted that fathers must be encouraged to do the right thing.

Cottrell said the welfare system in Illinois has many cracks. Jobless fathers are leaving their families so mothers can qualify for government aid. There are countless programs for single mothers in need of assistance. At the. same time, government programs need to be created to educate fathers and provide them with skills to remain with their families, he said.

Darnell Terrell's children participate in the Catholic Charities Head Start program at St. John's Head Start Center in Joliet. The owner of a disc-jockey business and father of six praised the other men who attended the conference. ''It takes a real man to listen to others about fatherhood responsibilities.''

Kenneth White and Donald Waddell, human services consultants and family counselors, shared startling statistics compiled by the National Fatherhood Initiative during their workshop. The findings highlight the fact that the absence of fathers has a serious effect on families.

More than 70 percent of teens who have committed homicide grew up without fathers. Approximately 60 percent of rapists were raised in fatherless homes. Three out of four teen suicides occur in single-parent families. And the list goes on and on, they said.

Substance abuse fuels domestic problems that work to break families apart, according to the two experts in the field. Presenting a workshop on the effects of addiction on fatherhood, White and Waddell described the impact that narcotics and alcohol have on the family unit and discussed some proven methods for combating the problem.

Addiction among parents needs to be addressed and curbed, Waddell told the Explorer, because children of parents who abuse drugs often become addicted themselves during adolescence and later in life. ''We want to break that cycle,'' he said.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 474.

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. HARE. 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.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL INTERNET SAFETY MONTH

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 455) supporting the goals and ideals of National Internet Safety Month, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 455

Whereas, on May 16, 2007, the United States Senate passed a resolution designating June 2007 as ''National Internet Safety Month'';

Whereas there are more than 1,000,000,000 Internet users worldwide;

Whereas, in the United States, 35,000,000 children in kindergarten through grade 12 have Internet access;

Whereas approximately 80 percent of the children of the United States in grades 5 through 12 are online for at least 1 hour per week;

Whereas approximately 41 percent of students in grades 5 through 12 do not share with their parents what they do on the Internet;

Whereas approximately 24 percent of students in grades 5 through 12 have hidden their online activities from their parents;

Whereas approximately 31 percent of the students in grades 5 through 12 have the skill to circumvent Internet filter software;

Whereas 61 percent of the students admit to using the Internet unsafely or inappropriately;

Whereas 20 percent of middle school and high school students have met face-to-face with someone they first met online;

Whereas 23 percent of students know someone who has been bullied online;

Whereas 56 percent of parents feel that online bullying of children is an issue that needs to be addressed;

Whereas 47 percent of parents feel that their ability to monitor and shelter their children from inappropriate material on the Internet is limited; and

Whereas 61 percent of parents want to be more personally involved with Internet safety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of recognizing National Internet Safety Month;

(2) recognizes that National Internet Safety Month provides the citizens of the United States with an opportunity to learn more about—

(A) the dangers of the Internet; and

(B) the importance of being safe and responsible online;

(3) commends and recognizes national and community organizations for—

(A) promoting awareness of the dangers of the Internet; and

(B) providing information and training that develops critical thinking and decision-making skills that are needed to use the Internet safely; and

(4) calls on parents, educators, Internet safety organizations, law enforcement, community leaders, and volunteers to increase their efforts to raise the level of awareness for the need for online safety in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, June is National Internet Safety Month, and the resolution before us today highlights this designation. As a member of the Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN) for introducing this resolution and for her efforts to protect our children from the lurking dangers on the Internet.

It is not hyperbole to say that the Internet is the most powerful tool ever developed for disseminating information to as many people as possible. Not since the invention of radio or, perhaps, since even the printing press, has a technological development so radically altered the means by which we spread information to the general public.

Moreover, the Internet has completely revolutionized the way in which we communicate with each other on an individualized basis. Not since the invention of the telephone has a technology revolutionized the way in which we interact with each other, one on one, regardless of distance or geography.

But, of course, with such great revolutions, there are always drawbacks. There will always be some who take advantage of the profound benefits provided by technology and use it for nefarious purposes. As marvelous as the Internet and the World Wide Web have become as a means of empowering ordinary people to communicate ideas in a manner that was once unimaginable, the Internet has also becoming a breeding ground, yes, a breeding ground for poisonous messages and images. It has become the modern, virtual wild, wild west where cyberbandits and thieves roam to prey on unsuspecting consumers by deception and by extracting from them sensitive private information.

And at its very worst, the Internet and the World Wide Web can be a complete snakepit, full of predators and scum who would prey on the most innocent and vulnerable members of our society, our children.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 455 supports the goals and ideals of National Internet Safety Month. The resolution before us recognizes the many national and community organizations that exist to educate parents and children on what steps they can take to protect their families from unsuitable content and from online predators.

The Federal Trade Commission is the crown jewel of the Federal Government's mission to protect consumers, and has played a critical role in this regard. In addition to its ongoing efforts to crack down on cybercrime, the Commission has engaged in a public relations campaign to promote awareness and online safety habits.

The FTC has established a 1–800 number which serves as a help line and as the designee where consumers can file complaints. Moreover, the Commission has set up a special Web site, www.OnGuardOnline.gov—that is www.OnGuardOnline.gov—to provide tips to consumers in protecting themselves and their children from Internet fraud.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the FTC is engaged in a public awareness campaign to promote Internet safety through a child-friendly mascot named ''Dewie the Turtle,'' much the same way Smokey the Bear successfully promoted the prevention of forest fires.

In addition to the FTC's efforts, numerous private and community-based organizations exist to educate and empower parents, young children and teenagers to have a safe, wholesome Internet experience.

□ 1130

They all provide a commendable service that parents and consumers should use to help empower themselves against Internet dangers. These organizations are listed on the FTC's Web site, and I will include the list into the RECORD at this point.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

To learn more about staying safe online, visit the following organizations:

Federal Trade Commission—www.OnGuardOnline.gov—The FTC works for the consumer to prevent fraudulent, deceptive, and unfair business practices in the marketplace and to provide information to help consumers spot, stop, and avoid them. To file a complaint or to get free information on consumer issues, visit ftc.gov or call toll-free, 1–877–FTC-HELP (1–877–382–4357); TTY: 1–866–653–4261. The FTC enters Internet, telemarketing, identity theft, and other fraud-related complaints into Consumer Sentinel, a secure, online database available to hundreds of civil and criminal law enforcement agencies in the U.S. and abroad.

The FTC manages OnGuardOnline.gov, which provides practical tips from the federal government and the technology industry to help you be on guard against Internet fraud, secure your computer, and protect your personal information.

GetNetWise—www.getnetwise.org—GetNetWise is a public service sponsored by Internet industry corporations and public interest organizations to help ensure that Internet users have safe, constructive, and educational or entertaining online experiences. The GetNetWise coalition wants Internet users to be just ''one click away'' from the resources they need to make informed decisions about their and their family's use of the Internet.

Internet Keep Safe Coalition—www.iKeepSafe.org—iKeepSafe.org, home of Faux Paw the Techno Cat, is a coalition of 49 governors/first spouses, law enforcement, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and other associations dedicated to helping parents, educators, and caregivers by providing tools and guidelines to teach children the safe and healthy use of technology. The organization's vision is to see generations of children worldwide grow up safely using technology and the Internet.

i-SAFE—www.i-safe.org—Founded in 1998 and endorsed by the U.S. Congress, i-SAFE is a non-profit foundation dedicated to protecting the online experiences of youth everywhere. i-SAFE incorporates classroom curriculum with dynamic community outreach to empower students, teachers, parents, law enforcement, and concerned adults to make the Internet a safer place. Join them today in the fight to safeguard children's online experience.

National Center for Missing and Exploited Children—www.missingkids.com; www.netsmartz.org—NCMEC is a private, non-profit organization that helps prevent child abduction and sexual exploitation; helps find missing children; and assists victims of child abduction and sexual exploitation, their families, and the professionals who serve them.

National Crime Prevention Council—www.ncpc.org; www.mcgruff.org—The National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) is a private, nonprofit organization whose primary mission is to enable people to create safer and more caring communities by addressing the causes of crime and violence and reducing the opportunities for crime to occur. Among many crime prevention issues, NCPC addresses Internet Safety with kids and parents through www.mcgruff.org and public service advertising under the National Citizens' Crime Prevention Campaign—symbolized by McGruff the Crime Dog® and his ''Take A Bite Out Of Crime®.''

National Cyber Security Alliance—www.staysafeonline.org—NCSA is a nonprofit organization that provides tools and resources to empower home users, small businesses, and schools, colleges, and universities to stay safe online. A public-private partnership, NCSA members include the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Trade Commission, and many private-sector corporations and organizations.

staysafe—www.staysafe.org—staysafe.org—is an educational site intended to help consumers understand both the positive aspects of the Internet as well as how to manage a variety of safety and security issues that exist online.

Wired Safety—www.wiredsafety.org—WiredSafety.org is an Internet safety and help group. Comprised of unpaid volunteers around the world, WiredSafety.org provides education, assistance, and awareness on all aspects of cybrcrime and abuse, privacy, security, and responsible technology use. It is also the parent group of Teenangels.org, FBI-trained teens and preteens who promote Internet safety.

The measure before us today, Mr. Speaker, encourages consumers and parents to take advantage of these resources.

Again, I want to thank my good friend from Illinois, Congresswoman BEAN. She's such a champion on this issue. I want to thank her for this resolution, and I hope the House will see fit to pass this measure in expeditious fashion.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from North Carolina and his comments and obviously thank our colleague from Illinois (Ms. BEAN) for bringing this very important resolution to the House floor. I'm happy to rise in support of this resolution and emphasize, I believe, its important goals for my colleagues today.

As all of us know, the Internet is a wonderful tool for business, obviously for education, and for recreation. However, we have also learned the Internet can be a wonderful tool for not-so-wonderful different people. There are the general mischief makers, hackers seeking a cheap thrill, personal identity thieves that we know about and, most repugnant, stalkers and child predators.

But despite the plethora of information out there, many people are still unaware of the significant dangers the Internet poses to our children. Children themselves are often unaware of the danger, but are of a—well, you know, it won't happen to me—type of thinking.

That mindset can lead to trouble, and we've seen that in the NBC program, ''To Catch a Predator,'' in which

we've seen the insidious operations in which these child predators come in looking for the child, the teenager, and they're caught right on camera. So that camera has illustrated the problems that we have with the Internet and the dangers.

Not coincidentally, June is also the month many of our children leave school for 3 months of vacation and recreation. So we need to raise awareness of the danger to our children, to our parents, and that's why June is an appropriate time for National Internet Safety Month.

With less time in the classroom, these children spend more time obviously on computers. Parents are the first and most effective defense protecting our Nation's children. Most of us here in Congress are working parents. Our children are back in the district. We know we cannot look over them all the time, and perhaps the spouse is working also. So while we can't look over our children's shoulder every hour of the day, we certainly should put in place the software and the protection in our computer, as well as awareness of the child, of the insidious nature of the Internet and the evil people that are out there that are stalking our children.

So this resolution is meant to bring attention to the Internet dangers of cyberstalking, cyberbullying and cyberchild predators. In conjunction with our efforts, a number of organizations, both private and government, have launched public awareness campaigns with information related to National Internet Safety Month. I applaud the efforts of the multiple online safety organizations, industry-wide, and the Department of Justice's National Criminal Justice Reference Service for their efforts, and I think the American public should be aware that the National Criminal Justice Reference Service is available through the Department of Justice, and you can go online to the Department of Justice to find out more about this service.

The dangers of the Internet exist year-round and require vigilance in our defense year-round. At the same time, it is important for us to send a strong reminder to parents and children of the very threats of the Internet as our children begin their summer vacations and have more free, often unsupervised, time to explore cyberspace.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN), the author of this resolution.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 455, which supports the goals and ideals of National Internet Safety Month. Following the lead of the Senate, I'm proud that the House of Representatives will recognize June 2007 as National Internet Safety Month with passage of my resolution today.

I want to thank Chairman DINGELL and the resolution's cosponsors, Representatives UPTON, GREEN, SHIMKUS, MATHESON, DONNELLY and GILLIBRAND, for their help bringing to the floor this resolution on Internet safety.

The Internet is a wonderful resource for our children. Over 35 million students have access to the Internet and use it every day to expand their knowledge beyond what they can learn in textbooks and in the classroom. In addition, the Internet allows kids to stay connected with their friends when not at school.

The Internet has increased productivity and opened a new world of opportunities for our children; but at the same time, it has opened a world of dangers. These threats, whether it be unwanted online solicitations, Internet scams or cyberbullying, are dangerous and real. In order for our children to be protected from the dangers of the Internet, we must work together to raise awareness of Internet safety.

As noted in today's resolution, 41 percent of middle and high school students do not tell their parents about their Internet communications; 61 percent of students admit to using the Internet unsafely or inappropriately; and of most concern, 20 percent of middle school and high school students have met face-to-face with someone they first met online.

In recent studies conducted by the Department of Justice, one in seven children between the ages of 10 and 17 received a sexual solicitation online and one in 25, or essentially one per classroom, have received an aggressive sexual solicitation when a predator calls them on the phone, sends them gifts, or requests a meeting.

Fortunately, our schools, nonprofits, local, State and Federal governments, and concerned corporate citizens have been actively engaging children on Internet safety. Programs vary, but all emphasize the importance of protecting personal information, keeping parents informed of Internet actions, and being careful who you talk to online.

For the last 2½ years, I have hosted Internet safety forums for kids and adults in my own congressional district. Having teenage daughters of my own, I discovered while they enjoyed the opportunity to express themselves with popular networking sites, they had no appreciation for the dangers that lurked there. Whenever I meet with students from my district, I always emphasize tips for how to stay online.

We have a little bookmarker that we distribute to children across the district giving them safety tips. Some of those include, number one, not sharing passwords or personal identifying information, and they really don't appreciate that while this is a site that allows them to connect with friends, oftentimes predators are using these sites as online shopping catalogs for potential victims, and by sharing information, they're setting themselves up as just that potential victim.

We also talked to children about while trustworthiness is one of the pillars of character that many schools instill in their own character development programs, that that trustworthiness is not something that anyone they have met on the Internet is deserving of because oftentimes they're not who they say they are, and the 14-year-old from the school across town very well in many cases is a 38-year-old predator from out of State.

We also tell them to avoid posting pictures online. Again, they're sharing pictures of activities and themselves with their friends, but those pictures are often taken out of context and they have no control over how they're used, where they're used, who they're used by. And we also remind particularly our high schoolers that not only colleges but future employers will be looking on these networking sites to see the pictures they have posted; and while they may think these are private or they can take those pictures back, through the use of technology, in most cases they can't. Once they're out there, they can't get those back.

Besides educating children about Internet safety, it's as important to inform parents how to keep their kids safe online. The sad reality is children know far more about the Internet and they're much more comfortable with computer usage than we as parents tend to be, but we have to work at it.

Approximately 50 percent of parents admit that they do not properly monitor their children's Internet activity and they don't use filter, blocking or monitoring software on their home computers. Parents need to be engaged and ask their children what they're doing online.

□ 1140

We all remember, and our children remember, stranger danger. We certainly have all, as parents, encouraged them never to talk to strangers at the playground. The playground has gotten a lot bigger, and now those strangers can come right into our home, and in some cases, our children's bedrooms, which is also why we encourage parents not to put computers in their children's rooms but to put them in a public place.

Finally, install filter blocking and monitoring software to prevent children from visiting dangerous sites.

In addition to today's resolution, I have introduced legislation that will expand the FTC's resources to create public awareness with a national campaign to help kids, teachers and parents protect themselves.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 455 and encourage them to use Internet National Safety Month as an opportunity to support the efforts of our local, State and Federal government, local and national nonprofit organizations, and concerned

corporate citizens in promoting Internet safety.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the gentlelady for her statistics that she brings forward. I think many of us, when you hear 1 in 25, that doesn't sound too bad, but that one person out of 25 could be your son or daughter, and it would be a tragedy. The statistics bring home to all of us, particularly people that have seen our children grow up and use the Internet.

I would also suggest that she make available to all Members a copy of that bookmark. I think that bookmark is a terrific idea, and I think a lot of Members who have young children certainly could use that bookmark back in their district. Again, I think what she is doing is very important.

In the committee that I am ranking member of, the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, we have passed out of the subcommittee, the full committee, and in the House recently, the spyware bill, H.R. 964. This bill obviously is about spyware that's used to penetrate your computer and to find out different pieces of information about what you are doing that can be used for cyberstalking.

I want to applaud the House for voting overwhelmingly. I think it was over 360 Members voted for spyware. I urge the Senate to pass the spyware bill and bring it to conference, so that we can get it to the President's desk.

This would go also towards preventing the cyberstalking, some of the things we see here, and which we are seeking with Internet Safety Month.

Again, I thank the gentlelady for her efforts here.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I am pleased to offer my support of H. Res. 455 offered by my colleague, Representative MELISSA BEAN.

The power of the Internet has revolutionized communications and affected the lives of people in every comer of the planet. It does more good than most of us can imagine. It's also no secret that the Internet also can be dangerous, especially for trusting children who go online without parents or teachers looking over their shoulders.

Studies say that more than a billion people use the Internet, and none of us need a study to know that some of them are wretched predators. In the United States, 35,000,000 children in kindergarten through 12th grade have Internet access. Of those students, 61 percent admit to using the Internet unsafely or inappropriately. As many as 47 percent of parents feel unable to fully monitor and shelter their children from inappropriate material.

We on the Energy and Commerce Committee are acutely aware of the Internet's value to commerce and communication, but we have also seen the evil that people can do when they use the Internet to attract and abuse children. And yet many parents and children are simply unaware of hazards that exist only one click away.

We want our children to feel safe at home, and they do, but that sense of safety can also cause them to let down their guard with the strangers they meet by computer. The consequences can range from unhappy experiences with cyber-bullying to tragic involvement in kiddy porn.

June is National Internet Safety Month, a time used to promote education and awareness of these issues and stress their preventability through an ad campaign. The campaign focuses on advice to parents in educating their children on the dangers of the Internet along with true stories of children succumbing to predators. It also provides important links and information on how to report an offender.

H. Res. 455, promoting National Internet Safety Month, commends national and community organizations for promoting awareness of the dangers of the Internet and providing information and training that develops critical thinking and decision making skills that are necessary in order to safely utilize the Internet. The House also recognizes the continued involvement of parents, educators, law enforcement, and community leaders as vital to the online safety of America's children.

Designating June as National Internet Safety Month reminds us that we should always be on guard to protect our children from potential online threats.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. 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 North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 455, 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.

TRUTH IN CALLER ID ACT OF 2007

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 251) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit manipulation of caller identification information, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 251

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 ''Truth in Caller ID Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION REGARDING MANIPULATION OF CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.

Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF DECEPTIVE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States, in connection with any telecommunications service or VOIP service, to cause any caller identification service to transmit misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, with the intent to defraud or cause harm.

''(2) PROTECTION FOR BLOCKING CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent or restrict any person from blocking the capability of any caller identification service to transmit caller identification information.

''(3) REGULATIONS.—

''(A) DEADLINE.—Not later than 6 months after the enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement this subsection.

''(B) CONSIDERATION OF RELATED REGULATIONS.—In conducting the proceeding to prescribe the regulations required by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the Commission shall examine whether the Commission's regulations under subsection (b)(2)(B) of this section should be revised to require non-commercial calls to residential telephone lines using an artificial or pre-recorded voice to deliver a message to transmit caller identification information that is not misleading or inaccurate.

''(4) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize or prohibit any investigative, protective, or intelligence activities performed in connection with official duties, and in accordance with all applicable laws, by a law enforcement agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, or by an intelligence agency of the United States.

''(5) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Except for paragraph (3)(B), nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect or alter the application of the Commission's regulations regarding the requirements for transmission of caller identification information, issued pursuant to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–243) and the amendments made by such Act.

''(6) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—The term 'caller identification information' means information provided to an end user by a caller identification service regarding the telephone number of, or other information regarding the origination of, a call made using a telecommunications service or VOIP service.

''(B) CALLER IDENTIFICATION SERVICE.—The term 'caller identification service' means any service or device designed to provide the user of the service or device with the telephone number of, or other information regarding the origination of, a call made using a telecommunications service or VOIP service. Such term includes automatic number identification services.

''(C) VOIP SERVICE.—The term 'VOIP service' means a service that—

''(i) provides real-time voice communications transmitted through end user equipment using TCP/IP protocol, or a successor protocol, for a fee or without a fee;

''(ii) is offered to the public, or such classes of users as to be effectively available to the public (whether part of a bundle of services or separately); and

''(iii) has the capability to originate traffic to, or terminate traffic from, the public switched telephone network.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill which I offer today with an amendment under suspension of the rules. This is a consensus, noncontroversial bill, and it is sponsored by our colleague, Representative ELIOT ENGEL from the State of New York. A similar bill, sponsored by full Energy and Commerce Ranking Member JOE BARTON, passed the House in the last Congress unanimously.

I want to commend Telecommunications and the Internet Subcommittee Ranking Member FRED UPTON for his work and cooperation on this measure, and I commend full committee Chairman JOHN DINGELL for his excellent efforts on this bill as well.

This legislation addresses issues regarding so-called ''caller ID spoofing.'' ''Spoofing'' is when a caller masks or changes the caller ID information of their call in a way that disguises the true origination number of the caller. In many instances, a call recipient may be subject to pretexting through spoofing, which can lead to fraud, personal ID theft, harassment or otherwise put the safety of the call recipient in danger.

On the other hand, lest we think that spoofing always has nefarious aims, we must recognize that there may be circumstances when a person's safety may be put in danger if their true and accurate call origination information is disclosed as well.

For instance, Members of Congress often have direct lines in their offices in order to ensure that such lines do not become generally public and, therefore, remain useful to us. It may be necessary to keep such direct numbers confidential and have the outgoing caller ID information indicate a different number at which offices can be reached for return calls; that gives the recipient a legitimate phone number to call back, but keeps confidential lines that must remain private.

There are many doctors, psychiatrists, lawyers and other professionals who would similarly like to keep direct confidential lines private in this way, who have no intention of misleading anyone.

In addition, there may be instances, for example, when a woman at a shelter seeks to reach her children, when spoofing is important to safeguard someone's safety. Moreover, informants to law enforcement tip lines or whistle blowers have additional reasons for why their calling information should remain private. We should not outlaw any of these practices, and I think the legislation needs some improvement and clarification in these areas.

What we seek in caller ID policy is balance. This has been the case since we held hearings in the Telecommunications Subcommittee in the early 1990s on caller ID, when we sought to take into account emerging caller ID technology in a way that also allowed callers to block their origination number on a per call or per line basis. Technology also allowed call recipients to refuse to receive calls by anyone who is blocking their caller ID information from going through.

This is much-needed legislation. I urge support by all Members of the House.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I request such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 251, the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2007. I thank my good friend, Mr. ENGEL of New York, for his work here; also the ranking member, JOE BARTON of Texas, for his leadership on this very important piece of legislation.

My colleagues, millions of Americans use caller ID in order to secure greater privacy for their families. Yet, as new technologies continue to be developed, caller ID spoofing, as brought out by the gentleman from Massachusetts, has become a problem for both consumers and businesses.

This bill protects consumers by prohibiting the deceptive manipulation of caller identification information, a practice which has been defined and is clearly delineated as ''spoofing,'' ''caller ID spoofing.''

Now, this occurs when a caller masquerades as someone else by falsifying a number that appears on the recipient's caller ID display. The most important point about this discussion is that caller ID spoofing can make a call appear to come from any phone number the caller wishes. The increasing use of VOIP, which is voice over Internet protocol, that we see in America and other Internet telephone services, has made it much easier for people to make any number appear on a caller ID system.

In addition, several Web sites have sprung up to provide caller ID spoofing services, eliminating the need for any special hardware to replicate this. Although these caller ID spoofing services promote themselves for use in prank calls or for simple entertainment purposes, and that's what they propose only, they say, such services can be easily accessed and used by criminals.

□ 1150

So Caller ID spoofing has emerged as a useful tool for identity thieves and other scam artists. In addition, my colleagues, many business functions, from credit card verification to automatic call routing, depend on caller ID for security purposes, which spoofing can render useless.

So this bill, H.R. 251, prohibits sending misleading or inaccurate caller ID information with the intent to defraud or cause harm. The Energy and Commerce Committee drafted the language in this bill so carefully that it will go after the bad actors but, at the same time, preserve the ability to manipulate the caller ID information for legitimate purposes, such as the protection for victims of domestic violence.

A woman is calling, let's say, from a shelter and she wants to protect her ID, or she doesn't want to disclose, get the phone number disclosed where she is.

A single mother at home, she should have the opportunity to block her phone number so people can't recognize that number and call her, harass her or even use it in a way to bring harm to her.

So my colleagues, this is an important piece of bipartisan consumer protection legislation. I urge all of you to support H.R. 251, the Truth in Caller ID Act.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my good friend from Massachusetts for recognizing me.

I'm very proud that this was the first bill that was reported from our Telecommunications Subcommittee this year. We had extensive hearings last year on the bill, and this bill is truly bipartisan.

I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. BARTON, for working with me on this bill, as well as Chairman DINGELL, Mr. STEARNS and of course my friend, ED MARKEY.

When people look at their caller ID, they have a right to believe and expect that the number that is there and the name of the person who is listed there is truly the number and the name of the person calling them. And I was shocked when I first heard that can you manipulate both the name and the number. In fact, there are Web sites, you only have to dial a Web site and pay a fee and you can manipulate the name, the number. And there's even technology where you can change the sound of a person's voice. So a 50-year-old male calling can sound like a 21-year-old female, and the name is different, and the phone number is different. That should not be.

Constituents thought they were receiving calls from congressional offices at one time, and these calls turned out to be far from appropriate.

Think of the mischief that can continue to happen. Unscrupulous people can trick unsuspecting victims to release personal information such as credit card numbers or Social Security numbers. It's easy for someone to pretend to be with Chase Manhattan or Citibank when you take a look and you see it says Chase Manhattan or Citibank and a number, and someone calls and says, well, we just need to verify your Social Security number with your account, and perhaps a senior citizen or someone else would feel that they could trust the caller ID and give personal information. This has to stop.

Having investigated this issue in great depth, I became convinced that what was happening was only a harbinger of things to come. There's a strong possibility that more and more

people will use this technology in political campaigns. Imagine calling someone at 2 o'clock in the morning and having the number of the opposite political campaign calling you to say vote for this candidate. So this is ridiculous.

You could have insulting, slanderous, racist, sexist calls, and people would think when they look at their caller ID that it's somebody else calling, not the person who is calling.

Both the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Florida pointed out numerous instances. So this is truly a bipartisan piece of legislation, one that is needed, one that the American public is probably not aware that needs to be corrected. People just don't think that this can happen. They believe in what the caller ID says.

So I urge my colleagues to give this important legislation strong support. This is a good step towards protecting our Nation from this emerging technology. And again, the people who use this have to have the intent to defraud in order to come under this statute. So this protects everybody, as Mr. MARKEY pointed out.

There may be some instances, Mr. STEARNS pointed out, where we would want to protect this technology, where we would not want to give the correct ID. This shows that if you have the intent to defraud, you can be prosecuted under this. So it strikes a fair balance. Those were the hearings that we had.

And, again, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, and I'm pleased to be the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I request such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from New York mentioned about the harbinger of things to come, and I think that's what we are all worried about, so I think this is a great first step forward.

Just recently, my subcommittee, the Commerce Consumer Protection and Trade, which Mr. RUSH chairs and I'm ranking member of, we did a do-not-call reauthorization, which is H.R. 2601. We dropped that bill last week. We urge the conference committee to mark that up and get that forward. It's part of the process here to protect consumers.

In fact, in the committee that I serve, we've done a lot of Internet consumer protection, so I'm very wholeheartedly in support of this, and I encourage some other bills. In fact, the gentleman from Massachusetts' Social Security bill, H.R. 948, is an excellent bill; as well as the Data Security bill, H.R. 958. So I think these are the types of bills we need to protect consumers, and I very wholeheartedly support them.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to resume my service on the Telecom Subcommittee in this Congress.

I also rise in strong support of the Truth in Caller ID Act, which will prevent acts of identity theft and billions of dollars in consumer losses each year.

I would like to engage the bill's sponsor, Mr. ENGEL, in a brief colloquy to clarify the effect this bill has on other laws relating to national security and law enforcement. The relevant section reads: ''Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize or prohibit any investigative, protective or intelligence activities performed in connection with official duties, and in accordance with all applicable laws, by a law enforcement agency of the United States, a State or a political subdivision of a State, or by an intelligence agency of the United States.''

I'd like to ask the author what the meaning of this language is.

Mr. ENGEL. I want to assure the gentlewoman that this bill does not confer or authorize any new powers for any intelligence or law enforcement agency, nor does it prohibit any lawfully authorized investigative, protective or intelligence activity of a law enforcement agency of the United States, a State or a political subdivision of a State, or of an intelligence agency of the United States.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for clarifying that. Lawfully authorized national security and law enforcement activities are critical in this era of terror. Legislation designed to improve our Nation's safety and security, like the Truth in Caller ID Act, should not inadvertently impair them, nor should it expand them. This carefully crafted bill, in my view, strikes the right balance. And I would like to commend the author, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. UPTON for their diligent work. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1200

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude by thanking all of the Members, led by Mr. ENGEL; the very, very helpful comments from Ms. HARMAN in clarification of the intent of this legislation; Mr. DINGELL, the chairman of the full committee; along with Mr. BARTON, the ranking member, Mr. UPTON and Mr. STEARNS. This is a completely bipartisan piece of legislation, and we thank them for this cooperation. This is the way telecommunications legislation should be passed.

I would also like to commend the staff: Tim Powderly from the majority staff and Neil Fried and Courtney Reinhard from the Republican committee staff. I also want to thank Pete Goodloe and Gregg Rothschild from Mr. DINGELL's staff; Cristina Batt from Mr. ENGEL's staff; and Colin Crowell on my staff, who has been doing this type of legislation for 17 years, going back to the beginning of the discussion of all of these caller ID-related issues.

And, finally, I would like to thank Johanna Shelton on her last bill on the House floor. Johanna has been incredibly competent, more than competent. She really brings the word ''excellence'' into congressional and legislative service. And this will be her last bill on the floor, and there is lamenting of a magnitude hard to fully measure on the Democratic side that her leaving is creating, although I understand her husband is not sharing that sentiment as she leaves her service here.

And it is that duality that we all have to deal with here in our congressional service. But for my part, there has been no more dedicated public servant that I have met in my time here in Congress, and we will miss her service, and we thank her for all of her great work.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 251, the "Truth in Caller ID Act of 2007," which I co-authored with my friend, Representative ENGEL from New York. This bill protects consumers by prohibiting the deceptive manipulation of caller identification information—a practice is known as caller ID "spoofing."

Caller ID technology is an invaluable tool. Millions of people rely daily on the caller identification information that appears when their phones ring. Unfortunately, criminals are using "spoofing" to perpetrate fraud. "Spoofing" occurs when a caller masquerades as someone else by falsifying the name or number that appears on the recipient's caller ID display. Those who answer the phone and see the number of a legitimate company or charity are far more likely to fall victim to an illegitimate request for money or personal information.

Even worse, the Internet has made "spoofing" easy. Numerous websites sell simple web interfaces to caller ID systems that allow criminals to appear to be calling from any number they choose. Some of these services boast that they do not maintain logs or provide any contact information of their customers. Some even offer voice scrambling services to enable a caller to sound like someone of the opposite sex.

H.R. 251 prohibits sending misleading or inaccurate caller ID information with the intent to defraud or cause harm. The bill is drafted so that it will go after bad actors, but at the same time preserve the ability to mask or block caller ID information for legitimate purposes.

This is an important piece of bipartisan consumer protection legislation.

I urge you to support H.R. 251, the "Truth in Caller ID Act."

Mr. MARKEY. 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 Massachusetts

(Mr. MARKEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 251, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1322

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR) at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2638, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 473 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 473

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2638) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 2638 in the House pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 473 provides an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 2638, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for 2008. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except for those arising under clauses 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The resolution also waives points of order against the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI regarding legislating in an appropriations bill and appropriating for unauthorized programs.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may provide priority in recognition based on whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rule also provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

I am pleased to bring to the floor the first appropriations bill of the 110th Congress under a traditional open rule process. The security of our Nation concerns every American in every State, and it is a priority of every Member of this body. But while the effort to secure our homeland is a bipartisan one, there are clear differences between how the two parties approach it, and the bill demonstrates them.

We have before us legislation that provides more than $36 billion in critical funding needed to address security vulnerabilities identified by the Homeland Security experts. It is a fulfillment of commitments made by Democrats in implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007, which passed the House with a bipartisan majority.

With this bill Democrats are increasing funding for homeland security by 7 percent, or $2.5 billion, over the amount appropriated for it last year. In fact, we are providing close to $2 billion more than what the President asked for in his request to Congress. These increases aren't excessive. They are, instead, the result of the Democrats' commitment to adequately fund security programs which in past years have been talked about, but not sufficiently supported.

These funding increases stand in stark contrast to past Republican decisions to cut money for vital security efforts and to impose unfunded mandates on State governments. My fellow Democrats and I have rejected the Republican proposals for across-the-board cuts in these areas. We feel that they would indiscriminately and unnecessarily sacrifice billions in needed funding for rail, transit, and port security, as well as for first responder grants. And, indeed, the sad truth is that these grant programs have suffered funding cuts every year since 2004. Compare that to the fact that this bill provides over $4.5 billion, nearly double the requested amount, for these critical areas.

More specifically, we have provided $400 million for port security, doubling the requested amount. Similarly, $400 million will go towards rail and transit security grants, more than the administration requested. And we will increase spending for firefighter grants by $138 million. The administration had wanted to cut these funds significantly, but we are increasing them.

At a time of heightened concern about our border security, the legislation will help to secure our borders by paying the salaries of 3,000 new Border Patrol agents, and it also improves the benefits package for Customs and Border Patrol officers to ensure higher recruitment and retention rates. After years of a lack of accountability and questionable government contracts, this bill promotes both accountability and oversight through reforms of the contracting process, and this is amazingly important.

I mentioned our borders a moment ago and I want to return to that subject very briefly. As a representative from western New York, the security of our borders is an issue of great concern to me.

□ 1330

Both our northern and southern borders face unique and separate challenges, and the bill addresses each in turn.

The 3,000 new agents funded by the bill will mean over 17,800 brave men and women will patrol our borders by the end of 2008. And at the same time, we will increase northern border funding by 33 percent, and 500 new agents will be placed there. As important as this is, border security efforts must never blind us to the deep connection we share with our neighbor to the north. Ours is a 200-year-old relationship that has benefited both of our nations immensely. In fact, I often say

that people of northern border communities don't see Canadian towns and cities as being in another country; instead, we see it as one nation with a river running through it.

The travel and trade which cross the northern border every single day between America and Canada are critical to our economy and to the northern economic security. We must never sacrifice our relationship with Canada in a misguided attempt to increase border security.

I have long said that economic security and physical security are not mutually exclusive; we can and we must have both. Unfortunately, the approach to northern border security currently advocated by the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State is flawed. The Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative, of WHTI, will choke off legitimate travel and trade and sacrifice local economies unnecessarily by imposing onerous border-crossing requirements. WHTI, while well-intentioned, is simply unacceptable in its current form.

For 2 years, I have been working with fellow border members and concerned local groups and Canada and their government to fix WHTI, and I am proud to say today represents a major step forward in that battle. With Chairman PRICE's help, I inserted language into this bill that will withhold $100 million from the funds required to implement WHTI until a series of our demands have been met, demands that will push both DHS and State in the direction that they need to go, that is, away from requiring expensive crossing documents and towards commonsense, low-cost alternatives, and will keep our border closed to criminals, but open to the families and the businesses which make it so vibrant.

Additionally, the language will require the completion of a pilot project, which DHS is paying for and has not yet started, involving the State of Washington and British Columbia before WHTI can go forward. We see no point in paying for a project only to ignore it. The project will reveal the feasibility of the passport requirements in WHTI. With the 2008 winter Olympics being held in Vancouver, there will soon be an even greater number of Americans traveling across the border there. And this is a perfect way for us to test the requirements of WHTI before it is put in place nationwide, and we are going to make sure the results of that test are known.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bill. It demonstrates the Democratic commitment to smart security, as well as to ensuring that the money spent by this government goes where it is needed most and is spent wisely, efficiently, and effectively. These are our priorities. Our constituents deserve no less, and our security can afford no less.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and on the bill.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from New York, the chairman of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for the time. And I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Several years ago, Mr. Speaker, I had the distinct privilege to bring forth the first rule for a Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. Since then, the Department of Homeland Security has grown and begun to mature under the bipartisan oversight of the Appropriations Committee and of the Committee on Homeland Security. In fact, Ms. SLAUGHTER and I worked together, when I was the chairman and she the ranking member of the select Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Rules, to make certain that the committee became the permanent standing committee that it is today.

As we know, the Department of Homeland Security was created in the wake of the attacks of September 11, 2001, to help mobilize and to organize the Federal Government to the best of our ability to secure the homeland from further terrorist attacks.

Thanks to our new concerted approach to security, and I think it is important to recognize, to the 180,000 hardworking employees of the Department of Homeland Security, we have not suffered further attacks. But we must not let our guard down. Within the last month alone, Mr. Speaker, we have seen several plans thwarted to attack both Fort Dix and a major airport in New York City. We must not lose our focus. We must continue our efforts to protect the United States from yet another deadly attack.

There is an item in this legislation that helps fulfill a recommendation of the 9/11 Commission and that will provide additional security to districts that many of us represent throughout the country, including the one that I am honored to represent, districts with large airports. In its report, the 9/11 Commission recommended that the Transportation Security Agency expedite the installation of advanced in-line baggage screening equipment.

Miami International Airport, which is in the district that I am honored to represent, is a high-security, category 10 airport on the front line of homeland security defense. Miami International Airport has approximately 1,160 international flights each week, more than any other airport in the United States. Miami International Airport has over 900 flights a week from Latin America, more than all other U.S. airports combined. Miami International ranks third in overall international passenger traffic.

The Miami-Dade Aviation Department, which operates Miami International Airport, is currently building two new terminals at MIA and is incurring over $100 million in in-line Explosive Detection System, EDS, terminal modification costs. In 2005, TSA committed $20 million in Other Transaction Agreement funds which will almost cover the 75 percent Federal share for the south terminal project.

As Miami International Airport begins the installation process of EDS in its north terminal, the airport still requires an additional funding agreement to cover the Federal share of the $79 million modification project. For fiscal years 2007 and 2008, the Miami-Dade Aviation Department is projected to spend $28.8 million on the north terminal modifications, $21.6 million of which falls under the Federal Government's cost share.

I wish to commend the Appropriations Committee for allocating $560 million for Explosive Detection System, EDS, procurement and installations. These funds will help reimburse Miami International Airport in its efforts to complete its EDS installations.

Mr. Speaker, there are still some concerns with this bill, as Ranking Member ROGERS has stated publicly. There is concern about the rapid growth of funding represented by the bill, for example. And although the Appropriations Committee worked in a bipartisan manner to produce this bill, there is concern from many Members of this House about the process. As we know, the Appropriations Committee has announced that earmarks were not included in this bill and will only be added during the conference process with the Senate. It is not until that point that Members and the public will be able to see the earmarks. By adding earmarking during the conference process, Members will not have the opportunity to make amendments to remove or adjust earmarks approved by the majority on the Appropriations Committee.

The announced procedure protects earmarks from what during the opening of the 110th Congress some refer to as the ''disinfectant of sunshine.'' This procedure for earmarks is in effect reversing a traditionally more open appropriations process. I urge our colleagues in the majority to reconsider this procedure and allow for an open appropriations process.

I would like to commend the majority for bringing this important appropriations bill to the floor under an open rule. The House, as Ms. SLAUGHTER mentioned, has historically considered appropriations bills under open rules in order to allow each Member the ability to offer germane amendments without having to preprint their amendments or receive approval from the Rules Committee.

I hope that the majority will live up to their campaign promise of running a transparent House and continue our tradition of open rules with the rest of the appropriations bills this year.

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

□ 1340

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2638, which makes appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008.

Mr. Speaker, in November the American people asked for a change. They wanted us to do two things: one, change priorities; two, restore accountability to this government.

We began with a down payment by raising the minimum wage; ending the big subsidies for oil companies, instead putting money into renewable energy; requiring pharmaceutical price negotiation instead of giveaways; making college more affordable by lowering interest rates; and we supported small businesses. These were the beginning.

Today, we take up the first of 12 appropriation bills, and in each of these bills we must do what we promised the American people we would do; change priorities and restore accountability.

This bill on homeland security, brought before us on a bipartisan basis, does both. It funds the Department of Homeland Security. It was created largely in response to the tragedy of 9/11. Since its inception, the Department has been given a crucial mission, and that is protecting American soil and American lives, enhancing our overall security. They have a big job, and it is no small undertaking.

This Homeland Security bill addresses priorities and reflects our change, and it reflects accountability, our responsibility to taxpayers.

The priorities that I would like to speak to that are embedded in this homeland security bill are among the following:

One, it establishes as a key priority funding our first responders with the training and the equipment that they need. Each one of us knows that the first responders are the ones who are going to be there, and in each of our districts they need the training, they need the funding. This Homeland Security bill has rejected a $1 billion cut that was proposed by the administration and restores Homeland Security grants in Firefighter Assistance grants.

Second, it implements a key recommendation of the 9/11 Commission by providing improved aviation security. This bill substantially increases efforts to purchase and install the latest explosive detection systems for checked baggage and other things that have been mentioned by the speakers.

Also, Mr. PRICE and Mr. ROGERS both spoke about the need for accountability. The good intentions of protecting the homeland does not give this bill a pass when it comes to accountability. The bill mandates that all grants and contact funds be awarded through full competitive processes.

Finally, I want to thank Chairwoman SLAUGHTER for leading to a sensible approach on the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative. Thank you, Chairwoman SLAUGHTER.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this rule. As has been pointed out by our distinguished Chair, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and the gentleman from Miami, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, in their thoughtful remarks on this issue, this is an open rule. The problem is, we are still dealing with this problem of the lack of reform in the earmark process. It is for that reason that having voted upstairs, yes, the fact that we haven't brought about the very important reform that is necessary to this horrendous earmark process, that I am going to join with Mr. DIAZ-BALART when he calls for defeat of the previous question and an opportunity that would be allowed by defeating the previous question for us to offer an amendment that would take on this earmark issue.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART very correctly pointed to the fact that in the 109th Congress we were able to implement very important, sweeping reforms for the earmark process. We know that there was understandable, bipartisan outrage that was reflecting the concern of the American people over the abuse of earmarks. There are people who are in prison today because of this, among other reasons. That is why last fall, we stepped up to the plate, and under our Republican leadership, we put together a bipartisan support for earmark reform.

At that time, unfortunately, our colleagues who were in the minority and today in the majority described those reforms as a sham and meaningless. But those reforms, Mr. Speaker, guaranteed accountability, transparency, enforcement, disclosure, things that have been completely thrown out the window unfortunately in the 110th Congress.

So while they described the very important, tough reforms that we had in the 109th Congress as a sham, they have gone right down into the drain and really created potential for little more than abuse of the issue of earmarks.

We have already seen examples of that. Of course, the problem that took place in the clash between the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee, Mr. MURTHA, and our colleague from Michigan, Mr. ROGERS, when it came to the issue of earmarks. Unfortunately, there was no chance whatsoever for us, because of the lack of enforcement that exists now under the Democratic leadership, for us to get at that.

Then when we heard just last week the words that came from the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, that we will not see earmarks provided in the appropriations process itself, but instead, what we are going to see is this secret slush fund put into place that allows, in a very secretive process, to ''air drop'' these earmarks into a conference report that could come out at some later point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not what the American people wanted when they called for reform of this earmark process. That is not what they expected. It is not what they got with the reforms that we put into place in the 109th Congress. But unfortunately, well, we had these great reforms, but they have been thrown out the window in the attempt to continue to, in a surreptitious manner, seek these things in there.

We just marked the 20th anniversary of the very famous speech that was delivered by Ronald Reagan at the Brandenburg Gate where President Reagan said, ''Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.'' I have been reminded, I mentioned here last week when we had two votes on different rules to try and bring about reform of the earmark process another famous speech Ronald Reagan gave in the negotiating process with the Soviet Union. He said, and I have now been working on my Russian on this, ''Doveryai no Proveryai,'' which meant ''trust but verify.''

The fact of the matter is, we want to be able to trust our colleagues, fellow elected representatives, to do the right thing when it comes to earmarks. But we feel very strongly that the American people should have the right and the opportunity to verify whether or not those dollars that are being spent can, in fact, stand up to the light of day.

So while I am pleased that we are going to have a truly open rule if, in fact, this thing passes, I am going to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. And if we don't succeed, Mr. Speaker, in defeating the previous question, I am going to urge all my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to vote ''no'' on this rule because of the fact that it does not step up to the plate and allow us to have the kind of reform of earmark abuse that the American people desperately want.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), chair of the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman of the Rules Committee for yielding, and for her good work along with the ranking member and members on both sides of the aisle in granting this open rule, an open rule for debating of this fiscal 2008 Homeland Security appropriations bill. We requested an open rule, with some necessary waivers. The Rules Committee has granted that, and for that we are grateful, and in just a few moments we will be on our way, debating this bill.

This is a critical bill. It is the first of the 12 appropriations bills that we will

be debating this session. So we will lead the pack. We will be telling our colleagues about what we have done, a hardworking subcommittee that has produced, I think, 20 days of hearings and has written a comprehensive bill.

It is going to provide funding to address our country's most pressing security vulnerabilities, with a new emphasis on ports and transit systems. It is going to provide critically needed funding, as the gentleman from Vermont has stressed, to our States and communities to confront terrorist activity threats, but also natural disaster threats.

□ 1350

Thirdly, it is going to help ensure that taxpayer dollars are well spent by requiring management reforms and by withholding funds until some expenditure reports and other accountability measures are in place.

And fourth, we're taking a long-term approach by requiring outside reviews of several major programs and activities to ensure that our long-term investments are being wisely spent.

I appreciate the chairwoman of the Rules Committee's interest in this bill. In particular, she has stressed, as she did again in her statement today, the challenges of protecting the northern border and also the concerns that she and many others have about the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative. We are directing the Department in this bill to increase by over 40 percent the number of border patrol agents at the northern border. That will comply with the levels called for in the Intelligence Reform Act.

She also expressed particular concerns about the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative. The bill makes $100 million for implementation of that program unavailable for obligation until Customs and Border Protection reports on its experience with pilot programs, provides detailed information on infrastructure and staffing required, confirms the use of radiofrequency identification technology that has been adequately tested under operational conditions, and describes how it will ensure privacy protection. We worked with the chairwoman in putting those protections in place, and we appreciate the consistent interest she has shown in them and in this bill in general.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I once again thank our Rules Committee colleagues for an open rule and for paving the way for what we hope and believe will be a productive debate as we consider our homeland security needs for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. I do thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time, and I want to say, first of all, that I want to commend the gentleman from Florida and also the gentlewoman from New York, the chairwoman of the Rules Committee, two of the Members in this Congress for whom I have the greatest admiration and respect, and I appreciate the fact that they are bringing this legislation to the floor under an open rule.

But as both the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) just expressed, there are still some concerns about this bill, number one of which is the fact that this bill is $2.1 billion over the President's request and a 13.6 percent increase over fiscal year 2007. That is more than four times the rate of inflation. With an almost $9 trillion national debt and over $50 trillion in unfunded future pension liabilities, we just can't keep giving every department and agency that wants one or four or five times increase over the rate of inflation. As the ranking member, Mr. ROGERS, said a few days ago, even the Department of Homeland Security should be subject to some fiscal discipline.

A few weeks after 9/11 when we had renamed the farm bill that year by adding the word ''security'' to the title, the Wall Street Journal wrote an editorial in October of 2001 and said: ''Any bill with the word 'security' in it should get double the public scrutiny, and maybe four times the normal wait, lest all kinds of bad legislation become law.''

And a few months ago, Secretary Chertoff, the Secretary of Homeland Security, testified before the Senate in a way perhaps no other Cabinet member ever had. He essentially said we are spending too much on security and we should not let overexaggerated threats of terrorism, quote, drive us crazy, into bankruptcy, trying to defend against every conceivable threat.

He went on to say, quote, we do have limits and we do have choices to make. We don't want to break the very systems we're trying to protect. We don't want to destroy our way of life trying to save it. We don't want to undercut our economy trying to protect our economy, and we don't want to destroy our civil liberties and our freedoms in order to make ourselves safer.

That is the Secretary of Homeland Security. I think, Mr. Speaker, we need to take some of those words into consideration. In a short time, later today, we are going to have several amendments to the bill that I think are worthy of consideration by all of our Members and I think should be passed. We just shouldn't blindly pass a bill and pass everything that anybody wants because they attach the word ''security'' to it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think this bill being brought forth today is an excellent bill. It will strengthen America's security, and every Member interested in doing that ought to vote for it.

The four security-related appropriation bills which we will bring to the floor, Military Construction, Homeland Security, State/Foreign Operations and Defense, will come in at a level about $2 billion above the President's request. This is a key bill in doing that.

I do want to make a few comments about what I understand was said while I was off the floor a few minutes ago with respect to earmarks. Let us trace what the facts are. The last time the Democrats controlled the appropriations process, I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee. In those days, earmarking was focused on about four subcommittees. There were no earmarks whatsoever in the Labor-Health-Education bill the year that I was chairman. Two years ago, there were over 3,000 when the Republicans were running the show.

When we took over the Congress last year, the Republicans had not passed a single appropriation bill on the domestic side of the ledger. So we had to complete their work for them. And one of the ways we did that was to put a moratorium on all earmarks for the year. We promised at the time that we would try to resurrect the process, provided that we had a process that was more transparent.

Now, I understand someone from the other side claimed that we were going to airdrop these earmarks into the conference with no notice. Not so. What we plan to do is the following. And let me say, we didn't not preclude earmarks by choice. The simple fact is that because we had to deal with last year's Republican budget, because we had to deal with the Iraq controversy which consumed the next 3 months of staff time, because we were under subpoena by the San Diego U.S. Attorney to turn over papers related to Republican shenanigans that occurred last year, we did not have the staff time to focus on the substance of the bills for this year or earmarks. And we finally decided that we need to keep the bills moving, even if that meant that we would have to play catchup later with the earmarks.

So what we are going to do is as soon as the staff can prepare them, and we estimate it will take at least 4 to 5 weeks to screen all of those earmarks, we will submit and put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a description of virtually every earmark that we intend to try to include in conference reports. We will then ask every Member to review those projects. If they have questions, raise questions about them, we will then ask the sponsor of the earmark to respond in writing, so that the person responsible for the request is the person who has to explain to the House what is going on. And then we will use our judgment about what makes sense. If the House thinks that we have got projects in there that shouldn't be in there, they can vote against the bill.

But let me point out there is a big difference between what we are doing

and the existing Republican process. It took 2 years after the fact to find out what Duke Cunningham was asking for. The fact is under our process, you will know 30 days ahead of time. It took us more than a year to find out about the Florida road that was evidently inserted in the highway bill by a Republican Member of this House from another State.

□ 1400

That can't happen in our process. Under our process, you will have 30 days to review what they request. That is a sweeping reform in comparison to the absolute, behind-the-scenes operation that existed when the Republicans controlled this House.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my distinguished colleague yielding me this time.

Sitting here listening, I am puzzled by some of the things being said. First of all, we are having folks thank the majority party for having them give us an open rule. I find it very unusual that we would have to thank somebody for doing what is right. You ought to thank somebody when they do something that is above and beyond what is the right thing to do.

I also find it very difficult to understand how the appropriations chairman can say that they have had to deal with the Iraq problem for 3 months; and therefore, they have not had time to do their work.

Who is in charge here? You all are in charge. You should have been able to do your work. You let yourself get bogged down for 3 months on something that was totally useless, and here you are blaming the minority party. I find it unbelievable that you don't accept the fact that you are in charge of things. What is the ''existing Republican process''? You all are in charge. You can't blame us.

I want to quote from the Rules Committee chairman on 1–4-07, ''Our rules package requires full disclosure of earmarks in all bills and conference reports before Members are asked to vote on them,'' not 30 days afterwards, but before.

Where are those earmarks, Madam Chairman? I don't see them in here.

The American people were promised transparency, truthfulness, openness in this process. They were sold a bill of goods. They don't want more secrecy, they want less secrecy. The Democrats said, We will have a new day. This is much worse than anything we have ever seen before. We need to restore the earmark rule like the Republicans had it last year.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat puzzled myself over the earmark process as the Republicans had it last year.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute more to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, the comments of the previous speaker simply indicate how little she understands about the appropriations process.

The fact is that the Iraqi bill we had to deal with was last year's supplemental request. Last year's, not this year's, so we had to clean up your mess on the entire domestic budget; and we had to clean up your mess on Iraq before we could move on our business.

The first week we have been able to turn to our agenda is this week. We have spent the last 5 months cleaning up your spilled milk.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I hope to address several questions more deeply in general debates, as well as with some amendments; but as the ranking member of the Border, Port Security and Global Antiterrorism Subcommittee of Homeland Security, I have been spent much of my congressional career working narcotics, immigration and terrorism issues on the border, particularly as narcotics coordinator in Congress. I worked this even before 9/11.

In the year 2002, we issued the most comprehensive border report ever done by Congress. We had 11 hearings, include many hearings on the north and south borders. In addition, I have visited every major border crossing, north and south border, multiple times and, in particular, the largest southern border crossings many, many times, almost annually.

I have several amendments in this bill related to counternarcotics and terrorism with CBP and with the Coast Guard. But I want to talk briefly here at this point on the border. Thanks to continued funding and the hard work of the people in the Department of Homeland Security, we have made some progress, particularly since 9/11. That said, in case you haven't heard, our borders are still not secure. Not even close.

We have three basic interrelated challenges. And if you can't fix one, you can't fix any: terrorism, contraband and illegal immigration.

Last week we had an irresponsible individual who decided that despite being told not to travel to Europe, he did. Flying home, he flew to Canada and then crossed our border crossing. The screen was absolutely clear. It said, ''Refer to INS secondary.'' Even though all our border personnel had very clear instructions to place mask on subject, place in isolation, well-ventilated room, if possible, subject has multiple resistant TB, public health risk, among other things, he was waved on through after very brief screening. In spite of this, he was waved on through. Now that means we cannot even keep people we have caught.

Then there was this from yesterday: Homeland Security busted three Texas National Guardsmen for smuggling illegals using National Guard vehicles. That was just yesterday.

Last year, when I was subcommittee chairman, we heard horror stories on illegals being deported multiple times and coming back in and committing additional felonies. Yet the President of our country is coming over to lobby the other body about bringing a terrible amnesty bill back to life. There is not a Member in this body or the other body who doesn't understand that we have to deal with the people that are here, with H–1B visas, with the huge challenges we have in this country.

But this bill demonstrates the fraud of the Senate bill because it has unrealistic border controls that we are just asking in this bill, in clause after clause, for them to report on the costs. We cut the money intended for the travel initiative. How in the world can you do a 380-page amnesty bill if you can't even begin to deliver the basics?

Fortunately, the bill before us today starts to address those. The cost is horrendous. I want to go through, item by item, the challenges, the premises behind what the President is arguing.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

This has been an interesting discussion with regard to which system is better in order to challenge earmarks: one in which you can actually come to the floor and challenge specific earmarks in a bill, or in a committee report; or have a situation where the conference report comes to the floor and you have no ability whatsoever, no ability, to bring to a vote any of the earmarks that are in there.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee mentioned that it is better to be able to write a letter to the Appropriations Committee and question an earmark than actually bring it to the floor because he mentioned that Mr. FLAKE brought 14 amendments to the floor last year and failed on every one of them.

I actually brought 39, and I failed even more miserably; I failed all 39 times. Nineteen of them called for a rollcall vote. I didn't come close on any on them because as the distinguished Member mentioned, logrolling works pretty well. People will say, I won't vote against your earmark if you don't vote against mine.

But this year is different, partly thanks to the reforms that the Democrats put in place in January of this year following the lead of the Republicans in the fall of last year where you actually said, All right, if you want an earmark, you have to sign your name and claim credit for that earmark.

Of the 39 times I came to the floor last year, most times when I came to the floor I had no clue who had sponsored the earmark I was challenging. Many times we had a vote, sometimes a rollcall vote and sometimes a voice vote, and I still left the floor not knowing whose earmark that was because we didn't have a requirement that the Members claim credit for them.

That is no longer the case. The Appropriations Committee right now is sitting on more than 30,000 request letters where the Members signed off and said, This is my earmark and it is going to this specific entity. That is something we haven't had before, and I applaud the Democrats for putting that reform in place. The problem is, if we go forward with what has been proposed, it won't mean anything.

But here I can tell you, if I was able to come to the floor with some of those earmarks, knowing which entity it was going to, knowing which Member had requested it, and to have the media and others, the blogging community and other organizations going through and finding out what that private entity was or had that private entity made campaign contributions to that Member, if there was a tie that we didn't know about before, it changes the dynamics incredibly here because them Members have to weigh, Do I want to do that or not?

The Appropriations Committee chairman pointed out there have been problems with Members and earmarks. There have been investigations and Members in jail, and there are other investigations going on.

If you have good information, more information, that gives you power. When you come to the floor and are able to point specifically at earmarks, knowing which entity they are going to and knowing which Member requested them, it changes the dynamics.

I would respectfully disagree with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee when he says that this process that is being put in place is superior to being able to challenge earmarks. Again, let me repeat. Under what has been proposed, we will never have a vote on any earmark; and that is simply wrong.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to engage Mr. FLAKE for a moment.

The chairman of the committee made it really clear that you are going to have 30 days to look at the earmarks, whose earmarks they are, and contact them if they are in the bill. The Rules Committee will decide whether you have the ability to strike them or not.

I yield to Mr. FLAKE.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, but we will have no vote. The process of logrolling will work just as it has in the past. There will be no vote, no ability by anybody to challenge specifically those earmarks on the floor of the House.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I wouldn't want you to believe this is going to be the permanent way this is going to run. Given the vast number, the 32,000 that you mentioned, and the fact that we had no budget last year, no Federal budget last year, there was an extra strain on Mr. OBEY; and I am confident that the next year will be different.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would say to my colleagues, here we go again with Orwellian democracy, which is alive and here on the floor of the House with the majority party saying one thing and doing another. They promised us a more transparent process, they promised us a process that had greater accountability; and in fact, what we are getting is something completely the opposite.

I would note also that we are coming to the floor now with the first appropriations bill which is 1 month later than when we brought our appropriations bills to the floor last year.

I am sorry that the Chair of appropriations has left the floor. He made the comment that this would be a more responsible earmark process. He said he would take all of the requests and would add, quote, ''virtually every earmark,'' unquote, would be included in the bill. Well, that is interesting.

What that process does is make the Chair of the Appropriations Committee the judge and the jury, the sole judge and the sole jury for every single special project. I would prefer there would be no special projects, but it appears that the Appropriations Chair is going to be the one to determine whether or not your project is worthy.

Those that have already been dropped into bills brought before this Congress give us no comfort. There appears to be significant favoritism that is being played, significant politics being played. And the threats that have been given by a Member on the majority side to a Member on the minority side, if he didn't support an earmark, give us no comfort.

We will get 30 days to review. Well, that is a wonderful thing, with no opportunity, as the gentleman from Arizona said, to have any vote on any earmark.

Mr. Speaker, that is not greater transparency or greater accountability.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee said, Well, if you don't like an earmark, vote against the bill, with no ability to get to a specific egregious program that so angers the American people.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is Orwellian democracy at its finest, doing one thing and saying exactly the opposite. This ought to be an interesting period of time as we move through the appropriations bills. It ought to be a very interesting time as we move through a process that has turned into a sham. It ought to be a very interesting time; and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the American people are, indeed, paying attention.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I thank all of my colleagues who have taken part in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question, so we can amend this rule and allow the House to consider a change to the rules of the House to restore accountability and enforceability to the earmark rule.

□ 1415

Under the current rule, so long as the chairman or sponsor of a bill, joint resolution, conference report or manager's amendment includes either a list of earmarks contained in the bill or report, or a statement that there are no earmarks, no point of order lies against the bill. This is the same as the rule in the last Congress.

However, under the rule as it functioned under the Republican majority in the 109th Congress, even if the point of order was not available on the bill, it was always available on the rule as a question of consideration. But because the Democratic Rules Committee specifically exempts earmarks from the waiver of all points of order, they deprive Members of the ability to raise the question of earmarks on the rule. This was most recently discovered on the question of the Murtha earmark on the Intelligence authorization bill.

This amendment will restore the accountability and enforceability of the earmark rule to where it was at the end of the 109th Congress to provide Members with an opportunity to bring the question of earmarks before the House for a vote. Without these changes, the new earmark rule, in effect, is nothing more than a fig leaf.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

A lot of time has been spent today on the open rule and the open amendment process, and I'd like to give you and anybody else who may be watching some idea of what we can expect.

Some 94 Republican amendments were filed, 16 Democrats. One Republican is responsible for more than 50 percent of that side.

Let me give you a couple of examples of what they are. None of the funds can be used for supporting yoga classes.

None can be used to support art classes. None can be used to support dance classes. None can be used under other programs, any program that offers to support a dance class. And my personal favorite, none of the funds can be used for supporting puppet shows.

There isn't anything in the world in any part of this bill having anything to do with these amendments, but nonetheless here we are. We'll be debating this into the night, but I would ask everybody to listen to those amendments and decide which is serious on homeland security.

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

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 473 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Clause 9(c) of Rule XXI is amended to read as follows:

''(c) As disposition of a point of order under paragraph (a), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the bill, joint resolution, or conference report, or amendment described in paragraph (a)(3). The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.''.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgeral who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the defInition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 473, if ordered, and motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 474.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 194, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—194

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

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

NOT VOTING—16

Arcuri
Barton (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Davis, Jo Ann
Doyle
Edwards
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Lewis (GA)
McHenry
Radanovich
Sessions
Simpson
Stark
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1440

Messrs. RENZI, BILIRAKIS, REYNOLDS and CANNON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 451, on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 473, my vote did not register. Only after they closed the vote, was I told of that fact.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF FATHERS IN THE HEALTHY DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 474, 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 Illinois (Mr. HARE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 474.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
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
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
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
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, 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 (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
Meehan
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
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
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.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
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
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Arcuri
Barton (TX)
Davis, Jo Ann
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (GA)
Radanovich
Sessions
Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1448

Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois and Mr. TANCREDO changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 460, this time has been designated for the taking of the official photo of the House of Representatives in session.

The House will be in a brief recess while the Chamber is being prepared for the photo.

As soon as these preparations are complete, the House will immediately resume its actual session for the taking of the photograph.

About 5 minutes after that, the House will proceed with the business of the House.

For the information of the Members, the photographer will be ready to take the picture in just a few minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess while the Chamber is being prepared.

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

□ 1451

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.

(Thereupon, the Members sat for the official photograph of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress.)

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair in one or two minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1455

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR) at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2638.

□ 1459

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2638) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying how proud I am of the work of our subcommittee and its fine staff that has been done over the last number of months.

Through the 20 hearings we have held so far this year, featuring testimony from Department officials, watch dog agencies and outside experts, numerous security vulnerabilities and management problems have been identified and solutions offered. I believe that the bill reported by the committee is well informed by what we learned in these hearings.

I want to express my gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), both for his leadership as the inaugural chairman of this subcommittee and more recently for his significant contributions as ranking member. Mr. ROGERS established a strong, bipartisan approach to providing vigilant oversight of the Department, and I have endeavored to continue on that path.

I also want to pay tribute to Martin Sabo, the former ranking member of this subcommittee, who is an example to all of us not only for his expertise and leadership on homeland security issues, but also his commitment to public service and to this institution.

And I don't want to go any further without expressing my respect for and gratitude to the professional staff of the subcommittee, both majority and minority. Beverly Pheto has been an exemplary clerk. Her mastery of the issues facing the Department and each of its components has been invaluable. And I cannot underestimate the contributions of Stephanie Gupta, Jeff Ashford, Jim Holm, and Shalanda Young on the majority side; and Tom McLemore, Ben Nicholson, and Christine Kojac on the minority side, as well as Darek Newby of my personal staff. Our subcommittee relies on the professionalism and expertise of these individuals. They are performing an invaluable service to the country.

Mr. Chairman, in total, the bill before us contains $36.3 billion in discretionary funding, which is $2.5 billion, or more than 7 percent, above the funding appropriated in 2007, including funding given an emergency designation in the 2007 bill. That so-called ''emergency'' funding was primarily for border security needs that have necessarily been absorbed into the baseline for fiscal year 2008. The bill contains $2 billion, or 5 percent, more than the amounts requested by President Bush. I hope my colleagues will agree that the country's outstanding homeland security vulnerabilities, including border security, more than justify this level of funding.

This bill does four important things: First, it provides funding to address our country's most pressing security vulnerabilities with a new emphasis on our ports and on rail and transit systems.

Secondly, the bill provides critically needed funding to our States and communities to confront not only the threat of terrorist activity but also natural disasters and the emergency situations that must be dealt with in our community every day. Homeland security requires a faithful partnership among the Federal Government, States, and local communities. And this bill honors that partnership.

Thirdly, the bill helps to ensure that taxpayer dollars are well spent by requiring specific management reforms related to contracting, procurement, and competition. It cuts $1.2 billion below the fiscal 2007 levels and $244 million below the requested amounts for programs and activities that are not performing well or for which increased or level funding has not been adequately justified; and it withholds a total of $1.9 billion for various programs until the Department submits detailed expenditure plans.

And, fourth, the bill takes a long-term approach by requiring outside reviews of several major programs and activities to ensure that long-term investments of taxpayer money are made wisely and productively. For example, we are commissioning studies by the National Academies of Science on the current direction of the BioWatch program and on the Department's risk analysis capabilities and the improvements needed to ensure that investments are well targeted.

The funding increases provided in this bill address the security vulnerabilities identified by numerous expert groups, including the 9/11 Commission and the Hart-Rudman Commission. They also fund security actions mandated in the SAFE Ports Act and the Katrina Reform Act.

Aviation explosive detection systems are funded in total at $849 million, $324 million more than the regular 2007 bill. Air cargo security is funded at $73 million, $18 million more than the 2007 bill. And the bill directs TSA to double the amount of cargo it screens prior to loading onto passenger aircraft.

Transit security grants are funded at $400 million, $225 million more than the 2007 bill. Port security grants are funded at $400 million, $190 million more than the 2007 bill. An additional $40 million is provided for the Coast Guard to implement the requirements of the SAFE Ports Act.

Emergency Management Performance Grants are funded at $300 million, $100 million more than the 2007 bill. Metropolitan Medical Response System Grants are funded at $50 million, $17 million more than 2007. State Homeland Security and Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention grants are funded at $950 million; that is $50 million more than 2007. Urban area security grants are funded at $800 million, $30 million more than the 2007 bill. REAL ID and interoperable communication grants are funded in total at $100 million, in contrast to no funding provided in 2007. Fire grants are funded at $800 million, $138 million more than 2007. And FEMA management and administration is funded at $685 million, $150 million more than 2007.

Mr. Chairman, I want to highlight a number of other provisions in the bill that are particularly important. We have all heard about contracts and awards from the Department that were not competed. FEMA recently submitted a list of nearly 4,000 contracts that were never competitively bid. This bill mandates that all grant and contract funds be awarded through full and open competitive processes except

when other funding distribution mechanisms are required by statute. This approach creates a level playing field and also ensures that there are no congressional or administration earmarks in this bill.

In addition, the bill addresses a major immigration vulnerability that exists today. It requires that ICE contact correctional facilities throughout the U.S. on a monthly basis to identify incarcerated immigrants who are subject to deportation. Although ICE deports some number of these individuals now, it is not systematically identifying and deporting them. There is simply no excuse for failing to identify every deportable alien and deporting them immediately upon their release from prison.

These are undocumented individuals who have served time in jail for committing crimes, and we are now, unfortunately, releasing them all too often back into the population. So asking prisons for information about these individuals so they can be deported should be among the first priorities in our illegal immigration enforcement strategy. This bill provides the direction and the funding to ICE to make this happen.

The bill funds the Secure Border Initiative at the requested level of $1 billion, while requiring the Department to clearly justify how it plans to use these funds to achieve operational control of our borders. For each border segment, the Department will have to produce an analysis comparing its selected approach to alternatives based on total cost, on level of control achieved, impact on affected communities, and other factors.

We are also requiring the Department to seek the advice and support of each local community affected by a border infrastructure project. I want to be clear that this does not give border communities a veto on border projects and it will not result in any project delays if the Department efficiently carries out its responsibilities. The provision simply requires the Department to actively and faithfully consult affected communities to ensure that our border security efforts minimize adverse community impacts. That is reasonable to ask of the Department, and the Department agrees that such consultation is appropriate.

We are also directing the Department to increase by over 40 percent the number of Border Patrol agents on the northern border to comply with the levels called for in the Intelligence Reform Act. In addition, the bill addresses a Customs and Border Protection staffing problem that we heard about on a February congressional delegation to the southwest border.

Because CBP officers are not considered law enforcement officers, despite the increasing role of law enforcement in their duties, they don't receive the same benefits as DHS personnel who are considered law enforcement officers. This has made it extremely difficult to hold on to CBP officers. In a nutshell, the bill would allow eligible CBP officers to transition to law enforcement status beginning in fiscal 2008.

The Transportation Security Administration's loss of the personal data of thousands of its employees is only the most recent example of the privacy problems plaguing the Department. The bill withholds funding for certain DHS programs until the proper privacy protections are in place because security and privacy can and should go hand in hand.

In conclusion, let me mention a few other provisions, Mr. Chairman. First, the bill includes language mandating that stricter State and local chemical security laws and regulations cannot be preempted by the Federal Government. Secondly, the bill mandates that all grant and contract funds comply with Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements. Thirdly, the $101 million in the bill for the new DHS campus facility at St. Elizabeth's will not be available until the Department submits an explosive detection equipment spending plan and promulgates long overdue regulations on U-Visas for victims of domestic violence, rape, and involuntary servitude.

This withholding of funds should not be interpreted as a signal of lukewarm support for the development of the St. Elizabeth's campus. On the contrary, the Department and the country would be better served by colocating most of its headquarters components onto this single campus. This is simply our way of signaling that any further delay on an explosive detection plan or on the overdue U-Visa rule is completely unacceptable.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me start, Mr. Chairman, by commending the subcommittee chairman on putting together a thoughtful bill, his first as the chairman of this important subcommittee. I must also recognize the chairman's continuation of this subcommittee's bipartisan tradition as well as to state how much I appreciate the chairman's willingness to listen to the concerns on this side of the aisle and accommodate us as much as possible.

I would, however, like to briefly say a few words about some specific items of concern. First, fiscal responsibility.

The 302(b) allocation for the Department of Homeland Security is $36.25 billion. That is $2.1 billion above what was requested of us and amounts to a 13.6 percent increase above fiscal 2007. And that doesn't even include the billions in one-time emergency funding that has been added to the DHS budget over the last year, including the $1.05 billion in unrequested funding just approved in the supplemental last month.

If you include that figure in the increase, it is almost a 17 percent increase over the current year. By comparison, the budget request would give the Department a 7.2 percent increase, and I think that recommendation is more than sufficient, even generous, for the Department.

The public is demanding accountability and fiscal responsibility, and I don't think we can exclude any Federal agency from fiscal discipline, even the Department of Homeland Security. More money and more government do not equal more security.

Therefore, I will offer an amendment later today to limit the budget to a more than generous and responsible 7.2 percent increase over current spending. I am hopeful my colleagues will support that effort.

And when I use the term ''responsible,'' Mr. Chairman, I am also stating that we must ensure DHS has sufficient resources to carry out legislative direction. The bill includes a bold mandate for ICE to contact every correctional facility in the country, over 5,000 of them, at least once a month to identify incarcerated aliens and initiate deportation proceedings against them. That is a laudable goal, and I support the policy and the goal. But, Mr. Chairman, it is going to be very, very difficult to do mechanically and it is unfunded.

□ 1515

We are going to be asking the States and localities to pay, assumedly, for the review of who is in their jails.

Number two, they don't have the authority nor the capability to determine whether or not Joe Blow in cell 18 is an undocumented alien or not. It's not their job, and they don't have the capability to do that. So I don't know what will be the result of this mandate. It is unfunded, and it is going to be very difficult to put in practice. The Department already surveys routinely the most probable jails where the most probable criminal aliens are being held anyway.

Despite the requirement for ICE to report on the resources needed to carry out this unfunded mandate, I am concerned that the bill presupposes ICE can simply transfer or reprioritize monies from other sources within their budget, for example, the fugitive apprehension program. They are out there trying to catch the criminals on the streets that are loose. It seems to me they are a bigger danger than those incarcerated in the jails.

These enforcement activities involve many duties, duties that include tracking down at-large criminals, investigating smuggling networks, preventing child pornography, preventing the exploit of sensitive national security technology, and taking down employers who are exploiting illegal immigrants to the point of abuse.

From which of these critical missions should ICE take monies in order to comb the Nation's jails and correctional facilities, most of which never have any criminal aliens in them anyway? So to suggest that ICE should

refocus its resources almost exclusively on jailed illegal aliens at the expense of trying to catch fugitives on the street who are raping and plundering seems to me as short-sighted as it is potentially very dangerous.

There must be a balance among ICE's many critical missions. And I am concerned this bill falls short in that regard. I am hopeful the Chairman will work with me and others to develop a more realistic implementation of this policy as we move forward.

I have other concerns as well. Any immigration policy starts out with securing the border. If we can't control who crosses our Nation's borders, all other possible immigration initiatives will fail. To address this critical issue, Congress has authorized and appropriated for substantial infrastructure on the southwest border. But the bill contains a number of onerous restrictions on funding for fencing and other tactical infrastructure along our borders until the Department performs certain actions.

At first glance, these individual fencing and tactical infrastructure requirements appear to be based upon sound policy. However, added together, they are a series of obstacles that can potentially impede installation of critical border security systems. I fear that securing the border will be greatly deterred.

While I am pleased with the continuation of robust planning requirements for SBInet, I am absolutely committed to securing our borders as rapidly as possible. We will work with the Chairman to ensure that DHS accomplishes that critical task on time and on budget. There must be a balance between prudent oversight and timely execution of the Department's border security mission.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the bill removes for the first time the cap on the number of TSA screeners that was put into this bill in 2002, and every year since. That cap was established for very good reasons, reasons that still exist. TSA was created by Congress in 2001. At that time, I chaired the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, and we put in this cap because TSA was demonstrating absolutely no discipline in its planning, hiring and use of technology. TSA's mindset was to hire an army of screeners, 70,000 of them, while advancements in research and technology were largely ignored.

By requiring in law that TSA could not exceed 45,000 screeners, TSA was forced to refocus its decision-making. They began to place better, cheaper, and more effective technologies and machines in the airport, x-ray machines and the like, and started to slowly clear out the more expensive, manpower-intensive trace detection machines in the lobbies of airports.

The screener cap, Mr. Chairman, works. Without it, I am fearful that TSA will go back to its old ways of solving screener problems by simply adding more people, a very short-sighted, costly, and dangerous solution. Given these concerns, I plan to offer an amendment to restore the 45,000 screener cap later today.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the annual expectations we may be setting for State and local grants. These funds are intended to address counterterrorism needs and disaster preparedness, the Homeland Security portion of local first responders' budgets and duties. These agencies are certainly happy, of course, to get these grant funds, and now even expect it. I am concerned that we are transforming the mission and purpose of these grant programs from risk reduction to that of revenue sharing, something it was never intended to be.

Rather than just adding billions to these grant programs, as this bill does, what we ought to be doing is working with the authorizing committees to change the way these grant programs are authorized and administered, and lay out specifically what the Federal Government expects for the grants that we do make.

Grants to States and local communities are intended to reduce our vulnerabilities and are not immune from fiscal discipline, particularly when you consider that there is nearly $5 billion in unspent first responder grant dollars simply laying there waiting to be spent. We should be working on seeing that the pipeline is unclogged. Why put billions more dollars in the hopper when it's full already, waiting to be drained out the bottom in a clogged pipeline?

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I believe this bill has the potential to do a lot of good. There are many provisions and funding recommendations that I agree with. I applaud Chairman PRICE's efforts to keep the Department on track to produce results, provide strong oversight, and continuing the subcommittee's tradition of strict accountability.

I look forward to working with him and the Members of the House and the Senate as the bill moves forward.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee to inquire about the language in the report accompanying this bill relating to funding for the capability replacement laboratory that is being built as part of the Pacific Northwest Laboratory complex in the 300 Area at Hanford. This lab is being constructed in order to replace facilities that are being demolished as a result of the environmental cleanup program managed by the Department of Energy. The existing lab provides critical science and technology capabilities to the Department of Homeland Security, including radiation detection and analysis, information, analytics and testing, evaluation and certification capabilities.

To maintain these capabilities, DHS, along with two agencies within DOE, has entered into a memorandum of understanding to share the cost for replacing this laboratory complex.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to point out that DHS provided approximately $2.25 million in prior years for conceptual design of this project. In addition, the FY07 Homeland Security appropriation bill provided $2 million for the continued design and initial construction of this facility. And I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his help last year. However, no funds were included in the FY08 budget request from DHS. The MOU calls for $25 million to be contributed by DHS to begin construction. If this funding is not included, the project will likely be delayed into future years, causing both DHS and DOE to lose important laboratory capabilities they need to keep our country safe.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for those important points. It is my understanding that there is language in the report to accompany the bill addressing the funding commitment made by DHS in the MOU.

I would yield to the chairman of the subcommittee for clarification.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The gentleman is correct. Language in the report directs the science and technology directorate to fulfill the funding obligation to which it committed itself in the MOU signed last November.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the chairman for his response, and I ask him to continue to work with me and my colleague from Washington to ensure that this obligation is fulfilled by DHS.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I would be happy to work with you and Mr. HASTINGS to ensure that the Department adheres to the direction provided in the report.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you for yielding. I thank the gentleman, and I thank the Chair as well, and look forward to working with both of you in this regard.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a very hard-working member of our committee, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky, Ranking Member ROGERS, for yielding time and for the leadership he and Chairman PRICE have given this committee. It has been a pleasure to serve.

I rise today to speak about an issue of vital importance to me, the infrastructure protection and our energy delivery system protection.

This bill has $532 million to protect the infrastructure of this country. Our transportation system has been a very high focus because that is how we were attacked, the use of our transportation system. But in my view, the vulnerability of America is very much its infrastructure on energy. We lack oil refineries and cannot afford to have any refineries offline from a terrorist attack. We now import 13 percent of our gasoline from foreign countries and often have to bid for it when it's in the ship.

Our natural gas system is struggling to furnish adequate and affordable natural gas for us to heat our homes and run our businesses because we are using huge amounts of it now to generate electricity. We are using large amounts of it now to make ethanol because it is a fuel. Ninety-six percent of all the new ethanol plants use natural gas.

We are finding that natural gas is the mother's milk of this country, and any disruption in our pipeline system, because we are not able to produce adequate amounts of natural gas without any disruption in the current delivery system.

Our electric grid, in my view, we were short on generating capacity; that has been beefed up because we have built a lot of natural gas electric generators. But we have not adequately invested, or in some cases have not been able to build the grid that connects our country. We need to have all of our country criss-crossed with a stronger grid, so that if any portion of it goes down, another portion, we can come in the back door with electricity.

Our dependence on electricity and our use of electricity is growing every day. And in my view, with wind and solar slowly coming online, those are often in areas that we don't have a good hookup to the grid, and we need to build transmission lines to bring that capacity to the system.

I believe the Department of Homeland Security must be more stringently identified as a priority within the Department of Homeland Security. I have said throughout the process of marking up this bill that the vulnerabilities of our electric grid, our pipeline system and our refinery system need to be a higher priority. I am thankful for the language that was accepted in this bill to require the Department of Homeland Security, with input from the Department of Energy, to provide a report on the most critical capacity limit segments of the North American electricity transmission and distribution network. And we probably ought to be doing the same for all of our other energy infrastructures.

It is critical that we identify these segments and also identify if disruption of any of these segments would generate a cascading affect that could cripple the economy of our country. It is vital that we protect our energy infrastructure.

I want to thank Mr. ROGERS and Mr. PRICE for their dedication on this bill and their willingness to work with me on what I believe are the vulnerabilities that need to be beefed up to make sure this country has the energy it needs.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and would like to commend Chairman PRICE, Ranking Member ROGERS, and their wonderful staff for their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor.

The bill provides adequate funding for programs that are crucial to the Nation's security, many of which the President chose to underfund or eliminate in his request.

Although we have not suffered a terrorist attack since the morning of 9/11, the threat remains real. Therefore, it is crucial that we provide sufficient resources to support those who represent our first line of defense.

I am pleased that the bill acknowledges this reality and restores proposed cuts to grant programs such as the Metropolitan Medical Response System and the SAFER program, which helps our struggling local fire departments fulfill ever-increasing homeland security missions.

□ 1530

I know that my own City of New York is making good use of all of these grants, including those provided to the Urban Areas Security Initiative grant program.

Beyond helping our States and municipalities, I would also like to express my support for the way the committee handles the balance between the different demands in the different departments and their ongoing missions. These critical missions, such as stopping the flow of illegal drugs and approving visas, have not gone away since 9/11. This bill properly recognizes this reality and provides support.

Finally, I am pleased that the chairman and ranking member chose to address issues related to the treatment and deportation of immigrants. As we work to secure our borders, it is important that we never lose touch with America's enduring spirit as a nation that stands ready to welcome all who come in search of a better life.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I believe the bill does a good job of providing adequate funds for programs crucial to the security of the homeland and strengthens the partnership between the Federal, State and local governments and all the local communities. I truly believe it includes all the ingredients necessary for success.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I would ask for their vote.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), one of the hardest working members of our subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to thank Chairman PRICE and Ranking Member ROGERS for the hard work that they have done on this Homeland Security bill. What we are trying to do is secure our Nation with our Homeland Security bill, and this goes a long way to doing that. But I have some concerns about this bill, and I have expressed them.

We have got to secure our Nation, and it is of primary importance to this country that we secure this Nation at every level. We have been working diligently and hard to do that. We have tried to use an open process in the Homeland Security Subcommittee, and that is, we lay all our cards on the table in our appropriations bill. We have historically let all the spending on homeland security be laid out before this House so that the daylight and reality of how we are spending the American people's money is in the bill.

I am concerned, and I wish to express the concern that in the appropriations process this year there is a lot that is going to be done in the dark. In this particular bill, it is a very small item as compared to what is coming down the road at us, but there is $16 million for bridges which we won't know exactly how that is going to be spent for this House to examine it, but it will be ''air dropped'' in in the conference committee. That is an indicator of what we are looking at as we deal with Member-initiated spending with the nickname of ''earmarks'' in the future.

At present, the plan is to set aside the money but not tell us how to spend it, and, oh, by the way vote for it. But I think in the last election the American people told us that they wanted sunlight on this process. They wanted to be able to see how we spend our money, including they wanted our names put on the things that were individually requested. In fact, the Republican House passed such a rule, to put the names on every earmark.

Yet we see in a very small part in this bill, and much expanded in the bills to follow, that there is going to be no sunshine on this process. In fact, it is going to be inside closed doors in the conference committee where there is really not a whole lot this House can do about it.

With increased nonemergency spending of $81.4 billion, these are issues that American people want to know about it. They want their elected Representatives to take a look at it and be able to figure out how the money is being spent. We debated this process the last session of Congress. We made it important to us as individual Members. We talked about it and discussed it and voted on it.

Now, all of a sudden, we have a process that has gone behind closed doors in secrecy, and as we vote these things

out, as Members of Congress we are voting a bill which has a fund set-aside which we are not told how that fund is going to be spent. We are told it could be published over the break. This is inexcusable.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), another member of our committee.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise as a member of this committee and want to commend the style of this committee. I don't think any committee has had more hearings with more substantive issues than this Committee on Appropriations for security.

In fact, this bill appropriates a record amount of spending, $36.3 billion. What we tried to do in the committee, and I want to commend Mr. ROGERS and Mr. PRICE, was starting out asking what are the risk issues that we really need to face in the Nation. This whole emphasis has been essentially an antiterrorism effort, when, in reality, in creating this huge, huge bureaucracy and moving the Department of Agriculture and everybody else into it, what we have found from a lot of experts is that you really have to deal with issues such as the first responders would be the same for a terrorist activity as they would be for a natural disaster, and that we really have to base our decisions on risk-based management.

It was no more clear than in a place that we are just sort of throwing money at, which is the border between Mexico and the United States. In testimony, we found that there are more terrorist incidents—in fact, there have been none on the Mexican-U.S. border, but there have been several on the U.S.-Canadian border where we have very little security whatsoever. So if you were acting just on risk management, you would put more assets on the Canadian border than on the Mexican border. But the emphasis here isn't about homeland security; it is more about immigration.

I think hearing all the things put together, this is a really good bill.

One of the things Mr. ROGERS mentioned that I would like to just disagree with, all of our local law enforcement say that the biggest problem they are having is they arrest people who don't have papers and then they release them because nobody from INS will come around and check it out. Everybody on the committee was concerned about the fact that there wasn't enough effort put into what they call ''jail checks,'' and this committee bill addresses that.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Members, and point out that this is not just a spending bill, because they cut a lot of things and they put conditions on spending.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a very hard-working member of our committee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

I commend the gentleman from North Carolina for putting together a bill that meets the security needs of this country. As a former member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee, I respect the enormous task the subcommittee has in providing oversight to a department that is still finding its way.

Of particular concern to me are the Department's Infrastructure Protection analysis centers, which provide basic analytic services to the Department of Homeland Security. PSAC, the Protective Security Analysis Center, is one such tool. PSAC is a collaborative effort between a number of Department of Energy national labs and industry partners which exist to collect, analyze and share infrastructure risk information within DHS, as well as with the communities in which the infrastructure is located.

PSAC integrates infrastructure information, risk analysis and data collection through assessment tools to support the process of risk-based decision-making. PSAC also hosts a number of DHS systems supporting chemical facility security and bombing prevention, as well as the National Asset Database, all of which are essential to accomplishing the DHS mission.

It is also important to note that DHS has made a $52 million investment in PSAC over the past 4 years to develop these capabilities and expertise. Without continued support, this significant investment would be lost and DHS would be left with numerous unfunded mission requirements. It is my understanding the committee has approved $78.9 million for identification and analysis.

Chairman PRICE, I ask if you will work with me, please, to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security provides adequate funding for these analysis centers, particularly the PSAC, in FY 08.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his kind words on our bill, and I appreciate his interest in the Protective Security Analysis Center, or PSAC.

As the gentleman noted, the bill includes $78.9 million for the Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection to carry out identification and analysis programs. This funding supports the analytical work done by DHS to identify risks to infrastructure and to model the effects of terrorist attacks and natural disasters.

The PSAC is an important part of these activities. I look forward to working with the gentleman to ensure that these important activities are adequately funded in our bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this Homeland Security appropriations bill. For too long, this Congress has failed to fund our critical homeland security priorities. I am pleased, however, that this bill today takes significant steps towards addressing these issues.

As a Member who represents the Port of Oakland, I want to just mention port security, which has been long neglected by the Bush administration. In this bill, we make an important commitment to provide at the authorized level $400 million in port security grants, which is $190 million over the President's request.

To protect critical transit infrastructure, this bill provides $400 million in grants, which is $225 million over the President's request.

On the issue of ensuring that first responders are able to communicate between themselves, this bill provides $50 million for essential interoperable communications.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress is making good on its promise to provide a clear and new and realistic direction on homeland security. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), a member of the authorizing committee for homeland security in the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2008. I would like to thank Chairman PRICE and Ranking Member ROGERS for including a solid increase for funding for detection canine teams used by DHS. The bill includes an increase of $17.3 million that will add more canine teams for air cargo inspections. The bill also includes funding for 1,506 canine teams for CBP, which represents an increase of 272 teams over last year's level.

These increases reflect a provision I supported in the Rail and Public Transportation Safety Act of 2007 and H.R. 659, the Canine Detection Team Improvement Act, which I introduced earlier this year.

However, I am deeply concerned about section 527 that would classify instructors at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center as inherently governmental. This provision would impose a dangerous ban on using non-Federal trainers after a national emergency and the resulting needed times of surge.

I also remain concerned about the ability of DHS to recruit and train an additional 3,000 new Border Patrol agents funded by the bill. Given attrition rates, this means that Border Patrol will need to hire and train approximately 4,400 agents a year. While I support putting more boots on the ground as quickly as possible, I am convinced

that the current approach DHS is using cannot meet this goal.

I am also concerned that it continues to cost $187,000 to recruit, train and deploy just one Border Patrol agent. The Subcommittee on Management Investigations and Oversight plans to hold another hearing on Border Patrol agent training costs in its capacity next Tuesday. It is my hope that the findings from this hearing will be considered by the House and Senate conferees on this bill to improve the way DHS recruits and trains Border Patrol agents.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I gladly yield 2 minutes to a very fine Member, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of our authorizing committee on homeland security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman giving me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2638. This legislation goes a long way to meeting the Nation's homeland security needs. It also provides funding in a number of areas at the Department of Homeland Security that have repeatedly been shortchanged.

Specifically, the bill before us today provides DHS with $36.3 billion, a $2.1 billion increase over the President's request. Additionally, H.R. 2638 addresses many of the areas identified in the authorization bill that the Committee on Homeland Security developed.

The House overwhelmingly approved the authorization bill in early May. At the same time, it also is shaped by many of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, as well as programmatic changes called for in H.R. 1, legislation that I authored and that passed the House in January on a bipartisan basis.

□ 1545

For instance, this bill includes $78 million to double the amount of cargo screened on passenger aircraft. This would put TSA on the path of inspecting 100 percent of cargo, a key provision in H.R. 1.

Chairman PRICE is to be commended for producing a bill that makes the homeland more secure, especially given the tight budget constraints. We all know that to get border security right, we need to put more trained ''boots on the ground.'' H.R. 2638 provides funding for 3,000 additional Border Patrol agents to bring the number of agents to 17,819 by the end of the fiscal year.

It also makes some major enhancements to the operations of the Department. It mandates that all grants and contracts can only be used for projects that comply with Davis-Bacon. It also allows State and local governments to set chemical security rules that are stronger than those issued by the Federal Government. And it sets information protection standards for vulnerability and security plans for chemical facilities.

I support this bill and urge its passage.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member on the Border and Terrorism Subcommittee of the Homeland Security authorization committee, Mr. SOUDER from Indiana.

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

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the distinguished ranking member and chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out a tremendous irony that is happening here in the Capitol Building today. In the other body, the President of the United States has come over to lobby for an immigration bill and the other body is considering this. Yet we are debating a homeland security bill where we have had Republicans come down to the floor who say it's too expensive, that it's spending too much money, but if you took this times four on an annual basis for 5 years, you couldn't begin to meet the standards that are in the Senate bill. We have people like Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky pointing out that we're mandating Homeland Security to go check everybody in these detention centers but without any money for it. Unless your intention is complete and pure amnesty, how would you do that if you don't fund programs?

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama pointed out that we don't have a realistic program for training Border Patrol, that it's costing too much. Yeah. Well, how are we going to ramp this up two or three times if we don't have money to do the Border Patrol people?

This bill is an advertisement, a walking billboard for the gaping holes in the bill of the other body. On pages 12 and 13 of this bill, and I agree with all these criticisms as we worked through our subcommittee, it says that they have to define activities, milestones and costs of implementing the program for the Secure Border Initiative. You mean they don't have that? You mean they're promising that we're going to have a secure border and they don't even have the cost estimates? Yes, that's correct.

Number 2 here on page 12 says, demonstrate how the activities will further the objectives of it and have a multi-year strategic plan. You mean they don't have a multi-year strategic plan? No, they don't.

Identify funding and staffing. You mean they haven't done that?

Describe how the plan addresses security needs at the northern border. They don't even have the date set for when they're going to develop a plan for the northern border, yet we're debating a bill in the other body that says that we're supposedly securing our border?

On page 37, it says, complete the schedule for the full implementation of a biometric exit program or certification that such program is not possible within 5 years. Well, I've talked to US-VISIT. They haven't even been talked to about it. Of course they can't meet 5 years. We're talking 10 years minimum.

What are they debating over in the other body? When the American public looks at what's happening in the Capitol Building on the same day and we're passing an appropriations bill that has theoretically looking at a biometric exit maybe in the next 5 years and the other body is acting like it's done, what's going on here?

On page 59, there's a direct challenge to the question of our matching system. Now, the other day we had somebody with TB who had the warning on the screen, one we actually caught and we released him. But what we have is a question of are our lists even valid and there are restrictions on that.

Other parts of the bill are actually going to delay the implementation of the fence by saying that, for example, 75 percent of the land in Arizona is actually either government-owned, Native-American-owned, it's a wilderness area, it's a range; and it says we have to work out each of those things before we can put any fence in.

Another part of the bill says we have to work with State and local governments in their areas. How in the world can the other body be making these promises when this bill points out the gaping holes?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island who's worked with us on this bill, Mr. LANGEVIN.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to say that I rise in strong support of the FY 2008 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. I want to begin by commending Chairman PRICE's leadership in crafting a measure that will provide an additional $2.1 billion above the President's request and fill many of our remaining security gaps.

As chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity and Science and Technology, I am particularly pleased that this bill incorporates language I worked on to strengthen chemical security by allowing State and local governments to set chemical safety rules that are stronger than Federal mandates.

Further, this legislation incorporates an additional $307 million for aviation security, an area the 9/11 Commission highlighted as a priority. This bill will allow TSA to install vital explosive detection systems at commercial airports nationwide and will double the amount of cargo screened on passenger aircrafts.

This bill also takes the critical step of lifting the cap on TSA airport screeners, a provision which is of tremendous importance to T.F. Green Airport in my district.

In addition, H.R. 2638 incorporates robust funding to strengthen border protection, including $8.8 billion to fund

an additional 3,000 Border Patrol agents for FY08.

Finally, this legislation will help our first responders who place their lives on the line each and every day by restoring funding to the local law enforcement terrorism prevention program and the assistance to firefighter grants program.

Of course, no appropriations measure is perfect and this bill is no exception. I am especially disappointed with the inadequate funding level for R&D for cybersecurity. Cybersecurity poses potentially devastating threats to our Nation's critical infrastructure, and I hope we can improve the bill in this area. I have a later amendment to that effect that I hope to discuss with the chairman.

Overall, however, this is an excellent bill. I again want to commend the chairman and the committee for their outstanding work on this measure. It provides support to many critical programs, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank, Mr. Chairman, Chairman DAVID PRICE and Ranking Member HAROLD ROGERS for the leadership and bipartisan work that they have done in this bill.

I rise in support of this Homeland Security appropriations bill because I am a Member who represents part of the U.S.-Mexico border and this is strong on homeland security.

One of the things I would like to emphasize is that it allows input from the local communities. I think before a fence is put, that I think it's very, very important that we get the input of the local county officials, city officials, the business sector before any sort of fence is put in there.

The second part of it is we're doing a lot to help Border Patrol, but I think it's also important to provide incentives for customs officers; and by giving them law enforcement officer status, that will improve the Department of Homeland Security to recruit and retain those officers.

The last point is the criminal alien program. By providing extra funding, the $50 million to make sure that we contact the local jails, this is important to make sure that we deport anybody who is in one of the local jails and move them out.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the leadership you have provided.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 6½ minutes. The gentleman from Kentucky has 6 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman very much, and I thank the ranking member for their work.

I want to point out particularly in the interest of our subcommittee on the authorizing committee, chairwoman of the Transportation Security and Critical Infrastructure, is the importance of the added amount of dollars for the Transportation Security Administration, a figure that is $307 million above the 2007 request, $6.62 billion. I am hoping that that means that we will begin to look at the entire operations of airports, to ensure that the grounds, the back side of the airport as well, are as safe as the front side, that we will be able to screen all of the employees that come on the airport grounds.

I am very happy to see that the port security grants are there, representing Houston and the Port of Houston. Lastly, let me say that I hope we will be able to work together on ensuring that when we have outreach and security training that we include the neighborhoods surrounding the items that may generate the kind of nonsecure incident that may occur. We must provide security for neighborhoods.

I hope that we will pass this bill and add the issue of securing neighborhoods to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, September 11, 2001, is a day that is indelibly etched in the psyche of every American and in the minds of many throughout the world. Much like the unprovoked attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, September 11 is a day that will live in infamy. And as much as Pearl Harbor changed the course of world history by precipitating the global struggle between totalitarian fascism and representative democracy, the transformative impact of September 11 in the course of American and human history is indelible. September 11 was not only the beginning of the global war on terror, but moreover, it was the day of innocence lost for a new generation of Americans.

Since that catastrophic day, I have put the protection of our homeland at the forefront of my legislative agenda. I believe that our collective efforts as Americans will all be in vain if we do not achieve our most important priority: the security of our Nation. Accordingly, I became then and continue to this day to be an active and engaged member of the Committee on Homeland Security, and chairwoman of the Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection Subcommittee.

Our Nation's collective response to the tragedy of September 11 exemplified what has been true of the American people since the inception of our Republic—in times of crisis, we come together and always persevere. Despite the depths of our anguish on the preceding day, on September 12 the American people demonstrated their compassion and solidarity for one another as we began the process of response, recovery, and rebuilding. We transcended our differences and came together to honor the sacrifices and losses sustained by the countless victims of September 11. Let us honor their sacrifices by passing H.R. 2638, which funds the important work of the Department of Homeland Security.

The Homeland Security Appropriations bill makes significant strides forward toward implementing the suggestions of the 9/11 Commission report, as well as addressing the most pressing security issues that we, as Americans, face. In particular, new emphasis has been placed on port, rail, and transit security; on the need to support state and local efforts to prevent and respond to terrorism threats and natural disasters; on aviation security; and on border and immigration security.

Earlier in this Congress, we passed H.R. 1684, the Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for 2008. This legislation included many significant provisions I ensured were incorporated either into the base bill or through amendments at the full committee markup, and I am pleased that my amendments are reflected in H.R. 2638, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for FY 2008. These amendments were designed to strengthen and streamline management, organizational, personnel, and procurement issues at the Department to facilitate execution of its homeland security mission. Among these was an amendment to strip the Department's authority to develop a personnel system different from the traditional GS schedule Federal model, known as MAX–HR. In a number of critical ways, the personnel system established by the Homeland Security has been a litany of failure, and my amendment repealed a personnel system that eviscerated employee due process rights and placed in serious jeopardy the agency's ability to recruit and retain a workforce capable of accomplishing its critical missions.

I also worked with Chairman THOMPSON to incorporate into H.R. 1684 language authorizing Citizen Corps and the Metropolitan Medical Response System programs to strengthen emergency response and recovery efforts. The Citizen Corps Program is a critical program within the Department of Homeland Security that engages the community in emergency preparedness through public education and outreach, training, and volunteer service. My language ensured that funding will enable local Citizen Corps Councils to more adequately provide education and training for populations located around critical infrastructure.

Today, we are here on the floor to ensure that the department entrusted with protecting the security of our Nation is adequately funded. I believe that H.R. 2638 does exactly that, while also requiring specific new accountability and management reforms related to contracting, procurement, and competition. These reforms serve to ensure that American taxpayers get the greatest possible value for the money they provide.

H.R. 2638 provides $4.52 billion in funding for First Responder and Port Security Grant Programs. This figure is $1.97 billion above the President's request, and $863 million above the 2007 funding level. Even though homeland security costs continue to rise, funding levels for these grants have been cut every year since their inception in 2004. These funds are used for grants to train first responders, aid preparedness in high threat communities, and protect critical infrastructure.

This bill also provides $6.62 billion for the Transportation Security Administration, a figure that is $307 million above 2007 funding and $219 million above the President's request. This funding will be used for a number of key programs, including explosive detection systems to protect commercial aircraft, increased and expanded air cargo explosive

screening for passenger aircraft, and a secure flight certification program requiring the Administrator of TSA to certify that no security risks are raised by TSA's Secure Flight plans that would limit screening of airline passenger names only against a subset of the full terrorist watch list.

Additionally, this legislation appropriates significant funds for efforts to secure America's borders: $8.8 billion is provided for customs and border protection, including border security fencing and other tactical infrastructure, as well as 3,000 additional border security agents. The committee mark adds $27 million for 250 additional Customs and Border Patrol officers for commercial operations and Customs Trade Partnership against Terrorism validation, verifying that ''trusted shippers'' have in place necessary security measures, as mandated in the SAFE Port Act. Additionally, $4.8 billion is appropriated for immigrations and custom enforcement, including the Federal Protective Service, a figure which is $322 million above 2007 and $15 million above the President's request.

This appropriations bill also funds a number of other crucial programs. It provides $272 million for infrastructure protection, $32 million above the President's request and $44 million above 2007 funding, to be used to identify critical infrastructure, and assess security vulnerabilities.

Additionally, $685 million, $17 million above the President's request and $150 million above 2007, is appropriated for FEMA management, including funding for regional offices responsible for assisting state and local communities prepare for and respond to disasters. This money will fund the necessary improvements to FEMA's management operations, whose weaknesses were laid bare in the shamefully catastrophic response to Hurricane Katrina. This bill provides a further $1.7 billion to assist State and local governments following a declared disaster or emergency, and $120 million for projects that reduce the risks associated with disasters.

In conclusion, I stand here remembering those who still suffer, whose hearts still ache over the loss of so many innocent and interrupted lives. My prayer is that for those who lost a father, a mother, a husband, a wife, a child, or a friend will in the days and years ahead take comfort in the certain knowledge that they have gone on to claim the greatest prize, a place in the Lord's loving arms.

Mr. Chairman, the best way to honor the memory of those lost in the inferno of 9/11, is to do all we can to ensure that it never happens again. The best way to do that is to bolster the efficacy, accountability, and our oversight over the Department of Homeland Security, which we created in the aftermath of 9/11 to protect and preserve our Nation which we all hold so dear. I encourage all my colleagues to vote for this legislation, and to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security can continue its important work protecting our homeland from all manner of threats.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, providing our police forces, firefighters, emergency medical service personnel, and public health personnel with the resources they need to effectively confront and overcome the threats posed by terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies requires our continued commitment and dedication. Our first responders work tirelessly to protect and aid victims of disasters across our country. It's our responsibility to make sure they have the support necessary to perform their jobs.

The dedicated men and women who serve the people of California's 6th District understand the importance of adequate homeland security resources. Each day, ships arrive to dock in ports throughout the Bay Area, commuters travel across the Golden Gate Bridge and the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge, and travelers fly all over the world. In order to best utilize the well-trained first responders in my District, we need to enhance the security of the Bay Area's waterways, expand our ability to better prepare for disasters, and improve our ability to mitigate their effects once they occur.

In 2004, Congress provided $4.92 billion in grants for port security and our first responders. Since then, the Bush Administration and the last Republican Congress cut funding for these programs every year, despite the fact that the costs of preparing for new homeland security threats have steadily increased. The President has continued to deny the importance of sufficiently funding our first responders by asking for only $2.55 billion for these grant programs this year.

We cannot expect local communities to be the first to respond to an emergency unless we give them the resources to do so. Additionally, we cannot assure safe passage for those traveling into our country, nor that the containers transported aboard the airplanes and ships do not conceal weapons of mass destruction unless we provide adequate funds toward improving the safety and security of both our ports and our airlines.

Fortunately, the Homeland Security Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2008 represents an important step in remedying past failures to support our first responders and to strengthen our national security. This bill provides $4.52 billion for first responder and port security grant programs, $1.97 billion above President's request and $863 million above the total these programs received in Fiscal Year 2007. Specifically, it provides $800 million for firefighter assistance grants, $800 million for urban security grants, and $400 million for port facilities and infrastructure security grants. This bill also eliminates the cap on the number of federal airport screeners that the Transportation Security Administration can employ, which will help to improve security at airports nationwide.

In addition to funding measures to address our country's most pressing security vulnerabilities, the Homeland Security Appropriations bill also increases funding for our country's Disaster Relief Fund to $1.7 billion in order to assist state and local governments following a declared disaster or emergency and provides $230 million to modernize over 100,000 flood maps used to determine rates for the National Flood Insurance Program. Additionally, this important piece of legislation will require that all homeland security contracts will be awarded in an open, competitive process, ending the Bush Administration's practice of awarding large-scale contacts to companies with political connections to the White House. Furthermore, this bill will make sure that all funds allocated in this bill can only be used for projects that comply with the Davis-Bacon mandate, requiring that federal contractors pay workers no less than the local prevailing wage.

Securing our homeland demands a strong partnership between the federal government, state governments, and local communities, and I commend the Democratic leadership and the members of the Appropriations Committee for their diligence in working to strengthen our homeland security. By allocating our country's resources to where they are most needed, we will be able to better prepare for and respond to disasters that that threaten the safety of the American people.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chair wants to make clear that the Committee is considering this bill under the 5-minute rule. Amendments are in order when the appropriate paragraph is read. If Members wish to offer an amendment in a timely fashion, Members should rise and orally seek recognition when the appropriate paragraph is read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, $102,930,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $40,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. CROWLEY:

Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $35,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 8, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, Representatives FOSSELLA, MATSUI, GARRETT, and I are offering an amendment to increase by $50 million the funding for the high-threat, high-density urban area program. If passed, our amendment would ensure that the program receives a total of $850 million in fiscal year 2008.

As many of you know, this initiative, also referred to as the Urban Area Security Initiative, is the only homeland security initiative specifically targeted to assist the cities and States most vulnerable to a terror attack.

The Urban Area Security Initiative was created by myself and my fellow New Yorker, Representative FOSSELLA, in the months following the attack of 9/11. Its creation was a bipartisan effort, and it continues to be a bipartisanly supported program. Specifically, I want to thank Representative PRICE, chairman of the Homeland Security appropriations subcommittee, and the Democratic majority of the Homeland Security authorization committee for their hard work and dedication to the urban area initiative and to keeping Americans safe. Both of these committees understand the threats that America faces, both here at home as well as abroad, and they are working to make the investments that we need to make in order to secure our Nation.

Although the majority of this Congress understands the threats in the world that we face, I believe some of my colleagues do not fully understand them. There are some Members in this Chamber who oppose the urban area initiative and all homeland security grant initiatives, calling them, and I quote, revenue sharing, unquote, or secret earmarks. I think that's nonsense. Would my colleagues prefer we return to the pre-9/11 days? As someone who has known personal loss from that day, I for one do not want to.

The chief role for the Federal Government is to protect its citizens from attack and the Urban Area Security Initiative, like many other of the important domestic security programs in this bill, help to accomplish this. While some on the other side may try to play cute games with words, our Nation's security is more important than word games or photo ops.

I come from the State of New York where my hometown was hit and knows firsthand the act of terror. My own family knows firsthand the striking of terror. That is why I urge my colleagues to join me in strengthening the Urban Area Grant Initiative as a way to maintain our vigilance in the face of continuing threats against America that are both at home and abroad.

□ 1600

This amendment is about making targeted, smart and necessary investments to keep our country safe. The Urban Area Security Initiative works. It provides needed resources to the communities at greatest risk of an attack, and it helps to keep those who are defending us on our front lines of terror, our first responders, our fire fighters, EMTs, and police officers safe and protected.

This initiative has been a success, and I urge my colleagues to support the Crowley-Fossella-Matsui-Garrett amendment so we can continue to make the right investments in the protection of our homeland.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The committee mark already includes huge increases in grants for the urban areas, and I am opposed to this further increase. I mean, there is only so much money to go around to all of the cities in the country and all that need help.

Just for an example, the urban area grants portion of the bill is increased already over current spending by some $30 million. It is up to $800 million just for the urban area grants.

Port security grants, all of which go to the large cities, increases from $210 million to $400 million in the bill already.

Rail and transit security grants go from $175 million currently to $400 million.

And then the SAFER fire grants, moneys that go to urban area fire departments for personnel costs, goes from $115 million to $230 million, double what it is now. There are huge increases in these grant programs, particularly for the urban areas.

I know the gentleman appreciates that. But we just don't have any more to go around unless you take it from another worthy cause.

I would oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

I do understand these large urban areas are at high risk from a terrorism event. We have addressed that conscientiously in this bill. This committee is providing $30 million over last year's level of $770 million for the urban area grants.

The gentleman's amendment would increase the Urban Area Security Initiative grants by $50 million. At the same time it would reduce the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management and the office of the Under Secretary for Management. The Office of the Secretary and Executive Management would be reduced by $15 million, or 14 percent.

Funding for a number of offices is included in this appropriation, including the Secure Border Initiative Office, the Policy Office, the Privacy Office, the Civil Rights Office and the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement. The bill provides only enough funding to support current on-board staff except for the Privacy and Civil Rights Offices, where staffing levels are increased slightly, and the Policy Office, where additional funding is provided for REAL ID and the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States.

If funding is reduced, these program enhancements, which are carefully designed and will help ensure privacy and civil rights, could be compromised or largely defunded.

The gentleman's amendment also proposes to reduce funding for the office of the Under Secretary for Management by $35 million, or 14 percent. The total increase in this office is due to $101 million provided for DHS headquarters facilities at St. Elizabeth's. We have already substantially reduced the request coming from the administration. We need to get the Department consolidated in this new headquarters; and of course, this amendment would make even less funding available for this new facility.

So I reluctantly ask for a ''no'' vote.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Homeland Security made significant changes to our homeland security effort. They announced that for the first time areas such as Sacramento, San Diego and Las Vegas were at risk of losing their UASI grant funds.

Since learning of the changes to the UASI program, my colleagues and I have worked tirelessly to ensure that our most at-risk urban areas receive the funding they deserve. As a result, DHS has modified the UASI grant process. DHS's formula now includes more critical infrastructure such as dams and levees, and has also added a tiered system.

While I am glad that my work has ensured that Sacramento and other at-risk urban areas are eligible to apply for UASI funding this year, I believe my work is not done.

I have spent much of my time in the district working closely with local law enforcement and first responders of homeland security. I have seen firsthand the tremendous efforts to protect the millions of people living in the Sacramento area from a terrorist attack.

In Sacramento, I had the honor of attending the opening of the Sacramento Regional Homeland Security and Training Center. The new center was built using a wide range of Federal homeland security funding, including UASI. The center will improve intelligence sharing by housing all levels of law enforcement in one facility. This is just further proof of the truly unparalleled regional cooperation among Sacramento's law enforcement and first responders.

I have long been impressed by the local law enforcement and first responders in my community, and throughout the country. Now we need to make sure that Congress is giving them the necessary resources to do their job.

And so my colleagues, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. Mr. GARRETT and I have offered an amendment to add $50 million to the UASI grant program.

While I commend the chairman and the ranking member for adding $30 million to the program, I believe an additional $50 million is warranted. Our first responders and law enforcement tackle impossible tasks daily. This increased funding will help in pursuit of their mission, to keep our country safe and secure.

Finally, I would like to add to what the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) has said about the issue of revenue sharing. I, too, don't think this is an appropriate place for semantics. The point is, this grant program and the criteria for receiving funding is predicated on the assessment of risk and a community's vulnerability. I would argue that with the UASI program, the issue is not cost sharing but risk sharing. I think this is an appropriate role for the Federal Government in the post-9/11 world. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of the Crowley-Matsui-Fossella-Garrett amendment. I want to thank Chairman PRICE and Ranking Member ROGERS for their work on this legislation.

Time after time we come to the floor to ensure that homeland security dollars are allocated on a reasonable and rational basis, and that is to protect the American people and those who come to our country.

Time after time, we wake up and realize that places like New York City and other high-threat areas are the subject of potential terrorist attack. There are many, including myself, who believe that our homeland security dollars should be based on the threats and the vulnerabilities and the consequences that come with the potential; or, God forbid, an attack itself, as was the case, the catastrophic case, on 9/11.

As has been mentioned, our amendment would add $50 million in funding for the high-risk, high-threat cities to fight terrorism. The additional funding would be directed to the Urban Area Security Initiative, which is the only homeland security grant program which distributes funding based on a risk-based formula, which is a key recommendation of the 9/11 Commission.

The President's budget on the underlying legislation funds UASI at about $800 million, $50 million short, we believe, of the all-time highest appropriation, which occurred in fiscal year 2005.

Despite the fact that America has not been attacked since September 11, our Nation is still at war with an evil enemy. Indeed, just a month ago, law enforcement captured four alleged terrorists on charges that they were plotting to blow up Kennedy Airport in New York City. Their plan was to top the attacks of the World Trade Center, to massacre more people, destroy more property, inflict more damage, and leave our city in ruins.

The threat of terrorism remains very real, making it essential for cities that face the greatest risk to have the tools and resources they need to stop attacks before they occur. The amendment will help our first responders prepare, train and be ready to protect innocent Americans from acts of terrorism.

I believe it will also provide greater consistency to UASI, which has been beset by funding fluctuations of hundreds of millions of dollars from year to year.

It is clear that major cities like New York remain the center of the bull's-eye for terrorists. UASI helps us fight terrorism, and ensures our first responders have the equipment they need to protect the American people.

In a way, just in the last couple of years, a number of attacks have been foiled thanks to the efforts of law enforcement and intelligence gathering, much of it because of the funding that has gone through programs like UASI. Wouldn't it be wonderful if we can keep having the news media focus on foiled terrorist plots rather than counting caskets.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 43 at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman aware that the amendment was printed incorrectly?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without prejudicing the gentleman from North Carolina's point of order, does the gentleman from California seek to correct the printing error?

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I am not aware of what the printing error is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair there was a printing error, so the Clerk will report the amendment at the desk in lieu of amendment No. 43.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

In title I, under the heading ''Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $9,961,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman from North Carolina not hear the amendment as read?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. No, I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order. The Clerk will reread the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina wish to continue to reserve a point of order?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we have before us today would increase spending. When coupled with the supplemental bill that the President just signed a few weeks back, would increase spending in the area of homeland security by nearly 17 percent. Now, perhaps people on the other side of the aisle have not noticed, but we have a deficit, a very large deficit in this country. And we still are adding to that deficit every year.

Now, I think Members on the other side of the aisle have noticed this because they have talked about their PAYGO and other principles, that we won't be increasing spending without some way to pay for this. However, with this appropriations bill we are doing exactly that. We are increasing spending by billions of dollars, by 17 percent over last year's level, without paying for it in any way, without reducing spending anywhere else, which means that we are adding to the deficit because of the spending, the additional spending that is in this bill.

Let me just give you a sense of what a 17 percent increase is. If someone outside of this building in the world is making $15 an hour, they would have to get a raise this year to $17.55 an hour in order for their income to keep pace with the spending increase in this bill.

□ 1615

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that most of the people out there making $15 an hour, or any number you want, are not likely to see their bosses come in and say we want to give you a raise of 17 percent from $15 an hour to $17.55 an hour, not something that they are likely to see. But yet to keep and sustain this level of increase in spending, that's exactly what would have to happen or else we just take more and more and more money out of individuals' pockets so we can spend it here.

Now, I'm sure that people on the other side in support of this bill are going to start to talk about how important this bill is to homeland security. Okay. We will have that debate over the next couple of days about what is in this bill, but what this amendment does is deal purely with bureaucracy. We're not dealing here with any program. We're not dealing here with officers in the field. We're not dealing here with equipment that's being used or computers or anything else for homeland security.

What this amendment says is simply that the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management, the office of the Secretary, purely bureaucracy, gave the Secretary of Homeland Security and the people in that person's office, right now this bill gives them an 11 percent increase, when we're trying to get a deficit down, when we want to, at least some of us do, keep taxes low.

What this bill says is you ought to be able to get by on what you had last year. It is not even proposing that we cut the spending of this bureaucracy, not even proposing that we take the Secretary's office and just their bureaucracy in there and cut it, but simply saying get by on the same amount of money you did last year. Now, how many people in America do that every day but somehow the bureaucracy in Homeland Security can't do that?

And by doing that, Mr. Chairman, this amendment saves $10 million. Now, maybe in a $3 trillion budget it doesn't sound like much, but $10 million is still a lot of money. It's a lot of money to everybody out there. It's lot of money to me. It's a lot of money to you. And $10 million and $10 million and $10 million and we will eventually get our spending down, and that, Mr. Chairman, is how we are going to eliminate this budget deficit and that's how we're going to do it without having the largest increase in taxes in American history, which the other side has proposed to do.

And what is that tax increase for? It's for things like this, for things like taking a bureaucracy of people, sitting around doing phone calls and paper and saying we're going to give you an 11 percent raise. We should not be doing that, not in this environment and not in this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully ask that Members support this amendment, not feed the bureaucracy further and save the taxpayers $10 million.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it's the easiest thing in the world to come to this floor and to rail against bureaucracy, this abstract notion of cutting bureaucracy; but I think it's prudent to ask what exactly do these officials do and what is actually in the bill and why is it there. So let me try to get beyond just the symbolism of cutting bureaucracy and try to answer those very basic questions.

First of all, let me say, I don't know where the figure 17 percent that the gentleman's using comes from. The increase in this bill over fiscal 2007 spending, counting the bill that we passed last year and the emergency spending incorporated in that bill, is 7½ percent. And if you include the emergency funding that we just added to the 2007 bill, then the increase is 4 percent without the Katrina funding, and it is actually a cut of 7½ percent with the Katrina funding. So if you're using the 2007 bill as the baseline, those are the accurate numbers.

Now, let's look at the front office of the Department of Homeland Security. The bill includes, sure enough, $923 million for Department operations, but that's less than the 2007 appropriation. It's less than the President requested by $73 million.

The gentleman has focused on one aspect of front office operations, which is the Office of Secretary and Executive Management, and he wants to cut that by almost $10 million. But there are good reasons for that being increased while the overall front office expenses are being decreased.

This appropriation, the one the gentleman has targeted, the one he has said is purely bureaucracy, included in that appropriation are the Secure Border Initiative office, which many Members on both sides of the aisle have a strong interest in; the policy office; the privacy office, which surely needs strengthening; the civil rights office, which surely needs strengthening; and the office of counter-narcotics enforcement, a critical function as well.

And the bill isn't lavish even in this respect. It provides only enough funding to support current on-board staff except for the privacy and civil rights offices, where staffing levels are increased, and the policy office, where additional funding is provided for REAL ID, a new program that requires some staffing up, and for the Committee on Foreign Investment of the United States, which, as every Member knows, we are trying to also strengthen.

If funding is reduced, these program enhancements, which will help to better ensure privacy, to better ensure civil rights protections, would not be funded. So let's get past the rhetoric about bureaucracy. Let's look at what the appropriation actually does. I think if Members do, they will reject this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I join Chairman PRICE in his comments. I think that we come to the floor with two kinds of amendments, one that really tries to do something, that we believe in, and another just for grandstanding and for publicity.

The gentleman speaks about a deficit and speaks about his side wanting to reduce the deficit. Let me just do a few seconds of history.

When the last President left, we didn't have a deficit. We have a deficit now. Why? Because we were involved in a war and we were sent off to war when we should not be at all, and so we spend billions and billions and billions of dollars every week on a war that was built on lies and bad information, and now we try to get out of that war. And instead of getting out of it, we keep spending more, billions and billions and billions.

And if you think this war deficit is a problem, wait till the boys and girls come home and we have to provide them the medical services that some people will want to cut. The deficit would only grow.

Secondly, to be brief, the gentleman speaks about giving somebody a 17 percent pay raise. Yet it was that side that refused to give some people a couple of pennies' increase in a minimum wage. So all of the sudden that side is very concerned about raising people's salaries to keep up with the needed expenses of surviving in this society, but they were not for giving some folks a minimum wage increase.

So let's get it clear. Yes, there is a deficit, but this bill doesn't cause a deficit. The war is causing the deficit. The war on terror is causing the deficit. That's what this is about. This bill, in a very smart way, deals with some issues that we have to deal with.

And, lastly, it is always easy to attack the bureaucrats. Everybody wants services, everybody wants something done, but nobody wants anybody in charge of providing those services. Somehow we expect a computer to run the agency and not have people actually doing the work.

Let's be fair. Let's be honest when we come to the House floor. If we have an amendment that really has a message, present it. If we're just grandstanding, then we should have a disclaimer that says, and by the way, this is the reason that I'm on the House floor today.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I'd yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from New York said that there were two types of amendments, one that tried to do something that you believe in and others that make statements.

I would like to assure the gentleman from New York that I believe in this amendment, and I think a lot of people on this side of the aisle believe in this amendment because we believe that we need to start controlling costs in this government.

And is this amendment all by itself going to do that? No, of course not, but it will begin the process of doing that, and in combination with a lot of other amendments like it, yes, it will start to control the cost of government, and, yes, I firmly believe in what this amendment is about, in spite of what the gentleman from New York suggested.

The gentleman from North Carolina talked about numbers, and perhaps my numbers are incorrect, but this bill is now at $36.254 billion over and enacted last year $31.905 billion which is a 13.6 percent increase.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think it will be in the interest of the debate the rest of the day to have this straight, so I do appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

It's true, the bill is at $36.3 billion. Last year's appropriation was $34.2 billion. That is counting the emergency spending that was enacted at the same time as the regular bill. That means this year's increase is 7½ percent. And then if you add the 2007 supplemental appropriations, which were just voted by the House, depending on whether you count the Katrina money or not, you either get a 4.2 percent increase or a 7.5 percent decrease from the 2007 funding level.

I appreciate the chance to clarify those numbers.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

To the gentleman from North Carolina, this is something I guess we'll probably need to work out as we go along because I'm not looking at increase over a baseline. We're looking at increase over actual enacted last year, and maybe we can compare notes. But my notes show that that actual last year was $31.905 billion, and then there was the supplemental which has been added on top of this bill itself.

But in any event, one other thing the gentleman from North Carolina alluded to was that this amendment proposes to cut spending in this area in the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management. I want to make that clear. This is a definitional thing which we often have problems with in this House and in this building.

What this amendment proposes to do is to leave the budget for the Office of Secretary and Executive Management equal to what it was in the prior fiscal year. That is not a cut. If you have $10 and I give you $10, I take away $10, give you back $10, that is not a cut. That is the same amount of money you had before. What this does do is it prevents the 11 percent increase that is in this bill.

So let's make it very clear in vernacular that if I make $10 an hour and I want to make $11, if somebody gives me a raise to $10.50, it is still a raise; it is not a cut. And that's what is going on here.

We are not proposing to cut this office. We are merely proposing to tell them, do continue your operations on the same amount of money that you did last year. I don't think that is a great leap to ask of what is clearly an element of the bureaucracy, in spite of the gentleman from North Carolina's admonitions that it is not.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I certainly support his amendment.

In the big scope of the Federal budget perhaps the dollars are not large, but before we can really ever attack spending, we have to attack the culture of spending, and you have to lead by example.

And why can't we ask people in the Federal Government, as we ask families all around the Nation, as our friends on the other side of the aisle have recently passed the single largest tax increase in history, they're expecting American families to somehow do more with less. Can't we expect a few of the administrators of this agency to somehow, somehow get by on the same amount of money they had last year?

I encourage the support for this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I want to commend the gentleman from California for offering this amendment. I think that at the beginning of this first appropriations bill of the 110th Congress, which I might add is 1 month after the first appropriation bill that we, when we were in the majority last year, that we moved through the House. So the time is without a doubt getting late, but I commend the majority for finally bringing this to the floor.

But I want to commend the gentleman from California because this is the type of amendment that sets the tone about what kind of responsibility we will bring to this House for all of our appropriations processes over the next number of weeks.

□ 1630

I want to commend the gentleman for this amendment. I appreciate the fact that he has identified an area where, yes, it's only $10 million, but $10 million in my area is a fair amount of money. So I want to commend the gentleman for bringing the amendment to the floor.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

To the gentleman from North Carolina, just to clarify again on these numbers, we agreed that it's $36.3 billion in this bill, and the number you threw out, $34.2 billion, I believe, was the President's budget proposal for this, and that the prior year enacted, 2007 enacted, was $31.9 billion.

Do you have different numbers on that?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for a response.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I am happy to clarify the situation.

The 2007 appropriation, as enacted, was $34.2 billion. That includes the $31.9 billion that the gentleman cited, plus the emergency spending in that same bill, because as you well remember, we needed to address the border and immigration situation. So that was added to the bill.

The spending in the 2007 bill was $34.2 billion, and we are increasing that by 7.5 percent, and then we have recently supplemented the appropriation. The 2007 spending now stands at $39.2 billion, and the 2008 bill is 7.5 percent less than that in nominal terms.

If I may just say further, the gentleman referred to the way we do accounting around here. This is just straight nominal numbers. The departmental operations are cut—are cut—in our bill from 2007 levels by $1.2 million. They are cut from the President's request by $72 million. It's not a matter of adjustments one way or the other for inflation; those are straightforward cuts.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman pointing out the increase by 7.5 percent. Again, I would like to just draw the House's attention to the fact that this may just be $9.5 million, but as I mentioned, $9.5 million is a fair amount of money.

I appreciate also the gentleman coming to the floor earlier and talking about broadening this debate. He talked about what he called the war deficit. He brought minimum wage into this debate, brought spending into this debate. That's a wonderful thing. Because, yes, that's what we're talking about. We are talking about spending hard-earned taxpayer money. So no amount of money is too small to discuss and to bring light to.

I would implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to, yes, look at the expansive nature of these appropriations bills, to look at the increase in the amount of money that this majority plans on spending over past Congresses.

I also would ask my colleagues to look at the process. Because the debate has been expanded, I think it's an appropriate time to talk about the issue regarding earmarks, special projects. We have now a policy apparently in this House of Representatives, that allows the majority party or, actually, one Member of the majority party, to determine when he decides which earmark, which special project, warrants support by the entire House or warrants the opportunity to even have a vote on a special project.

But can you have a vote on a specific special project? No, no. What we will have, our special projects that are the pet special projects of one individual, brought into a conference report, and no opportunity, no opportunity for any Member of this body to point out that, in fact, that ought to have a particular vote, that we ought to have individuals stand up.

I support the amendment of the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

We do have some concerns on this side about the legislation put together, as we would have on any large bill that spends billions of dollars, but I want to commend my colleague from North Carolina for his fair work and his hard work on this legislation.

With that, I would like to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

If I can refer to the gentleman, I believe I heard, and maybe we can sort this out, but I think that if you include

the supplementals on both sides, that we went from $34.2 billion to $39.2 billion, which would be a 15.2 percent increase, perhaps not the 17 I said earlier, but in either event, frankly, whether it's 17 percent, 15 percent or the 13.6, if you leave both of the supplementals out, it's a lot of money. It's billions and billions and billions of dollars of increase.

Some of that increase is a lot more than inflation, multiple times more than inflation, and it's a lot more than taking the growth in inflation and the growth in population and put it together. Most importantly, it's a lot more than personal income growth.

That's something we need to look at, as we are looking at all these appropriations and all of these spending bills. Because if we increase spending faster than people's incomes are increasing in America, it is unsustainable over time unless you continue to take more and more and more of their hard-earned money away from them.

Now, I know that's what many of you on the other side of the aisle want to do. But, A, we don't; and, B, even if you want to do it, eventually you'll run out of space. Eventually, you'll take it all if you increase at this kind of level.

Once again, this amendment does not ask anybody to cut anything. It simply tells this one element, this one part of the bureaucracy in Homeland Security to do, get by and exist on the same amount of money that you had last year.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague for his comments.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I felt compelled to say something after the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from New York talked about bureaucracy. It's easy to pick on bureaucracy. I ask any Member of this House that has talked to any constituencies, whether it's about a Social Security issue, a veterans' issue, Department of Homeland Security, FAA issue, to talk about it, and they will tell you that they had trouble with the bureaucracy, that they were having to call your office because they had trouble with the bureaucracy. This government has grown at a pace way beyond our population.

As we know, once somebody gets in a position in government, what they try to do is to expand that position, to get another secretary, to get an assistant secretary, an executive secretary, and so forth, because they are trying to build their power base.

So, yes, you ask any citizen that was affected by Katrina on the gulf coast if we have too much bureaucracy in our government, because a lot of those individuals down there that were hurt by that hurricane have yet to get assistance, or the full assistance they need, because of the bureaucracy in Washington D.C. So don't say that the bureaucracy is just something easy to pick on.

Let me say this. The gentleman from California is very earnest in wanting to get $10 million. Now, $10 million may not sound like a lot to a lot of people, but it's a lot of money. I will tell the gentleman from New York that commented on what was causing a deficit, yes, the war is causing the deficit, some part of the deficit. But what is causing the deficit, this is a moment of truth, is overspending, overspending.

Yes, the public did speak last November, and what they said is, you Republicans who have always stood up and said, government is too big and we have too much spending. Yet we were the ones up here increasing the size of government and spending too much money, it's time for us to reclaim the brand of being fiscal conservatives and watching after the taxpayers' dollars. That's exactly what this amendment from the gentleman from California does.

Our base, the Republican base, does not like to spend money or does not like to see government grow, because we think that the entrepreneurial spirit is that we can take care of ourselves better than the government can take care of us. The unfortunate side for our base is that the majority base thinks that the government can do a better job of looking after people than people themselves.

So that's the dilemma that we find ourselves in, that we have got one side that's trying to reclaim their brand, trying to make people realize that we really are who we say we are and doing the things that we are supposed to be doing in cutting the size of government and reducing spending. The other side is saying, here we are and here we are to take care of you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 38, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment directs FEMA to conduct a comprehensive study of the increase in demand for FEMA's emergency response and disaster relief services as a result of weather-related disasters associated with global warming.

It will tell us what FEMA can expect 5, 10, and 20 years from now. The assessment will include an analysis of the budgetary material and manpower implications of meeting such increased demand for FEMA services. We have been warned. We have been warned that we should expect to see more extreme weather, like severe rain storms and snowstorms that can come in an El Nino season.

We have been warned that we will see stronger hurricanes and hurricanes with more total rainfall. We have been warned to expect heat waves. We have been told to expect melting glaciers, rising sea levels swallowing low-lying land in places like Bangladesh, Florida, the gulf coast and Manhattan.

We have been warned that rising temperatures will force infectious diseases to move north or upwards in elevation to expose previously unexposed and, therefore, defenseless populations. We have been warned that droughts will intensify and lengthen, straining already strained water supplies and bring crop failures. Droughts also place those areas at greater risk for wildfires.

These warnings come from the most respected, most credible, most well-studied scientists this world has to offer. This was most recently affirmed by the Fourth Assessment Report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Turns out, they were right.

The 11 hottest years on record have occurred since 1994. Two of the three last hurricane seasons have broken records. The polar ice cap is melting even faster than our previous best estimates. Greenland's ice is melting. Permafrost in Alaska is thawing, causing homes to crumble. Residents of low-lying nations like Tuvalu have applied for entry into other countries as climate refugees and have been denied.

West Nile virus from Africa has taken a toehold in the U.S. The European heat wave of 2003 killed well over 15,000 people. Carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere are at levels scientists say have not occurred in 400,000 years.

These effects are directly in line with the warnings we received from the scientific community. Even though it is difficult to attribute all of these effects directly to climate change, some have been able to. A 2006 article in the journal Nature blames half of the risk associated with the European heat on human-induced warming.

The World Health Organization has estimated that 150,000 deaths every year can already be attributed to climate change.

□ 1645

Hurricane Katrina gave us another grim warning, telling us not only what we should expect, but showing us what happens if we're not prepared.

Katrina showed us that when disasters hit, the most vulnerable among us become even more vulnerable because they lack the resources and access to cope. That was made clear as image

after image of those hit the hardest were people of modest means and people of color.

In fact, in the Chicago heat wave of 1995, African Americans were twice as likely to die as Caucasians. The elderly, many of whom could not afford air conditioning, made up most of the victims.

Katrina showed us that disasters are expensive. We have so far spent about $77 billion on disaster assistance for Hurricanes Katrina, Wilma and Rita alone. Insurance companies whose very existence rely on their predictive abilities have seen enough to make them drop certain coverage and to conduct campaigns to try to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. Reinsurance companies in particular, like Swiss Re, have taken a leadership role in promoting action on climate change.

Katrina has showed us that an unprepared FEMA costs time, money and ultimately lives. If past is prologue, we have an obligation to look at the future in order to prepare. We have to allow FEMA to take into account the realities of the challenges that await them.

At this moment we can still choose among policy options. We can deal with the effects of climate change in one of two ways. We can acknowledge the extraordinary challenges before us and prepare for them voluntarily and aggressively, but steadily, predictably and controllably, or we can continue to create policy as if there's no problem and wait for the severe weather to control our pace of adaptation. The choice is ours.

Let FEMA prepare for the task ahead. Vote ''yes'' on the Kucinich amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his eloquence, both about the potential threat of global warming and what that may mean for emergencies that we have to deal with in the future, and also for the need to repair and rebuild FEMA so that we have a nimble, responsive agency that can respond to all kinds of disasters all over this country.

I understand that the gentleman will perhaps be willing to withdraw this amendment. I hope that he will do that, but I want to assure him that we understand what he's focusing on, and that we will work with him as we go to conference to make sure that FEMA has the resources that it needs. We have beefed up FEMA's resources a good deal in this bill.

Now, on the question of who should be studying global warming and assessing its future impact, there are legitimate questions, I believe, as to whether FEMA is the agency that's best equipped to do this. Other agencies, such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, do have expertise in this area, but if that expertise is not being translated into practical preparation, and if there's not adequate coordination between NOAA and the research operations and the operational agencies, then that obviously is a concern that needs to be addressed. I appreciate the Member from Ohio's raising that concern, and promise that we will work with you.

Mr. KUCINICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I will.

Mr. KUCINICH. First of all, I want to thank the chairman for his willingness to work to address this issue of the need for an increase in demand for FEMA's emergency response services. And I think that, as the bill moves to conference, that it could be a service to people in all those areas which are likely to be assailed by adverse weather conditions to make sure that FEMA understands that there's going to be greater demand on their services.

And if the gentleman, as you have indicated, is willing to take this issue up in conference on behalf of all of us, I certainly would be willing to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move to strike the requisite number of words on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has just been withdrawn.

Mr. CARTER. I believe I have the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for objection has passed.

If the gentleman just wishes to strike the requisite number of words——

Mr. CARTER. Okay. I'll wait for the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REICHERT:

Page 2 line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 2 line 16, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $11,000,000)''.

Page 4 line 24, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Intelligence, I rise today to offer an amendment that would restore a cut to the Department of Homeland Security's intelligence function.

This bill cuts the analysis and security's intelligence functions. This bill cuts $8 million from that account from last year, and this bill cuts the analysis and operations account by $8 million from last year, and is $23 million below the administration's request.

I simply do not understand why we would be cutting the intelligence funding. Let's be clear about this. Intelligence is what we use to prevent terrorist attacks. Good intelligence helped prevent the recent plots against Fort Dix and against John F. Kennedy Airport in New York. The Department of Homeland Security intelligence had a role in both of these cases, and, in fact, in the JFK plot the Department of Homeland Security was sharing classified intelligence with the private sector for more than a year before the threat was made public.

My amendment attempts to strike an appropriate balance between response, recovery and prevention. This legislation, in its current form, includes cuts to intelligence and yet significantly increases response and recovery programs.

While all are important to homeland security, I think we can all agree that it is better to prevent a terrorist attack than be forced to respond to one. According to the Department of Homeland Security, this bill would reduce the Department of Homeland Security's intelligence support for border security, terrorist travel, and human smuggling. It would severely impact the Department's ability to assess these threats, and would harm their efforts to focus on homegrown terrorism and violent extremism within the United States.

My amendment simply adds $10 million for analysis operations to that account to help restore the Department's intelligence functions. This would eliminate the cut and provide a modest $2 million increase from last year.

The terrorists only have to be right once, but to defend ourselves, we have to be right every time. Intelligence is the most sound investment we can make as a Nation to prevent terrorism.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington, although I want to heartily endorse the emphasis he's given to the importance of the intelligence and analytical functions.

Perhaps I can best begin by making an observation about this bill as a whole. We have closely examined the status of the programs that we're funding, their history of drawing down funds, their unspent balances, their ability to spend the money that has been requested. And so when the gentleman sees a reduction in funding of the sort that he sees in this account, it would be a big mistake to read that as a de-emphasis of this function or some kind of judgment that this function is not important. We think it's highly important. But we do have some observations that are included in the committee report.

I refer the gentleman to page 23 of the report about the rationale behind the, we hope, temporary reductions that we've written into this bill. It's a short section. Let me just read it. ''The Committee has reduced the funding level for intelligence and analysis below the amounts requested. The Committee notes that the Office of Intelligence and Analysis carried over

significant unobligated balances at the end of fiscal year 2006, and has shown no signs of an increased pace of obligations during the current fiscal year.''

That is not something we're pleased about, but the best way to create some pressure and some incentives to correct this situation, to get this function moving, is what the committee has done.

The gentleman's amendment would reduce by $10 million the amounts provided to the managerial function and the Border Patrol at DHS and reallocate those funds for the intelligence functions.

But as I said, at the end of 2006 the intelligence program had $50 million remaining unspent, largely because it was unable to hire the staff at the rate at which it was planned. There's been no indication from the intelligence managers of the Department that the pace of hiring has increased, so we fully expect the programs will end this year with significant balances unspent. It's simply imprudent to keep appropriating more money when those sizable balances remain unspent.

Now, as for the offset, briefly, the amendment proposes to reduce funding for the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management by $1 million, or 1 percent. That, as we've said earlier, would nip in the bud our efforts to better ensure privacy and to enforce civil rights. That's the reason there's a slight increase in that function. And the gentleman's amendment would remove that, as well as reduce funding for the office of the Under Secretary for Management, which is tied to the need to consolidate DHS operations in a new headquarters.

So, in the other aspect of the amendment, perhaps even more dangerously, the amendment proposes to reduce CBP salaries, Border Patrol salaries and expenses, by $6 million. That could generate significant vulnerabilities in the Border Patrol's ability to ensure the security of the northern and southern borders.

So the offsets are not good, and the overall increase would, in all likelihood, remain unspent.

So for those reasons, and certainly not for any lack of concern about intelligence and analytical operations, I do reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to address the Chamber and also to commend the gentleman for his excellent amendment.

As the gentleman knows, I come from, hail from the great State of New Jersey where we are all too well aware of why we are here on the floor tonight discussing the issue of homeland security. My district is in the shadows of the Twin Towers.

I commend the gentleman for his opening comments when he stated that we need a balance between response, recovery and prevention. I would suggest, if we're going to strike that balance, that we might want to tip that balance a little bit to the way of prevention.

While as glad as my constituents are, immediately in the aftermath of 9/11, of how tremendous the response was from people, not only from New York City, New Jersey, my State, the entire tristate area, but America in general to what happened on 9/11. That was the response.

And as great as it was, the recovery after 9/11, and putting people's lives back in order as well, the thing that most New Yorkers and all Americans would agree on is if we could have prevented 9/11 to occur in the first place, how much better that would have been.

Now, we just had another incident in the State of New Jersey as well, I'm sure the gentleman knows, down in the southern part of the State with regard to several terrorists, this time homegrown terrorists trying to get into a U.S. military establishment and shoot up that establishment. In that case we did not have to look at that balance with regard to response or recovery because our government did such a phenomenal job in the area of prevention.

And what does the gentleman's, his amendment do today? He addresses that point of prevention, trying to prevent another 9/11, trying to prevent another incident that could have occurred in the State of New Jersey and the loss of life there.

And what does the amendment do? It tries to restore the $10 million cut that would have occurred should this amendment not occur.

Now, the other side of the aisle, on this amendment and a previous amendment, and I presume for the rest of this evening as well, they will be coming to the floor defending the bureaucracy. They will be coming to the floor defending the bureaucrats. They will be coming to the floor defending the status quo.

I would suggest that we do not want to defend the status quo. We want to improve the situation.

□ 1700

The gentleman's amendment will do that by putting the resources where they should be, in intelligence, which is prevention so that we should never have such an incident in this country again.

I commend the gentleman and encourage my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this amendment when it later comes to the floor for a vote.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to yield to my friend from Washington, someone that is a professional in law enforcement (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

I want to just respond to a couple of points that were made. Part of this budget is classified, and we can say one thing, though, in open session, and that is that the Department of Homeland Security disagrees with your assessment. For instance, your report states that the Office of Operations and Coordination has significant unobligated balances. According to the Department of Homeland Security, as of June 7 of this year, OPS has obligated 63 percent of fiscal year 2007's funding and 99.9 percent of fiscal year 2006 carry-over funding.

So let's just be real about this bill. If you are serious about intelligence, why are we cutting it by $8 million over last year's budget, $23 million over the suggested administration's budget?

This is what it does: It will reduce our ability to deploy personnel to the southwest and northern borders to support border enforcement efforts. It will reduce our ability to identify and assess threats to the security of the Nation's land, air, and sea borders. It will reduce our ability to analyze the threat of homegrown terrorism and domestic terrorism. It will reduce our ability to provide an alternative perspective to terrorist threats. It will reduce our ability to collect intelligence and support those intelligence owners and operators of the Nation's critical infrastructure. And it will reduce our ability to analyze terrorist travel trends and methods.

I have 33 years of law enforcement experience in the Seattle area, was the sheriff of Seattle before I came here, now serving in my second term in Congress. I understand the balance between response and prevention. I understand the balance of civil liberties and protection of the public against criminal activity. I understand the balance there. This bill puts this balance way out of whack.

One million dollars taken from management in the Secretary's office, $11 million taken from the Under Secretary's office. They still receive a $79 million increase. The committee's recommendation in this report remains intact; therefore, civil liberty funding and privacy, counternarcotics funding levels remain intact. They are not part of our offsets. Also not a part of our offset is CBC.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman for offering the amendment.

You want to listen to somebody that has expertise in this. And I don't think anybody has more expertise in intelligence than a local sheriff does, somebody that has been involved in trying to find some criminals. And the gentleman from Washington has certainly done that. He has brought his professionalism here to Washington. And I think it is good advice that the Members vote for this amendment and recognize that we are listening to somebody that has got the experience and not bureaucrats that think they know how to do a job and they have never actually even been in the field.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to urge my colleagues to support my good friend from Washington's amendment. It is a good amendment because, as a sheriff, he knows, firsthand, homeland security. And what he also knows is the most important thing we can be doing in this time of war is funding our intelligence capabilities domestically and internationally. And what this legislation does is reduce our capacity to gather intelligence through this homeland security appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I think what my colleague from Washington has offered is a very sensible thing. This bill actually has $23 million less in funding for intelligence resources than the President requested. And what my colleague does is restore the funding level to the prior year's funding for the intelligence-gathering resources of the Homeland Security Department.

I think overall what we have to discuss as a Congress is whether or not we are going to fight an offensive war. Are we going to do the necessary things, the intelligence gathering that we need to do as a country and as a nation to make sure that we are safe and secure when we are dealing with these very complicated threats both internationally and domestically.

We saw what has happened over the last few years with intelligence-gathering capabilities that during the 1990s were decimated. Our intelligence-gathering capabilities were decimated. And what we have to do as a nation is make sure we have the proper funding so we don't have those threats, we don't have those scares, that we don't have that level of war here at home.

So, Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague for offering this amendment. I urge its adoption. And I think we can do this on a very bipartisan basis to ensure that we have a strong homeland and have the proper intelligence-gathering resources funded by this United States Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield to my colleague from the great State of New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

And I just want to reiterate a point that you made at the end, and that is to take a brief look at history to see where our intelligence apparatus, if you will, has been in this country.

I was going to step up to the floor a little earlier on a previous amendment when one of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle began to give a history as to the budget process and the deficits and the like, and I was going to say at that time, we really shouldn't be looking back on some of these issues. But I think you raised a point that we need to look back to, and it brings us to the point of 9/11 and why we got there in the first place. And that was, we went through a time, following the collapse of the ''evil empire,'' as Ronald Reagan called it, the Soviet Union, the breakup of the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc, the end of the so-called Cold War. And there were Members from the other side of the aisle in this House and the other House, but specifically in this House who said, we do not need an intelligence apparatus in this country anymore.

I remember one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle said that we can even get rid of the CIA because we no longer need such an apparatus in a world free of the Soviet Union and the like. That was impetus during a previous administration, back during the Clinton administration.

The dollars of investments were not made during that period of time, and what was wrought because of that? What became because of that? Well, not just 9/11, which we are all familiar with. Something that people are less familiar with or already forget was the first bombing of the World Trade Center, when at that time the towers did not come down, collapsing upon the neighbors and the people in the area; but you may recall that bombing in the cellars and the trucks.

What it led to also was bombing of U.S. interests around the world as well. In each instance it was because of a lack of dollars and investment in apparatus, invested in our intelligence community, in the CIA and other apparatus, National Security Agency and the like. Because of that those things came about.

So the gentleman is absolutely correct in this case of looking back to see where we did not make the investments in the past and where our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would say continue that wrong philosophy of not investing in intelligence but instead just looking to the recovery and the response.

We believe that we must be looking to the prevention, as the author of this amendment said at the very outset, that we must look to the prevention, and that has come about through the investment of our intelligence.

So I just want to reiterate that point that the gentleman raised. Look back to history. Look at which party led us to the problems that we have today and what we need to do about it today. Look back at history.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of this piece of legislation. This bill has particular significance for all Americans concerned about promoting the necessary and difficult objectives of protecting our homeland.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, it has been a pleasure for me to work with Chairman PRICE on adding language and enhancements that will make the bill stronger and generally more effective.

As a Member who represents a district that comprises 700 miles along the Texas-Mexico border, I am distinctly aware of the challenges that confront frontline law enforcement officers charged with upholding criminal laws such as drug and human trafficking. In recognition of these inherent dangers presented to law enforcement officials, also to private landowners as well as elected officials concerned about border issues, and the statutory requirements imposed by the Department of Homeland Security to erect a fencing barrier that spans 370 miles along the southwestern border, I was pleased to work with the chairman, who was working with me on these two distinct issues.

My first and most important objective that I would like to address is regarding homeland security grants that would hopefully help the border cities and the law enforcement personnel that are on the border such as the police and the sheriff, the first responders, for stemming the tide of drug and human trafficking along our border. Chairman PRICE was instrumental in working with me and helping us to obtain $15 million for funding for Operation Stonegarden, a program that this administration failed to seek funding for and which had previously been funded in 2006.

Operation Stonegarden began as a successful pilot program in 2005 and helped 14 border States on these issues. The initiative gave the States the flexibility that the Department grants provided to enhance coordination among not only the States but local community and Federal law enforcement agencies that are drastically needed. This pilot program resulted in an estimated 214 State, local, and tribal agencies working 36,755 man-days on various public safety as well as border security operations on the border.

The budgetary constraints imposed on the committee precluded more funding in this area, but the bill language sends a clear message that programs such as Stonegarden are viable and will serve as a funding aid to the law enforcement communities along the border.

Stonegarden did not receive funding last year. The funding assists local authorities with operational costs and equipment purchases that contribute to border security. The funds are intended to be used for operations involving both narcotics and human trafficking.

The second objective regarding the fencing and the barriers that are necessary, I want to thank the chairman also for working with us in making sure we provide these types of barriers in an appropriate manner.

I believe that the bill reported by the full committee and under consideration by the full House represents the most viable approach that can be utilized. I want to thank the chairman for allowing us to be able to present this bill. And as you well know, Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that is critical, an area that we have been lacking in this country where the administration has failed to provide the appropriate resources on the border. So I want to thank the chairman for allowing us to do that.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

In title I, under the heading ''Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $79,000)''.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the Chief of Staff account in the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management to the fiscal year 2007 level. It represents a $79,000 reduction, and it would go from $2.639 million to $2.56 million.

The bill's current funding level is a 3 percent increase over fiscal year 2007 as enacted. There has been at least $105.5 billion in new Federal spending authorized by the House Democrat leadership this year. The current Federal debt is $8.8 trillion, roughly $29,000 for every U.S. citizen.

□ 1715

And it grows by over $1 billion a day. Entitlement spending, being Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, is out of control and within a generation will force either significant cutbacks in services or benefits or massive tax increases.

The Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office have been warning Congress that the growth in direct spending, and that is spending that's on autopilot outside the annual spending process, is occurring at an unsustainable rate due to well-known demographic trends and other factors. Discretionary spending has also grown exponentially and must be brought under control.

This amendment is the first step of many necessary steps in forcing fiscal discipline and sanity upon the Federal Government and out-of-control Federal spending. We must restore fiscal discipline and find both commonsense and innovative new ways to do so, and we need to find ways to do more with less.

I have often speculated as to how this Congress would react if we brought a budget down here and presented a budget that would actually be a balanced budget without increasing taxes. We were on a trajectory to do that. And many of the things that have happened so far here in this 110th Congress have reversed that opportunity that we've had and made it far more difficult for us to be able to get to the point where we can balance this budget again.

Most of us will look back and remember that at the time of the beginning of this current administration, we were caught in a real flux, we had a dot-com bubble that was an unexpected growth in our economy. It brought in Federal revenues that surpassed the anticipated revenue stream and actually surpassed the ability of Congress to react to increasing spending with the Federal revenue increase. So, when the bubble burst, it slowed down our revenue, and at the same time, since we hadn't anticipated the increase, we ended up with some surplus in this budget, and we paid down some debt.

That was a good thing, and I would hope we could find a way to get back to that good thing, but the good thing didn't last very long because, at the same time we had the bursting of the dot-com bubble, we also had things we knew about that had to do with some corporate corruption. That was difficult on our economy and our adjustments. And nearly the same time, and from a national historical perspective it was the same time, we had the September 11 attacks, which in the end generated the very subject matter that is the appropriations of the Department that this bill appropriates. All of those things added together turned this increase or spending and slowed down our revenue increase. Now we've seen the growth in this economy. We have seen unprecedented growth in our Dow, for example. And we have a strong economy that surpassed my anticipation. It went beyond my optimism and exceeded that, Mr. Chairman.

So, what I would submit is that this Congress needs to have the discipline every step of the way, wherever we have the opportunity discretionarily, to take us back down to the level where we can one day come to this floor, Democrats and Republicans, and offer a balanced budget and then talk about how we spend that money within that balanced budget without increasing taxes. That's the key, and that's the thrust, and that's the message, Mr. Chairman, that I bring with this amendment that simply reduces the COS office by $79,000.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to indicate that we will accept this amendment, but I want to explain my reasoning, if I might, and explain it very carefully.

For 2 hours now we have sat in this Chamber and have heard Republican Members railing against the Bush administration. Member after Member after Member has risen in this Chamber to condemn Bush administration bureaucrats in unsparing terms, and not one voice on that side of the aisle has been raised in opposition, not one.

So, we are asking ourselves, how long are we going to defend a very carefully crafted bill that deals with the administration's legitimate needs to administer its Department?

Now, I don't care how many times people get on this floor and claim that we have made lavish increases. The fact is, and I will say it one more time, this bill cuts departmental operations. It cuts them below the President's request, and it cuts them below 2007 levels. And that is not a matter of inflation adjustment. It is a real cut in nominal terms.

Now, within that overall cut there are some adjustments. Some accounts are cut more, some are increased. They are not increased for frivolous reasons. If we have made an increase, it has been because there is a good rationale for that increase. A couple of the earlier cuts targeted the account that includes the Privacy Office, the Civil Rights Office, offices that need work and need to be strengthened.

So we have scrubbed this bill very carefully. We have basically provided only for current staff on board, and, in a few instances, for staff that we knew needed to be augmented to perform very specific functions. So, we have been conscientious within the context of overall reduction.

Of course, the easiest thing in the world is to rail against the front office or the Department, to rail against the bureaucrats, to say these are abstract, invisible cuts. Let's just cut away, and then beat our chest about how tough we are fiscally. I tell you, we've been tough fiscally, but we have not been irresponsible. We have tied, in each case, our funding recommendation to specific needs of the Department, specific functions that need to be continued or need to be augmented. So we are asking, why should we be the ones to stand up for this administration?

Now, I know not every Republican is in line with the sentiments that have been expressed here. I know there are Members on both sides of the aisle who understand that you need some reasonable level of funding to run a department. And in past years, we have provided that reasonable level, and we have done it again this year. But we are not going to sit here and simply hear all this and then be alone in our defense. So we accept the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow through on the comments made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. And I think for Members who aren't here, which is approximately 90 percent of the body, for Members who are watching in their offices or perhaps not watching at all, I should make clear what is happening here and what is not happening here.

We are not having a real debate on a real bill. What is happening is a debate, it is really ''filibuster by amendment.'' It has been made quite clear by the opposition leadership that the opposition

party intends to bring this institution to a halt today. And the way they intend to do that is by offering amendment after amendment after amendment. There are about 120 amendments pending. And as the gentleman from North Carolina has indicated, we are trying to responsibly deal with a budget from an administration of the other party.

The easiest thing in the world for us to do would be for us to gut and slash the administrative accounts in the bill for any department, because, after all, the administration is Republican and we are Democratic. But what we have tried to do instead is to meet our responsibilities. We tried to tie administrative budget levels to the actual needs of the agencies, and we have tried to deal with those agencies in a bipartisan manner.

But we have a series of amendments not taking any meaningful reductions out of these agency budgets. We have a series of very tiny nicks being taken out of these budgets. And these amendments, in my judgement, are designed more to take up the time of this body than they are to produce a different financial result. And as the gentleman from North Carolina indicates, we have been, for the last 2 hours, trying to defend an administrative budget for the other party's administration.

Now, we may not be the smartest folks in the world, but we haven't exactly fallen off a turnip truck. And I also think that we are not exactly cut out to be suckers. And so, I don't think that we can allow our friends on the other side of the aisle to assume that we will simply serve as punching bags, and that we will simply stand here continuing to defend administration operation accounts.

And so, as far as I am concerned, if the administration and if the minority party's leadership can't control their own Members in terms of these budgetary attacks on these agencies, then who are we to stand in the way? So, I think what happens to these administrative levels will be pretty much up to the administration's own party. It will be very interesting to watch.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

It is asked, you know, why are we doing what we are doing, and why are these amendments coming to the floor, and why are these Members saying what they are saying? There is a big picture involved here, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to speak to that.

Number one, this isn't just about increasing spending in one particular program or one pet project, this is about the now majority increasing spending everywhere, on virtually every program and virtually every pet project at almost every opportunity. Six months into the new majority, $6 billion on the omnibus appropriations, $17 billion in non-war-related emergency spending supplemental, $21 billion more on top of discretionary spending above the level at which we realize the veto threat is going to occur.

Each of these appropriation bills is representing an installment on a plan to increase nonemergency spending by more than $81 billion over last year. That is a spending increase of 9 percent, three times the rate of inflation.

Now, I will be the first to acknowledge that when our party was in the majority, we made similar mistakes. We made similar big spending increases. I recall my first term in 2000, coming at the end of the Clinton administration, an 11 percent increase in discretionary spending. That got built into the base, and what happened? Our budgets got thrown through the loop forever. We went into deficit. It was a big mistake at the time, that we should not have done that.

But there are four specific problems I have with this particular bill before us, Mr. Chairman, which the gentleman from Iowa's amendment does some things to help fix.

First, the President's budget called for an increase of 7.2 percent. This budget calls for an increase of 14 percent. So it raises the ante. So, instead of doubling the spending at the rate of inflation, we're going four times the rate of inflation on this bill.

Number two, this bill takes advantage of prefunding. They have already used the 2007 war supplemental to prefund over $1 billion in fiscal year 2008 Homeland Security appropriations. That lets us free up the cap for more spending. So, it's really more than a 14 percent increase from one year to the next.

Third, and this is my biggest concern, Mr. Chairman, earmark transparency. We have come a long ways on earmarks. The former majority party made mistakes on earmarks. Let me say this one more time. Republicans made mistakes on earmarks. And good thing Republicans, last session, began fixing those mistakes. Last session we brought to the floor and passed in the rules new earmark transparency rules, new earmark accountability rules, giving the public the ability to see the earmarks, see who the author is, and giving Members of Congress, there as the people's representatives, the ability to come to the floor and challenge those earmarks. To the Democratic Party credit, they extended those earmark reforms. And you know what, Mr. Chairman? They built upon them. They improved upon those earmark reforms. The Democrat majority improved upon the Republican earmark reforms when they came into power at the beginning of this year.

Where are we now? What has happened? We went three steps forward, and now we went six steps back, Mr. Chairman. Now, in instead of giving the public the ability to see these earmarks, instead of giving Members of Congress, the people's representatives, the ability to challenge them, to vote on them, to have scrutiny on them while we consider these appropriation bills, what are we doing? They are airdropping them in the conference report.

Okay. What did that just mean for those people who don't know our lingo? This means we're not going to see the earmarks while we are considering this legislation as they go through the House and the other body, the Senate. They will be conveniently put in the bill at the end of the process so that no amendment can address the issue, so that the public will have very little time to see these earmarks, so that no Member of Congress can challenge the worthiness of a pet project. When we have come to the time where Congress is putting in thousands and thousands and thousands of these earmarks, raking up to tens of millions of dollars, one of the bills we are going to consider this week has something like $20 billion slated for earmarks in just one bill.

□ 1730

No vote, just $20 billion, empty money to be spoken for, later inserted in the conference report by a couple of people in the majority, namely the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the dean of my delegation. No transparency, no public accountability, no ability for the people, Representatives, to come to the floor and challenge these earmarks.

That is not earmark reform, Mr. Chairman.

We need real earmark reform. Let's not go backwards. And what is worse about all of this is, these bills are coming in far above where they ought to be from a funding level. We are going to have a veto at the end of the year and a train wreck.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to build on the comments by my colleague from Wisconsin, but I also want to talk a little bit about this amendment and the previous amendment. I tried to talk about it, but did not get recognized by the chairman, unfortunately.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much concerned about the need for us to restore fiscal discipline to this House. I have only been here a little over one term. I am in my second term. I came here with the notion that Republicans would be people who cared about fiscal discipline. We did not care about fiscal discipline as much as I would have liked for us to, but we made a start in the right direction, and I was pleased about that.

Now what we are trying to do is bring more fiscal discipline to this House and to spending. We do have a broken process.

I find it really interesting that the gentleman on other side of the aisle, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is talking about our trying to shut this place down. I think that he has a very funny definition of this open process and this open rule and our being able to offer amendments. That

is the way I thought a democracy operated.

Saying that we are trying to ''shut the place down'' by doing our jobs is a little disingenuous, I think. I think that is coming because in the last 5 months you all have become so used to ramming things through with no opportunity for amendments that you find this a very unusual process. Well, we intend to use the opportunity available to us to offer amendments every chance we get.

He also made the comment that we are taking up the time of this body to do frivolous things. Well, again, this is the job that we are elected to do. We are not taking up the time of the body. We are doing what we are supposed to be doing.

You spent 3 months dealing with what we considered a frivolous exercise in talking about not funding our troops serving overseas, trying to protect us so we can do the very things that we are doing; and you didn't want to give them the money that they needed in order to be able to do that. That is where a lot of time was wasted, as far as I'm concerned.

I want to also talk about some comments that have been made by members of the other party that show that there were some people who made promises that have not been kept.

This quote is from 1–5–2007 from the gentleman from Alabama. ''Today, we made a strong commitment to returning fiscal responsibility to Congress. It is vital that Congress improves its stewardship of the taxpayers' money so we do not pass along today's spending tabs to our children and grandchildren.''

That is a Democratic Member from Alabama. That is what we are talking about here today. We want to make cuts in this unnecessary spending so that we're not passing along these bills to our grandchildren and children.

From the chairman of this very subcommittee, ''This bill mandates that all grants and contract funds be awarded through full and open competitive processes, except when other funding distribution mechanisms are required by statute. This approach creates a level playing field and also ensures that there are no congressional or administration earmarks in the bill.''

Well, that is very different from what we know is going to be happening on this bill, where these earmarks are going to be ''air dropped,'' as we say, later on, after the bill has already been passed, and people don't get a chance to react to those earmarks.

Another Member from Arizona: ''The American people deserve nothing less than a government that is fully accountable and completely transparent. They need to know that their elected Representatives are focused on the public interest, not the special interests and not the lobbyists' interests.''

In the last amendment that was offered, we wanted to do more to increase what is happening in national security. No. You all prefer to spend a lot more money on bureaucracy.

I am very pleased that you are going to take this amendment offered by my colleague from Iowa. I think that is a step in the right direction. But we need to do a lot more of that. We need to cut funding here, and we need to make sure that you fulfill the promises that you made so strongly last fall and at the beginning of this session.

Let's make this earmark process transparent. Let's know what is going to be funded in these bills. Let's put it all out there. And let's have the open debate that you promised we would have.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee mentioned that this debate is really not about the bills that we are debating this week, and in a sense, he is right. Unfortunately, that is the case. Particularly later this week, we will be debating three other appropriation bills, some of which have headroom or a placeholder for tens of millions or hundreds of millions of dollars that we don't know what that spending is. It is put in place for earmarks to be added later.

So we really are not debating the real bills, and that is unfortunate. We should be. How can we as a legislative body decide whether this is appropriate spending or not when we don't know what is in the bill, when that will be added later?

I am well aware of the plan to have Members request and that these earmarks later on will be somehow made public. But that is the legislative equivalent of appointing an ombudsman. Why does a body like this need something like that? We are not potted plants. We should be able to see what is in the bills. These are earmarks that should be transparent.

The Appropriations Committee has before it right now some 30,000 earmark request forms that could be made public. Other Members could see them. We could see if these earmark requests are appropriate or not. But we are not allowed to see them. We won't be allowed to see them. We will only be allowed to see those few that the leadership decides that we can see, the ones that are approved later; and then once we do see them, we will have no ability whatsoever to have an up or down vote on the individual earmarks. None.

That is not a legislative body. That is saying that we can't handle it, so we are going to appoint an ombudsman, in this case maybe a couple of members of the Appropriations Committee, and hope that they will sufficiently scrub these earmarks. That is simply not acceptable.

To the other point, that we are simply defending what the President has done or what the administration has done, let me just take one program here that we are discussing today, and that is the State Homeland Security grant program.

This program is being plussed up by, I think, about $50 million, a significant plus-up. Yet the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I think very wisely, in the committee report indicated several areas where this grant program is being misused, where there are several frivolous programs going on. Let me just name a few of them.

A $3,000 grant was given under the State Homeland Security Grant Program to the city of Converse, Texas, for a trailer used to transport lawn mowers to lawn mower drag races. For a fire department in Wisconsin, $8,000 for clown and puppet shows. That is under the Assistance to Firefighters grant program.

Under the State Homeland Security grant program, $202,000 was spent on ''downtown'' security cameras for a rural fishing village in Dillingham, Alaska. Now, ''downtown,'' there is a population of 2,400. This is 300 miles from Anchorage. There are no roads linking that city to anywhere. So $202,000 for security cameras in a remote fishing village in Alaska.

Keep in mind, we are plussing up spending for State Homeland Security grants by $50 million. Why in the world are we doing that?

Just a few others. $3,500 for small crates and kennels to hold stray animals. This is in Modoc County, California.

There are some even in my own State and in my own district; I think we are spending $100,000 or so for synchronization of traffic lights in Apache Junction, Arizona, in my district. That money shouldn't come from the Federal Government. We are making local governments dependent on the Federal Government.

Why are we plussing up funding for the State Homeland Security grant program by $50 million in this bill with this kind of wasteful spending?

As I mentioned, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee wisely pointed out some of these abuses. I will offer amendments to strike some of that funding. I hope that we have the support of the majority here.

This is not frivolous time being spent here. We are spending far too much money. We can ill afford it. If we can't do it here, when will we do it?

As I pointed out, we are not discussing a lot of the funding that is in the bills. It is off limits. We don't know what it is. It will be added later. It is secret at this point, secret from us, the Members.

So I applaud my colleagues for bringing forth amendments, and I hope that we will have more time to debate it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I too want to comment on some of the comments made by the Appropriations Committee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There are two things we are doing here. One was just very eloquently presented by the gentleman from Arizona.

We are trying to say and trying to insist that when these projects, when these earmarks, when these sorts of things appear in these bills, that there is sunshine, that people know what they are, that they can see them and that they are subject to an up-and-down vote, rather than these big slush funds that appear in this bill and others as they are currently constructed.

The other thing we are trying to do here is very simple, and that is saving the taxpayers $21 billion. There is $21 billion more that has been proposed to spend in the Democrats' appropriations bills than what the President proposed to spend.

Now, I might add that I am one of the 160 people who voted for a budget to spend $20 billion less than the President has proposed. It is not like what the President proposed was a flat budget. It is not like the President proposed a budget that didn't increase spending; it did. But what you have done is taken the President's proposals for spending increases, accepted all that, and added to it in most cases.

I think it is very interesting that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee seems so surprised that the amendments that some of us are offering, including the one that I offered just about an hour or so ago, that these were reducing spending that was actually proposed by the administration.

It may come as a surprise to people on the other side of the aisle, but we don't really care who proposed it, whether the President proposed it, a Democrat proposed it or a Republican proposed it. If it is spending more money than we believe should be spent, if it is increasing spending that increases the deficit, if it is further putting pressure, further trying to create a reason to enact the largest tax increase in American history that you all want to do, then we are going to want to stop it. And that is what we are doing.

Now, there was a comment also made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that there were 120 amendments, I believe he said, on this bill. We are talking about a lot money. I would bet there are a lot more than 120 earmarks that get put in here by the time things are done. I know there is at least $21 billion of more spending in all of these appropriations bills, and specifically on this bill itself a nearly $5 billion increase in spending over last year. So, for $5 billion and countless thousands of earmarks, 120 amendments is not a problem.

It may be many more than that. It could take many more than that.

□ 1745

These are big issues. These are important things. This is about whether we are going to start to arrest spending where we can, or whether we are going to let it continue to grow and grow and grow. Whether we are going to allow Americans to keep at least the amount of their own money that they keep now, or whether this government is going to continue to tax them and tax them and take more of it. If it is 120 amendments or 240 amendments or 480 amendments, we will stand here and we stand ready to do that.

I would hope that the message would get across at some point to the other side of the aisle that what they are doing is not right, and that these amendments are processes by which we are getting to what is right, which is not increasing spending on everything, not increasing all of these things and trying to keep it under control and making sure that when we do spend the taxpayers' money, we are up front about what it is, about who requested it and why. And that people have an opportunity to challenge that request.

Mr. Chairman, we have begun some amendments and we have a lot more. This is not a joke. This is not silly, this is not something that we don't believe in. This is something we believe in very deeply, and it is something that is important and that's why we are engaged in this fight and will continue to be engaged in this fight.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I have absolutely the highest respect for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY. He has worked very hard on this, along with Ranking Member LEWIS, on the overall appropriations process.

The conversation he had with this House a few minutes ago concerns me in that I think Mr. KING, what Mr. KING has proposed, it is small but it is frugal. It is trying to set a tone. As our chairman points out, we have offered, there have been offered over 100 amendments to this bill. What does that tell us? That tells us there are people who are looking at this in detail and trying to see if we are doing things wisely. We are exposing this bill to scrutiny.

I think the message that we are trying to send to the Congress and to the process is that it is good to lay out before the world honestly how we spend our money. And, in turn, it is a way to show concern for a process that has been created by the chairman which will not disclose how we are going to spend special project money as we debate these bills.

Two of the previous speakers have raised this concern. Quite frankly, the chairman mentioned we are trying to shut down the House. Well, if examining the work of the House is shutting down the House, examining it in detail, then, yes, I guess we are trying to shut it down. But I don't think that is the way you shut it down. That is the way you open it up. You let sunlight come on the process and let everybody look at it and decide: Is it worth that extra $79,000 or not? That is what this process is all about.

But in the earmark process that is being proposed in appropriations this year, there is no sunlight upon that process. This process is in the dark. In fact, we are being asked over the next couple of weeks to vote on numerous bills that have billions of dollars set out in some sort of unidentified account that tells you we are going to spend this money, we will let you know how.

I am sure my beloved wife, whom I love dearly, would love to have that deal; and I am sure there are a lot of other people who would love to have that deal. Here is the pot of money; I will let you know how I am going to spend it later, but I am going to spend it.

In this particular process, it is going to be done behind a closed door. And behind that closed door, and the Members of Congress, who by the way in this Republic were sent here to do just what we are doing here today, examine this spending in detail, we were sent here to take a look at this spending on the earmark process. But we are being excluded. And if we have an objection that we think is offensive to America, we should be able to have a process to stop that.

But when you ''air drop,'' as has been described, secretly drop into a conference committee the earmark process determined by one or more small groups of people without the 435 Members of Congress looking at it, too, I don't think that is any sunlight at all. That seems to be a dark, dark room where legislation is taking place. And it will only be exposed when you get a ''take it or leave it'' proposition back on the floor of the House. Take it or leave it. You can't amend it; you can't deal with it. Take it or leave it.

Really, we are showing what it means to put sunlight on a procedure. We are going to try to continue to put sunlight on this procedure because the American people have raised the issue to us at the polling place that we spend too much money. So let's let them see how we spend it.

I commend those who have examined this bill in detail and are willing to come in and make such delicate surgical cuts so as to say, this guy doesn't deserve an extra $79,000. You know, that is the kind of thing that is going to save this Republic. If we can just get the earmark process to be done out in the open, in the sunlight for all of us to see, it would be a better process.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak before the House, and I appreciate the fact that we are taking this amendment up under an open rule which allows for a wide-ranging debate on the important issues of the day.

Now, this amendment is very simple. It saves the taxpayers money. It saves the taxpayers money, Mr. Chairman, and I think that is what is very important for us to understand here on this House floor. If we do not spend this money in the appropriations bill, it will reduce our deficit.

As the chairman of the full committee said in his speech here on the floor a few minutes ago, he believes Republicans are simply filibustering.

Well, he is in the wrong Chamber for filibustering; it is across the hall in the Senate.

What we are doing here today is bringing out the fact that we as Republicans, our side of the aisle, we actually want to reduce spending and balance the budget. We have had some tough times since 2001, since this war began, when we were attacked in 2001. But, Mr. Chairman, what we have to do is understand as a nation, we have to cut this deficit and balance this budget and start paying down the national debt. We have to make sure that we have a balanced budget.

How do we begin that process for a balanced budget? It is not by raising taxes, which the other side of the aisle already proposed and actually adopted through their new budget that they put in place this new Congress. They made it clear that they want to roll back to the prior level of taxation, the very high level of taxation that we as Americans faced.

But what we believe in as conservatives, and on this side of the aisle especially, is that the way we balance the budget is not by raising taxes on the American people. We have plenty of income coming into the government, but we have a spending problem here. So with this amendment we are taking a small step, a very small step, but a step nonetheless, that will help us reduce spending.

The chairman of the full committee said they have been very busy spending for the Iraq war, the supplemental vote. Well, as we well know, within that Iraq war funding bill they have plenty of pork barrel spending, plenty of earmarks. Well, we believe over $20 billion in earmarks was in that final version of the bill. They were too busy spending on special interest projects to actually put in the details of this legislation so the American people can see what kind of pork barrel projects they have tucked into the legislation before us.

So first of all, the process is wrong.

Second, the spending is too high. The American people understand that, and they want us to do something about it. As conservatives, we need to take that first step. That first step is offered by my colleague from Iowa, Mr. KING, who has offered a very reasonable, very simple, very straightforward amendment that is good for the taxpayer and is good for Americans.

We all care about homeland security, Mr. Chairman. We believe it is in the interest of our government to fund homeland security and national defense effectively, but not blindly. Not simply because a number is put forward, do we have to accept it. And that is what the debate is about here today, about whether or not we are simply going to accept a high level of spending and look the other way while the deficit increases, while the American people are asked to spend more on government through their taxes.

But we have to take that first step. A small step, but a very good, very important step, nonetheless. I will be proud to vote for the King amendment when we get that chance here in a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to come forward with a consensus that these important spending matters deserve an open, honest, fair debate. It is not simply about getting it done quickly. We know that legislation takes awhile to craft. We should have an open debate and allow a real exchange of ideas about how to best spend our homeland security dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the American people understand that their government costs too much. So let's support my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), his amendment here today, that allows us to take a step in the right direction.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for his amendment, drawing attention once again to the amount of spending in this and, I am certain, in other appropriations bills as we go forward.

I think it is important for the Chamber and for all of those who might be watching to appreciate that spending is, indeed, the disease that infects Washington. It is the disease that makes it so that Americans all across this Nation no longer trust this Congress to do the right thing when it comes to being good stewards of their hard-earned taxpayer money.

In fact, this Congress so far has increased spending, authorization for spending, by over $50 billion already. And instead of being more responsible with the appropriations bills they are bringing forward, in fact we find tens of billions of dollars in more spending.

Now, the consequence of that is somehow you have to pay for that. What we have seen by our friends in the majority is adopting a budget that will be, if not the largest tax increase in the history of the Nation, the second largest tax increase, depending on how you do the numbers, but hundreds of billions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I know we have good friends who talk about the new direction that they brought to Washington, given the last election. Mr. Chairman, I am here to tell you, that new direction is backwards, and it is backwards to a time of tax and spend that, frankly, the American people don't favor.

One of the things the American people do favor, however, is sunshine. And they favor it for all of the activities that we engage in here in Congress, sunshine in the processes that we have, and sunshine in making sure that votes are recorded in committee, sunshine in terms of the debate that goes on. And, yes, Mr. Chairman, sunshine in terms of the money that this Congress spends, which is why it is so distressing that we have a new policy on behalf of the Appropriations Committee and the majority that allows for hidden spending, less transparency, less accountability when it comes to something that the American people care dearly about; and that is earmarks, special projects, or ''pork projects,'' as many people know them by back home.

□ 1800

We have been harping on this because it is such a change, such a remarkable change in policy and in procedure here on the House floor and within the House of Representatives.

And it's not just our opinion. It's not just our opinion. There are newspapers that have provided their opinion all across this Nation, that have agreed. They have said that the process that's been adopted, which would allow for one individual, one individual in this Chamber, to determine which special projects would be supported and to determine which projects would be included in a conference report, not brought to the floor in the usual appropriations process, not so that my colleagues here can stand up and say, I don't think we ought to be spending hard-earned taxpayer money on that project. In fact, I think I feel so strongly about that that we ought to vote on it, and people ought to be held accountable.

It's the kind of vote that when we were in the majority we allowed because it's an appropriate vote to allow, and we even went further in the last Congress and adopted a rule that said if earmarks, if special projects were put in in a conference report, when you only get to vote on the overall bill itself, you can't pick out individual projects. If they were put in that conference report, then a Member of the House on either side of the aisle could raise a point of order and say, we ought not be taking that up because it violates the rules of the House, and had an opportunity to highlight, to bring a specific vote for a specific measure.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that apparently is no longer the case, from what we hear by Members in the majority party now, and it's not only our opinion that it's the bad way to do the House's business, it's the opinion all across this Nation.

The Wisconsin State Journal recently wrote an editorial and said, with this maneuver, it will prevent the public and most lawmakers from questioning earmarks until it's too late. That means you can't do anything about it.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch said, But in a slick maneuver, they will keep them hidden from public scrutiny. In a slick maneuver, they will keep them hidden from public scrutiny.

Mr. Chairman, that's not the kind of leadership that the American people want. That's not the kind of responsible spending of hard-earned taxpayer money that the people want. That's not what they voted for in November. They didn't vote for more hidden rooms. They didn't vote for less scrutiny.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and to adopt any amendment that decreases spending in this appropriations bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, you know, it is amazing that the liberal leadership in the House is living up to the moniker of the hold-on-to-your-wallet Congress, and we see that they can't even get out of paragraph 1, Title I, of the bill without spending more money.

And I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa for offering his amendment. Sounds really simple, $79,000, make a reduction of $79,000 in spending and make it out of the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management. It's the right type thing to do.

In my district in Tennessee, people don't like what the Federal Government spends, and we are hearing from our constituents. They are looking at this bill, $36.3 billion, 6 percent more than was requested, 13.6 percent more than last year. And in the middle of all this money, we can't find a way to fund the fence, which is one of the things that people want to see, securing our southern border?

Now, my constituents are upset about that. They know that this is hypocrisy. They know that people are trying to skirt around the edges. They have caught on to this secret slush fund and going back to the way they were and the way things used to be done. And quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, it's something that they don't like, and they are hopeful that we are going to be down here making certain that we put some sunlight on what is taking place.

When you've got a group that is so addicted to the taxpayer dollar that they cannot get out of paragraph 1, Title I, of that bill without spending more money, you've got a problem. And my constituents know that that problem is not that the taxpayers aren't sending enough money up here. My constituents know that the problem is the Federal Government who has a spending problem. They know that it is the bureaucracy that has too much power over how that money is spent, and they know that it is the government that has a ceaseless and insatiable appetite for their hard-earned dollars.

So I commend the gentleman from Iowa. I commend him for being diligent and reading the language in this appropriations bill. I commend him for being diligent and making certain that he goes through this bill to find ways to reduce what would be spent, to cut out the waste, to look for areas where it can be pulled in and tightened up and reductions can be made.

You know, I know a lot of people in this House didn't like the Deficit Reduction Act, when we made a step in the right direction, reducing, cutting in that 2006 Deficit Reduction Act, cutting more than $40 billion, and poof, it all goes away with one stroke of their budget pen. Given the opportunity, they're going to spend more, and they're going to hide it and not tell you exactly where it is.

And the issue of earmarks, Mr. Chairman, it comes up in nearly every conversation that we're having in our districts. Let's have a way to evaluate those earmarks. Our constituents deserve to know before that vote takes place rather than after that bill comes out of conference committee.

In order to fund all this fun that the leadership is having, we face the single largest tax increase in American history. It is certainly, certainly inappropriate, and going in here and beginning to find places to make cuts, as the gentleman from Iowa has done, is the right type way to go.

If you cannot find $79,000 out of a $36.3 billion budget, you've got a problem. If you can't reduce some out of a 6 percent increase more than was requested, 13.6 percent more than last year, then you've got a problem. It is a spending problem. It is something that needs to be dealt with by the Federal Government.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to associate myself with the comments of the gentlewoman from Tennessee. I, too, appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Iowa in offering this amendment.

Again, the dollars may be small but the principle is large, and frankly, Mr. Chairman, I really somewhat object to those who somehow suggest that after a budget was passed in this institution, representing the largest single tax increase in American history, that somehow amendments to try to save the people's money are somehow dilatory, are somehow frivolous, are somehow not worthy of debate in this democratic institution.

We spent months, months debating one spending bill on whether or not to support our troops in Iraq, months, and now we hear protests from the other side, hours into a regular appropriations bill. Somehow after hours we've grown tired of that particular process.

Mr. Chairman, I'm worried about this largest single tax increase in American history and what it means to people in my district, the Fifth District of Texas, how it impacts their ability to send their children to college, how it impacts their ability to start a small business, how it impacts their ability to pay their health care premiums. Every opportunity we have to try to get some of that money back to them is an important use of this body's time, a very important use.

And so there are several amendments that have a very simple proposition behind them, and the simple proposition is in this particular Department, can't you level-fund from one year to the next year just that group administering the programs. All over America, after passing this single largest tax increase in the history, we're asking American families to somehow do with less, and all we're asking these people to do is do with the same amount that you had last year. That's all that we're asking, Mr. Chairman.

But there are bigger issues involved here besides the roughly $2,600, $2,700 per family in the Fifth District of Texas who are going to have to pay that single largest tax increase in history.

But we look to the future, and we know what happens if we don't take the first few steps towards fiscal sanity. Already we have been warned by the Congressional Budget Office, we've been warned by the Office of Management and Budget, we've been warned by the Comptroller General what is going to happen to this Nation if we don't do something about entitlement spending, something that our friends on the other side of the aisle refuse to engage in. Social Security and Medicare, in their budget, there's nothing about that.

We've heard from Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke: Without early and meaningful action to address the rapid growth in entitlements, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened, with future generations bearing much of the cost. Too much expenditure of the people's money impacts the people's security.

We've heard from Comptroller General Walker: The rising costs of government entitlements are a fiscal cancer that threatens catastrophic consequences for our country and could bankrupt America.

How are we going to pay for future homeland security bills if we don't take the first few steps towards fiscal responsibility now? Simply level-fund, level-fund, not cut, level-fund the administrative function and lead by example. Lead by example.

Mr. Chairman, we haven't even talked about the secret earmark slush fund yet, which, again, I don't understand. I would think if there was any party who would heed the lessons well of the last election, it would be the party that has become the majority party. They know the people are outraged at earmarks, at the process, and so instead of taking this forward, the new majority is taking us backwards.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to necessarily personalize debate, so I will paraphrase here, but recently the Wisconsin State Journal, and I paraphrase, said the Democrats are now dodging the very reforms they helped to generate, and that with this new secret slush fund, and I paraphrase once again, it would prevent lawmakers from questioning earmarks.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the King amendment, and I'm grateful for the opportunity to call for this apparently Draconian cut in the Office of the Chief of Staff of the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today in the context of having, like you, served in the Congress before September 11 and before there was a Department of Homeland Security. And I'll never forget in the hurried moments that would follow 9/11 how we

dealt with the immediate issues, funding, reconstruction and recovery efforts in New York and at the Pentagon, how we put together to the best of our ability transportation security for our country.

But I will never forget coming to this floor and feeling a great and ominous sense of foreboding as we created a Department of Homeland Security. I couldn't help but feel then that we might be unleashing, however well-intended, on the American taxpayers a behemoth of a new bureaucracy that we would someday find ourselves arguing over on this floor in the way we argue over every other bureaucracy.

But it was not meant to be the case. To be candid with you, Mr. Chairman, I thought this day might come decades from now, when the bureaucratic instinct would overtake even the wisdom and the clarity that would be derived on September 11, that made us focus a new department on the specific purpose of protecting our people from a real and present threat of terrorism.

And yet as I look at the watch, it is less than half a decade from that horrific day, and here we are with the party in the majority opposed to keeping bureaucratic and administrative staff funding levels at their previous year. It's really extraordinary to me; $8.8 trillion of national debt, and the majority comes to the floor of this Chamber with a 13.6 percent increase in the Department of Homeland Security.

□ 1815

The current budget, $31.9 billion, the proposed budget, $36.2 billion, more than 50 percent larger, or is $2 billion larger than the President's request. It's astonishing to me. I just have to wonder, as the American people look in on this issue, if they aren't just scratching their heads just the same.

But here we are, having these typical and predictable arguments on the floor of the Congress about bureaucracy and levels of bureaucracy when we are talking about homeland security. We are also doing it very much without, as most of my colleagues have said, without the daylight and the sunshine and the accountability of knowing what will ultimately be in this legislation.

I mean, it is extraordinary to me that a Democrat Congress seems so opposed to practicing democracy on the floor of the House of Representatives. To bring a bill to the floor of this Congress with the promise that Member projects, so-called ''earmark projects,'' will be added long after we have had the opportunity to challenge them.

The Democratic process on this floor is breathtaking to me. Again, it bespeaks of the embrace of a bureaucratic, big-government attitude even where our own homeland security is involved.

We ought, rather, in this process, to know what Members have requested what projects, and we ought to be having a thoughtful and focused discussion on this floor and calling votes one after another on those individual projects to decide what will keep our cities and our people and our families and our children safe. We ought to be having that discussion in the context of a full and open debate.

But, instead, we are told that we don't have time to do that. We are told the public will be made aware of these projects some day in the future.

That's not democracy, that's not the process.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today, first of all, to express my gratitude to the chairman for crafting a bill which tries to do what we want to do, which is to take seriously the admonition by former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge that homeland security starts in our hometowns, and tried to officially get homeland security funds to our neighborhoods.

Congressman CANTOR and I were going to be offering an amendment on the floor to address a program that has been funded in the last couple of years, albeit inefficiently, by the Department of Homeland Security, to deal with the problem that local neighborhood nonprofit organizations, churches, synagogues, civic institutions, are being visited by local law enforcement all the time saying, here are the things you need to do to make your institution more hardened for the challenge of homeland security.

Yet, with all the things they are being told to do, unlike a business that can pass along its expenses to stockholders, or unlike a government entity that can raise taxes or make choices on what they want to allocate, these nonprofit organizations really have no way to find the funds for things like security cameras, for emergency escape hatches, for communication devices within their facilities.

The nonprofit Homeland Security grants have done that. They have done it in a relatively efficient way. You haven't read the stories about great waste because they are relatively small amounts of money to pay for the things like I described.

This section of the bill, the administrative section, was where we thought maybe we could take some of the money to allocate for the nonprofit grants. The other body, an earmark, is going to take $20 million and allocate it for that purpose. It's only a $25 million program that we have allocated for the past couple of Congresses. I think that, frankly, the knowledge that this is going to be worked out in conference is comforting.

But we need to realize that one of the things we need to do, and frankly, it's a program that has been administered in a remarkably democratic, with a small D, way. It has been distributed to small towns, big cities, nonprofit organizations. They get visited by local law enforcement: These are the things you do to become more safe. They have gone out and done it. They have made applications to the States that have then funded these programs as they see fit.

We are not going to be offering the amendment, although I am grateful for the bipartisan work that we have done on this. I would like to ask the chairman, as this moves forward to committee, in the interest of time in moving the program forward, I just want to make sure that you are mindful of our concerns about making sure that these nonprofit grants continue to see the light of the day.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his strong advocacy for these nonprofit security grants. I, too, have constituencies concerned about these grants, about their continued availability, and have convincing testimony as to the importance of this resource.

We did not have a specified account in our bill, but I am aware that the Senate does, and we will be going to conference. I am glad to assure the gentleman that we will have an open mind about dealing with this in conference. I appreciate that he is not offering the amendment tonight, but we will be very, very happy to work with him going forward.

Mr. WEINER. If I could reclaim my time, I would express my gratitude to the chairman and also to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) who has been so helpful with this.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the sponsor of this amendment.

This is a defining moment, an illustrative debate about priorities for this Nation. To set the stage for this debate, we have to look at the original blueprint for the Nation's spending that the Democratic Congress has produced for the American people.

That blueprint sets the priorities for our Nation, and that blueprint includes the second largest tax increase in American history, second only to the tax increase that was proposed the last time the Democrats controlled the Congress. So the revenues that are being counted upon to be spent in these appropriations bills come from increased burdens on the American taxpayer.

The other interesting thing about that defining document, that budget of the new Democratic majority, is that it includes provisions that would make Enron accountants blush, because it funds priorities like the farm bill and other major authorization measures and other reforms. It funds those with these IOU accounts called ''reserve funds,'' but there's nothing actually in the reserve funds.

So this document raises taxes, spends all that money. Then, that's not enough, so they include these phony reserve funds to spend even more.

As we enter the appropriations process to actually get down to the nuts and bolts of spending and allocating

those dollars to the various programs, we also see explosive growth in the amount of money that they are spending and, again, to borrow from the accounting model that was Enron, more slush funds, more secret slush funds, stepping away from the important reforms that were passed in the last Congress that shed light on the process whereby Members could direct appropriations.

But under the process in the last Congress, it was open to public scrutiny, it was transparent to the press and to the public eye; and a point of order could be brought to this House floor if there was not disclosure and if it were air dropped in the moonlight of a conference.

All that's gone. All those reforms have been swept away by the new majority and replaced by a system whereby one person, one individual, will be the sole arbiter of what is or is it not appropriate public spending, relegating the other 434 Members of the House of Representatives to a state about as useful as an appendix.

One individual has deemed himself the sole determinant of where hard-earned Federal dollars will be spent, and that will be done at the last possible moment in the earliest possible hour of the wee hours of the morning without the press, without the public, without the taxpayers' involvement.

That is not acceptable.

Today's debate marks the beginning of an appropriations season where the Republicans will insist on transparency, insist on full disclosure, and insist on maximizing value for America's hard-earned dollars and how they are spent in this Federal Government. It may be $79,000 at a time, as this amendment is; it may be into the millions or the tens of millions or the hundreds of millions.

But we will not tolerate having a $2.7 trillion budget rammed down our throats without disclosure, without debate, without consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PUTNAM was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PUTNAM. It will not be done without appropriate deliberation, and these Members are here to ensure that every American tax dollar is spent as wisely as humanly possible. We will not accept the largest tax increase in American history without a fight, and the ruination that it will do to this economy.

It is important that we review each and every one of these issues, that we consider them thoughtfully, and that we consider each and every one of these amendments that these individually elected Members of both parties have brought to this floor to work through the democratic process.

That's how this institution was intended to run. That's how we will insist on its being run, and we will do so in a way that brings credit to this institution and not one that forces hundreds of millions of dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAMBORN:

In title I, under the heading ''Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $300,000)''.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, this would reduce by $300,000 the money appropriated by the Office of Secretary and Executive Management.

Instead of $6.3 million, it would be $6 million, and this would be in accordance with last year's spending. This appropriations bill in its entirety would increase spending for homeland security by more than $2 billion; that's more than what the President requested, and it will increase spending by more than $4.2 billion over the fiscal year 2007 Homeland Security appropriations bill.

We should show restraint by reducing the amount that the Federal Government spends, rather than increasing the amount. It is simply not prudent.

We are at a time when the Federal Government faces an $8.8 trillion national debt. It's important, and this is a step in the right direction. Just as the last amendment saved us some hard-earned taxpayer dollars, this would save hard-earned taxpayer dollars as well.

So we can be fiscally disciplined and reduce the deficit if this money is not spent elsewhere. Increasing the size of government or the amount of bureaucracy, as this bill would otherwise do, is not going to help in this reduction effort.

I look forward to the debate on this amendment. I hope it's as productive and successful as the debate on the last amendment.

Now, by reducing the Office of Public Affairs in the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management account to the fiscal year 2007 level, that is a $300,000 increase, or a 5 percent increase over the amount of last year's budget.

□ 1830

That's more than the rate of inflation. So this amendment would be the first step of many necessary steps in forcing fiscal discipline and sanity upon the Federal Government.

Now, this is part and parcel of a larger issue, Mr. Chairman, that's very concerning to many of us on this side of the aisle. We have an earmark process that is not subject to sunshine, not subject to sunlight. It is said that sunlight is the best disinfectant. And I'm disturbed.

You know, I'm a freshman coming in here, Mr. Chairman, and I expected the better of Congress. I thought that we would have the opportunity to debate earmarks, and I'm very, I'm deeply disturbed about that because apparently we're starting down a road of appropriations bills where the earmarks are going to be saved for the conference committee.

By the way, that'll be in August when we're going to be in recess. We're not even going to be here. And apparently there's going to be a list printed, and you get the bill out of conference committee, and you're just going to have to take it or leave it. That's not what I expected when I came here to Congress, Mr. Chairman. I expected better than that. And I'm sorry that we're going down this road. I hope that it can be changed at the last minute, and course can be reversed.

The bills that are just scheduled this week would increase spending by $20 billion over last year. Twenty billion dollars is significant, Mr. Chairman, and this is one of the four bills that would contribute to that $20 billion increase.

I'm also disturbed, Mr. Chairman, I've heard some reasons thrown around why this might be happening. I can only speculate, but what I've heard is that, for one thing, the Appropriations Committee was just too busy to look at the many, many, many earmarks that were requested of it. However, that reason doesn't really hold water, I don't think, because we just frittered away 3 months going through the Iraq war supplemental process, and ended up where many of us said it should have started out in the first place, and would have ended up and started out that way if we had just applied a little common sense at the beginning, and we would have saved those 3 months, and maybe we would have had time for the Appropriations Committee to look at some of these earmarks.

I've also heard it said, Mr. Chairman, that for those Members who vote against this bill, you know, they can pretty much write off any chance of getting an earmark. And I'm not planning on offering any myself. That's probably good. And I'm planning on voting against this bill from everything I know about it so far. But I just think that that kind of retaliation is beneath the dignity of the People's Body, and I think that, once again, that's something I as a freshman am coming in and seeing for the first time, and I'm deeply disappointed by it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, for the reasons I explained earlier, we accept the amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise again in support of the amendment. Again, we're being

asked to approve a bill that increases spending over the President's request by more than $2 billion.

The majority party wisely, I believe, in the report accompanying this bill, explained that there are several misuses in spending; that there is money that is being misspent. How in the world can we, then, appropriate $2 billion more than was requested by the administration?

If we believe in fiscal discipline, we should act like it, and we simply can't afford to spend this much more money.

I would also, again, talk about the earmark process. It seems to me that if we have a transparent process, or we require Members to actually put their names next to earmarks and to indicate the entity that the earmark goes to, that that ought to mean something, that we should be able to do something with that information.

Last summer, during the appropriation process, I offered I believe it was 39 earmark amendments, and I got beat on every one of them. I was beat like a rented mule. I never got more than, I think, 90 votes, and most times under 50 for those that we called a roll call on. It was because of the process of log rolling. I'll vote against your earmark or amendment if you'll vote against the others. And so it goes.

But we never had the luxury of actually knowing whose earmark that was. Sometimes, when the earmark was questioned on the floor, the author of the earmark would come to the floor and defend it. Sometimes they wouldn't. Sometimes we'd have the debate. We'd have a vote, roll call vote even, and we still had no idea who requested that earmark or what entity it really went to, because the language was very vague in the bill or the committee report.

Now we actually have that information. We would have a different dynamic. If you came to the floor and said, I'm going to strike funding for this amendment, or, I'm sorry, for this earmark, because it goes to a project that is duplicative, it's wasteful, and besides, it goes to a project that maybe this Member is a little too close to, maybe that Member is getting campaign contributions that are linked to that earmark. Those are things that you can find out if you actually have the information.

That information now sits at the Appropriations Committee. More than 30,000 request letters sit there right now, and we have no access to them, nor will we. We'll only have access to those few who are approved by a very few Members. And then we have the luxury of actually writing a letter and asking about the project and having the Member supposedly respond.

But then to what effect? We can take no vote on it. It's all an academic exercise because we'll have one vote, up or down, on the bill and no ability to strip the earmark. So this process is simply wrong.

It's been said that the majority is backsliding on commitments made on earmarks. We've seen that, unfortunately. I was pleased to see the reforms that happened in January. I have said more than once I think there were more effective reforms, more comprehensive than we did as the majority party last year.

The problem is your rules are only as good as your willingness to enforce them or use them, and that's where we've fallen down. That's where we're not only backsliding, but I would submit we're actually cutting and running the other direction. And unfortunately, a process in which you have some transparency but no accountability is an unacceptable process.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, 28 years ago I first took to this floor as a newly elected Member of Congress from the State of California. At that time we were spending more than we were taking in.

At that time I was one of those who joined others, oftentimes, in voting against appropriation bills because we were not taking seriously enough the direction of the people that we represented to, yes, spend money where necessary, but get our financial house in order.

During those first 10 years I served in this House, many times I was on the short end of spending votes. I recall during the 8 years of Ronald Reagan supporting him oftentimes on vetoes. And we managed to bring some of the spending down that was presented to him on occasion, but we still didn't do a good enough job.

I left this House for 16 years, and when I returned, I thought maybe we would see another day. Well, I was doubly disappointed because my party, then being in power, was not doing that which I thought was necessary, again, to bring our financial house in order.

And as much as I worked hard to ensure that my party would retain the majority status in both Houses, the people spoke otherwise. And I thought maybe this would give us an opportunity to finally get our fiscal house in order, because I had watched as we had dropped the banner of fiscal responsibility. I had watched, during the election, my friends on the other side of the aisle picking it up and suggesting that if they were put in charge, they would do what we had promised to do in the past.

And alas, I thought that we had some suggestion that that might be the case as the majority party took over and, in adopting the rules, took the rules that we had on some reform of earmarks and actually built upon them, suggesting to all of us and to the public at large that we would, in fact, be more transparent; that we would, in fact, be more accountable; that we would, in fact, have greater responsibility for all Members individually, and in this body, collectively.

And then I look at the very first bill that is presented here for this fiscal year from the Appropriations Committee, and I must register deep disappointment. In the first instance, this is an important bill, the appropriations for Homeland Security. There is probably no other appropriation bill that is more worthy of consideration, except perhaps the DOD, because, fundamentally, we are responsible for providing the security of the people who send us here.

And yet, while the people tell us that is what they want us to do, they also suggest that we need to get our fiscal house in order.

So how do we balance that? It seems to me we have to be honest with ourselves. If we get rid of all waste, fraud and abuse, we still won't get our fiscal house in order.

We have to have the courage to look at important bills such as this bill and say, are we spending wisely? Is every dollar spent here necessary? Do we need to have a 13.6 increase over nonemergency appropriations from the previous fiscal year?

And I would suggest that unless we look carefully at bills such as these, which are the most important bills that we have before us, we will never do the people's work appropriately.

And I'd just ask, how is it that we say we are going to be more faithful to our commitment to the people, to give them a sense of responsibility, when we are told that we won't know what earmarks there are when we vote on the bill because they won't be there then, but they will somehow be dropped in in the conference report? I don't understand how that increases transparency.

Now, I was just a lowly English major, and so I'm burdened by looking at the dictionary. And transparency means that you see better; that you see through things; that it is more obvious to you, not obscured. And for the life of me, I can't understand, if I'm denied the list of appropriations that are going to be put into that bill at the time I'm voting for it, how that fits the simple dictionary definition of transparency. Perhaps I can be aided by the other side to explain this to me, because I cannot understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I'm sorry some thought that after we spent 120 days getting to a single bill on spending for our troops, and after we spent Monday voting on important things such as changing the U.S. Code to recommend that people fly their flag on Father's Day, that

someone thinks allowing me to speak an extra minute is somehow offensive. I'm sorry that that is the kind of courtesy that is missing on this floor.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I would just like to conclude by saying this. If we truly want to get our house in order, Democrats and Republicans alike, we have to understand that it is when we're dealing precisely with those things that are most important that we find the courage to make sure that every dollar is spent wisely so that we can then move on to things such as waste, fraud and abuse. But unless we have the guts to do this, we're never going to get our fiscal house in order.

I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I support the idea of funding the Department of Homeland Security appropriately, but question whether a 13.6 percent increase over nonemergency appropriations in the previous fiscal year shows either that we have exercised that proper authority with respect to spending, and whether or not we have been discreet enough in our decisions.

And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Reclaiming my time, and I would like to ask the gentleman a question, or ask his comment.

At the end of the bill, in the general provisions, I'll be offering an amendment to cut, across the board, 5.7 percent of the entire bill, across the board.

□ 1845

Even with that so-called ''cut'' in the increase, it will still be a 7.1 percent increase over current spending, taking the budget request that came to us from OMB.

Would the gentleman feel compelled to support that type of an approach?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I would feel compelled to support that type of approach.

And, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is criticized at that time for having a cut through his amendment, I would suggest that those of us who want to lose weight should follow that kind of argument. Because we could say, instead of gaining 50 pounds, we only gained 30 pounds, and, therefore, we managed to lose weight.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Well, at the end of the bill, Mr. Chairman, I can't do it now and I would like to have done it at the outset of the debate, under our rules, it can only be offered at the end of the discussion. But at the end of the bill I will be asking Members of this body to reduce the increase for homeland security from its 16 percent level to 7.1 percent, which is the President's request; and, number two, thereby avoiding a veto.

I desperately want this body to pass a responsible funding level for the Department of Homeland Security and not have it vetoed. There is a veto threat there. If you want to prolong this agony over the bill, we need to pass a responsible funding level for the Department, which I think the President's proposal is responsible and even generous. But this Department, like all other departments in the government, is still subject to fiscal responsibility.

I am for a strong homeland defense, like all the rest of you, and for a number of years I chaired this subcommittee and I think we have done a good job of holding spending in line. But this increase is not needed. It is wasteful and it must be controlled. And the overall cutting amendment that I will offer at the end of the debate will be the responsible way to do it. And I would hope the gentleman and all of his colleagues in the body would support that when the time comes

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentleman would yield, I will be proud to vote for your amendment to have a 7.1 percent increase, which, as I understand, is more than double the rate of inflation over the previous year.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for offering this amendment, and I want to thank him for his leadership in this body, particularly on matters of fiscal responsibility. And I know his district is proud to have him as their Representative.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter that we discuss this evening. Like many Members of Congress, I commute. I work in Washington, but I live back in my district. And I have two small children that happen to be visiting this particular week, and I think about threats to my children and I know the threat of radical Islam. It is one of the most serious threats that they face. So I take the debate on this bill on homeland security very seriously.

But, Mr. Chairman, I see other threats to my children's future and my Nation's future. And another threat I see is a Federal budget that has grown beyond the ability of the family budget to pay for it. And, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid if I look at a bill that calls for roughly a 14 percent increase from one year to the next, almost twice the level of what the President requested, I question what this is going to do to the future of my children and the future of my country.

Because don't take my word for it, Mr. Chairman; look again at what the Congressional Budget Office has told us, the Office of Management and Budget, the Secretary of Treasury, the Federal Reserve, both conservative and liberal think tanks. They have told us that the present spending patterns that we have, if we don't begin to change the way we spend the people's money, if we don't reform out-of-control entitlement spending, the next generation will face one of two perils. Either, number one, we will actually see their taxes doubled, just to sustain this rate of growth in spending, their taxes will be doubled; otherwise, we will have a Federal Government that consists of little more than Medicaid and Medicare and Social Security.

I mean, Mr. Chairman, that is what is almost ironic about this debate; that as we talk about plussing up this account by 14 percent, if we don't change the way we spend the people's money, there won't even be a Department of Homeland Security for the next generation. So, again, what we are doing here in this bill is, we are kicking the can down the road, I fear.

And as I look at how money is spent, it reminds me, it is not always how much money you spend. It is how you spend the money. And I don't know if it is the President's fault, Democrats' fault, Republicans' fault, everyone's fault, nobody's fault. But when I see the Department of Homeland Security money somehow ending up helping fund lawn mower races, as the gentleman from Arizona brought to our attention, fund puppet shows, how is that a critical mission within the Department of Homeland Security? That is beyond me. That is beyond me.

So I think we have to look very carefully at how the money is spent. And I am afraid that throwing this much money at this situation is just going to exacerbate this kind of spending.

Now, in my home district, I am very happy when every volunteer fire department in every small community in my district gets a new pumper truck. I am happy to announce that. I wonder, though, with the challenges we face for the next generation if it is really mission critical.

And I am very concerned, as the gentleman from Arizona has spoken, as many others have risen on the floor today, about what is happening in the earmark process. Again, it is not so much always how much money you spend; it is how you spend the people's money.

So the new majority that promised us earmark reform is now telling us that they are going to do something completely opposite. They are going to take away the ability for Members, Members who are on the floor today, with the exception of one, I suppose, to offer amendments to strike these earmarks to get at spending perhaps like the lawn mower races. This is moving in the complete opposite direction of what the majority promised when they took office.

The American people will not stand idly by.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was just back in the cloakroom getting a little bit of the news of the outside world. And the outside world is focusing on what we are doing here.

There was a long segment on Fox News about the issue that we are discussing here today. And they actually

did a fairly good job of characterizing what is happening here. They talked about the fact that, as a result of a lot of discussion about the plans by the majority to take away our opportunities to have transparency in the earmark process, one person is going to be making those decisions as to whether or not the earmarks are right. We are not going to be able to vote on them.

They said, I think very correctly, that that is not what the American people were promised last year. And one of them, not known as a flaming conservative, I have to say, said what the American people wanted was maximum scrutiny and maximum sunshine on the process.

And I again want to bring some quotes to our discussion to remind people of some of the things that were promised. The Speaker of the House said last December, ''We will bring transparency and openness to the budget process and to the use of earmarks, and we will give the American people the leadership they deserve.''

Well, I don't think the American people deserve what they are being given by the majority party. I call it the ''house of hypocrisy'' and an ''attitude of arrogance.'' The attitude of arrogance is so pervasive on the other side that it has become something that even the press is talking about. We don't normally get that kind of coverage on what is happening here in the kind of detail that they are coming out with, and I think it is good for the American people.

Another quote by the majority leader: ''We are going to adopt rules that make the system of legislation transparent so that we don't legislate in the dark of night . . . 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.''

Earlier this evening the chairman of the Appropriations Committee accused us of simply wanting to slow down the process by our bringing up amendments and raising the issues about what this bill does. And yet his own leader says, ''Democracy works if people know what's going on.''

But the majority party wants to keep the people from knowing what's going on. They have an attitude of arrogance. They know best. The people don't know best. Our side of the aisle doesn't know best. Only one or two people know best in here.

Some other Members, some of the freshman Members actually, who were elected last year on the basis of openness in government and reform in government, the gentleman from New York: ''Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility to the American people to spend their hard-earned tax dollars in a fiscally responsible way.''

Some of my colleagues have just outlined the deficit problem that we have and how pretty soon almost all the Federal dollars are going to be spent on Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid, with nothing left. We are spending ourselves into a terrible deficit situation.

Another freshman, this time from Florida: ''Congress will not reestablish its credibility and trust with the American people until accountability and oversight is established in Washington.'' A grammatical error there, but that is the quote.

That is what the American people want. That is what they were promised last fall. They are not getting it.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I intended to offer a clarifying amendment to the underlying bill. As currently constituted, funding is appropriated for Customs and Border Patrol to construct, renovate, equip, and maintain buildings and facilities necessary for enforcing our immigration laws.

My amendment would have added the word ''structures'' in addition to facilities and buildings. This minor change would have made it clear that the Customs and Border Patrol can focus on the physical infrastructure needs of our border security apparatus with the funds appropriated by this bill.

Securing our borders, as we know, requires a multifaceted approach. We need to do more than just maintain facilities and buildings. We need to build fences. We need to deploy sensors, and we need to take advantage of all the advanced technology and equipment that is being developed right now.

Currently, the Tucson sector that I represent has more apprehensions than all other sections of the border combined. Every single day our Border Patrol apprehends, on average, about 2,000 individuals and over 2,500 pounds of drugs.

□ 1900

This is the most porous part of the U.S.-Mexico border.

While most illegal immigrants come here to look for work and opportunities, approximately 10 percent are involved in criminal activities. So, border security must be strengthened, and all options for accomplishing this must be on the table.

Nationally, the Border Patrol arrests about 1 million illegal immigrants annually, seizes about a million pounds of marijuana and 15 to 20 tons of cocaine. Smugglers' methods, routes and modes of transportation are potential vulnerabilities that can be exploited by terrorists attempting to bring weapons into our Nation. The Border Patrol must be allowed to deploy and sustain an appropriate mix of personnel, equipment, technology and border infrastructure in order to protect our Nation.

As Congress moves forward in this process, I urge my colleagues to allow the Customs and Border Patrol to take the necessary steps in order to secure our border and to secure our citizens. This would expand the opportunity for Customs and Border Patrol to secure our Nation and protect our communities.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in strong support of the amendment from my colleague from Colorado. I think it is important that we remind those participating in this debate what that amendment would do. That amendment would strike a grand total of $300,000 from the public affairs budget of the Department of Homeland Security. It would hold the Department's public affairs budget to the same figure that they are living with this year. I would suggest that that is not a shocking proposal. It is one that I am happy to support, and one that I think illustrates the kind of thing we can do in this Congress on this floor to demonstrate to the American people that we get it, that we understand that as a Nation we are overspending. We are spending not our money, we aren't even spending our children's money; we are spending our grandchildren's money. And they, the American people, have told us they do not want us to do that. They want us to stop that practice. They want Republicans to stop that practice, they want Democrats to stop that practice, they want conservatives to stop that practice, they want liberals to stop that practice. They want us to live within our means and to be reasonable.

The ranking member of this committee has spoken earlier today that the bill increases spending by 13.6 percent. I want to ask, how many Americans, how many people in this room, how many Members of Congress, how many of your children who have gotten a job this year will get a 13.6 percent raise this year? I suggest virtually no one can answer that question and say they will get that kind of staggering raise.

Instead, the ranking member has proposed a reasonable solution which is, in fact, quite frankly, generous in and of itself, and that is a 7.2 percent increase. Not exactly a tiny, not exactly a squeaky cheap amount; a pretty darn generous raise, a generous raise that probably any American would take. And yet, that is not enough.

I also rise to express my objections to the earmarking practices that are being condoned and that are proposed to be implemented in this body.

The reality is that earmarking has its defenders and can, in fact, do some good. The reality is that earmarking is also susceptible of outrageous abuse and can lead to scandals. Many of the scandals in this body which were talked about by the minority in the last election are scandals that relate to earmarks. And yet, in the face of promises that we would have more sunshine, in the face of promises that the American people would get to see where their money is being spent, that they can hear about it, that it could be challenged and debated on this floor, that it could be vetted and viewed, I happen

to believe in sunshine. I came out of the Arizona Attorney General's Office, and we had the most open sunshine laws in the Nation because we believed sunshine would bring cleanliness, sunshine would allow people to see what government was doing. And here we propose to hide that. We propose to hide tens of thousands, I guess the chairman of the committee says 36,000 earmarks are going to be air-dropped into the legislation at the end of this process. That is simply unacceptable to me, and it ought to be unacceptable to the American people.

The gentlelady just spoke of the importance of securing the Arizona border, and I believe that is extremely important. But let's talk about one provision of this bill that simply not only makes no sense, it is hypocritical, and it will clearly violate the U.S. Constitution.

In this bill we say point blank we are appropriating $1 billion for new high-tech security. And I certainly agree with my colleague from Arizona that every dime of that $1 billion for high-tech security on our border is needed. If we are to secure that border, we need that money. But this legislation says, we appropriate $1 billion, but then $700 million, almost three-fourths of $1 billion, is reserved and cannot be appropriated until a committee in the Congress says so. That is unconstitutional.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. PENCE. I rise in strong support of the Lamborn amendment, Mr. Chairman, for many of the reasons that have been expressed more eloquently by my colleagues, including the gentleman from Arizona.

It does strike me that at a time of an $8.8 trillion national debt, that we should be able to ask the Department of Homeland Security to get by on last year's public affairs budget, which is really all the Lamborn amendment does, by my way of thinking, is it asks the Department of Homeland Security to stay at the $6 million level for a public affairs budget as opposed to moving to a $6.3 million.

As my friend from Arizona just expressed, this legislation overall will allow for a 13.6 percent increase in a single year. And as other amendments have illuminated, much of those increases are simply going for the same kind of bureaucracy that we will argue over in every other aspect of government.

But I go back to my previous point, Mr. Chairman. I thought for sure when we created the Department of Homeland Security that it would be different. And I have to say, that is probably a naive thought. We excluded it from many of the public employee protections. We gave the President of the United States greater flexibility because we said, you know, very much like the military, the Department of Homeland Security will have a special and unique mission. It would not just be another Cabinet agency that we would be feeding from the trough here on Capitol Hill in the appropriations process every year. But here we are. Here we are with a Democrat majority that is opposed to even our willingness, with the outstanding leadership of the ranking member, to let this Department get by a 7 percent increase next year as opposed to 13.6.

I also would renew my objection expressed in much of the procedure that is happening on the floor today and well into tonight, and perhaps well into the rest of the week; that is, it is astonishing to me that a Democratic Congress is against democracy when it comes to providing for accountability in the spending process in the United States Congress. I mean, to simply say that there are tens of thousands of specific so-called earmark projects that have been requested of the committee that are in some filing cabinet here in the Capitol Building, but that were not able to be added to this bill in a timely fashion so that the democratic process and the accountability of this open rule could serve as that antiseptic that it is supposed to function is quite beyond me.

It is quite beyond me that the Democrat majority would think that the American people would be willing, having clamored loudly in the last election for fundamental reform in the way we spend the people's money, fundamental earmark reform, with the infamous ''bridge to nowhere,'' would now allow and stand idly by while the Democrat majority brings about earmark reform that says we will only bring earmarks when they can no longer be removed from bills. We will presumably make them public during the month of August so people can look at them, but we will give Members of Congress absolutely no power to challenge those earmarks in the legislative process. That seems to me to be a breathtaking step backwards from the earmark reform that the American people demanded in 2006.

And so I renew my support for the Lamborn amendment, Mr. Chairman, but I also renew my objection to the fact that we are seeing appropriations bills, starting today, coming to the floor with, shall we say, room to grow, room to add earmarks at a time in the legislative process when they cannot be challenged, and therefore, the interests of the American people and the accountability they demand cannot be served in the ordinary legislative process.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. CROWLEY of New York.

Amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment by Mr. REICHERT of Washington.

Amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 174, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

AYES—244

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack

Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Space
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—174

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Berry
Biliraki
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Castle
Christensen
Coble
Cole (OK)
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
DeLauro
Dingell
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Flake
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lucas
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Udall (NM)
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Arcuri
Bordallo
Conaway
Costa
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Doyle
Edwards
Faleomavaega
Goode
Gutierrez
Hastert
Kuhl (NY)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Miller (FL)
Platts
Sessions
Westmoreland

□ 1935

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, SPRATT, CUELLAR, BOSWELL, and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. INSLEE, GINGREY, CRENSHAW, PASTOR and BILBRAY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 453, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 221, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

AYES—201

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Cooper
Costa
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—221

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt

Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

Arcuri
Bilirakis
Conaway
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Doyle
Edwards
Faleomavaega
Gutierrez
Hastert
Kuhl (NY)
Lewis (GA)
Rangel
Sessions
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1942

Mr. BARROW changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 205, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

AYES—218

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hoekstra
Holt
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—205

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Arcuri
Conaway
Doyle
Edwards
Faleomavaega
Franks (AZ)
Gutierrez
Hastert
Hobson
Issa
Kuhl (NY)
Lewis (GA)
Sessions
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are exactly 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1949

Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 379, noes 45, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

AYES—379

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle

Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
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
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
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 (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
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
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—45

Baird
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Carson
Christensen
Clarke
Cohen
Dingell
Engel
Fattah
Grijalva
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Kanjorski
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCaul (TX)
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Mollohan
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Pascrell
Payne
Ryan (OH)
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Waters
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—13

Arcuri
Conaway
Doyle
Edwards
Faleomavaega
Fortuño
Gutierrez
Hastert
Kuhl (NY)
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
Sessions
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1956

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 381, noes 41, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

AYES—381

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Christensen
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
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
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
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
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—41

Baird
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Clarke
Costello
Dingell
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Grijalva
Hinchey
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)

Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kanjorski
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McNerney
McNulty
Mollohan
Murphy (CT)
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sestak
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Waters
Weiner
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—15

Arcuri
Conaway
Doyle
Edwards
Faleomavaega
Fortuño
Gutierrez
Hastert
Kuhl (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Oberstar
Sali
Sessions
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 2002

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 33 offered by Ms. FOXX:

In title I, under the heading ''Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $1,241,000)''.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the Office of General Counsel in the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management account to the FY 2007 level representing a $1.241 million reduction from $14 million to $12,759,000. The bill's current funding level for this office represents a 10 percent increase over FY 2007, enacted.

There has been at least $105.5 billion in Federal spending over 5 years authorized by the House Democrat leadership this year. The current Federal debt is $8.8 trillion, roughly $29,000 for every U.S. citizen.

This is growing by over $1 billion a day. We know that because every day we walk down the halls of these buildings here, and we see the signs that the Blue Dogs have put out, which remind us what the current Federal debt is and how much it is for every single U.S. citizen.

Spending on the programs, Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, is out of control, and within a generation will force either significant cutbacks in services and benefits or massive tax increases. We know that is already happening because the Democratic majority has already recommended the largest tax increase in the history of this country through their budget they adopted earlier this year.

The Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office have been warning Congress that the growth in direct spending, for instance, spending that is on autopilot and outside the annual spending process, is occurring at an unsustainable rate due to well-known demographic trends and other factors. That spending, subject to the annual spending process, has also grown exponentially and must be brought under control.

This amendment is one step of many necessary steps enforcing fiscal discipline and sanity upon the Federal Government and out-of-control Federal deficit spending. We must restore fiscal discipline and find both commonsense and innovative new ways to do more with less. The Federal budget must not grow faster than American families' ability to pay for it.

We have been hearing a lot here tonight about fiscal responsibility and spending, taxes and deficits. There was a lot of talk about these things during the last election. I think there is a lot of confusion and misinformation out there right now, and I want to take a few minutes to give people a heads-up on what's going on.

This debate and all this talk need some context and some simple facts. Speaker PELOSI said on September 12, 2006, ''Democrats are committed to ending years of irresponsible budget policies that have produced historic deficits. Instead of piling trillions of dollars of debt onto our children and grandchildren, we will restore pay-as-you-go budget discipline.''

If you want to know exactly what's not going to happen to the Federal budget under this Congress, listen to that statement. PAYGO will not touch a cent of the trillions of dollars with which we have saddled our children and grandchildren. Furthermore, new spending will be proposed and taxes raised to pay for it.

That's what we are seeing here, and that's what this debate is all about. The plan is to spend more than ever, repeal tax relief and allow the trillions of dollars of unfunded liabilities to go on unreformed, all under the veneer of fiscal responsibility called PAYGO.

I am down here now because I want people to know this, and to know what it means. I want to put this debate in context.

This bill and the others we will debate in the coming weeks mean that the Federal Government is going to cost you more. You are going to pay more than you ever have before in taxes. I think we need to talk about that.

People can deny it and spin it any way they want, but the cost of the Federal Government is going to increase under the current fiscal plan. This is in spite of the fact that Americans already pay a staggering amount of money, but Democrats want more. They always do and they always will, even though the average American worked about 125.6 days in 2005 to pay for Federal, State and local spending.

Guess where the largest part of it went. To the politicians right here in Washington. In 2005, the average American worked about 83 days to pay for Federal spending. Guess what, it's not enough. These numbers are set to increase as far as the eye can see.

Now, let's just put Federal spending into context.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, since the House was not in order, for another minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will have another minute, but the Chair will, for the edification of all Members, point out that the very able timekeepers do stop the clock when Members are interrupted.

Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Let's just put Federal spending into context. Do you know that the United States Federal Government is on track to spend more money next year than Germany's entire economy in 2005? Germany is and has been the third largest economy in the world.

There are only two countries in the world with entire economies larger than the U.S. Government budget, the United States itself and Japan. Do you know that next fiscal year, the fiscal year we are considering now, the U.S. Government is on track to spend $700 billion more, $700 billion more. That's more than the entire Chinese economy in 2005.

We are on a spending spree that needs to stop. It's called a tax-and-spend policy. That's the model. It hasn't changed.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment and make a very small dent in this unsustainable fiscal policy.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to accept the amendment, but I want to make clear that we are doing it in the spirit that we accepted earlier amendments. That is, if no one on the other side of the aisle is willing and able to defend the Bush administration and their budget request and their departmental operations, then it's not clear to us why we should take that on. We have had a steady stream of invective tonight, a lot of ideology, a lot of bureaucratic bashing, and not very much attention to the specifics of this very carefully drawn budget.

Now, you wouldn't have known it from the last presentation, but let me tell you what this amendment does. The amendment cuts the funding for the general counsel in the Department $1.2 million below President Bush's request. Now, it's not about earmarks. It's not about the history of the parties and their ideologies. It's about cutting $1.2 billion below President Bush's request for the general counsel in the Department of Homeland Security.

Now, Members can make their own decision about whether that's wise. But as for us, we don't intend to oppose the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify again that the gentleman from North Carolina just said that this amendment proposed by Ms. FOXX cuts $1.24 million from the President's request.

It is true that, in fact, it proposes to spend less on the Office of General Counsel, which is the attorneys, than what the President has proposed. But that does not make it a cut. Because what it proposes to do is leave the spending for the Office of General Counsel, for the attorneys, in the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management at exactly the same level they had last year.

I really have a hard time understanding how it is always a cut when it is less of an increase than you want it to be, or than somebody wants it to be, in this case, I suppose, than the President wants it to be. But we are not looking at this as Republican spending or Democratic spending, we are looking at it as spending.

The reason, I am not sure that it's been made quite as clear as perhaps it ought to be, that in the Democrats' budget that you all passed a month or so ago, where you moved towards a balanced budget, and I take you at your word that it's your intention to, at some point, get to a balanced budget, but you did it by enacting, proposing, I guess it's the second largest tax increase in American history, which means that as you increase spending on things, you intend to then balance the budget by increasing taxes.

That is clearly what you are going to do. That is what your budget does, and you have made it very clear through your PAYGO provisions what you intend to do. When you increase spending, going to balance the budget will increase taxes.

So with this amendment and with every other amendment we are looking at, we are saying here that we are not going to increase spending in the Office of General Counsel by $1.2 million. That is $1.2 million of additional spending that will not occur if this amendment passes.

But that means it is $1.2 million of taxes that you all won't raise if this amendment passes. Now that works on this amendment, it works on various other amendments that will be coming up through the evening. So it's more than just an academic exercise about whether or not a certain department's budget should be increased.

□ 2015

It, in fact, affects, Mr. Chairman, people at home today now watching this. Is this $1.2 million that you want to see your taxes increase to spend? I think not. I think most of the people on this side believe not; and that is really what we're talking about, because if you say, as you did in your budget, that you will increase whatever taxes you need to to get to a balanced budget, then this $1.2 million is $1.2 million of money that you will take out of Americans' pockets that you're not taking now.

And it's really more than that, because if this were to go in, then next year there's a new base, and it's a higher base, and if you increase it another 10 percent beyond that, then it's another $1.22 million; and if you increase it again, it's another $1.44 million. And it goes on and on, and so that over a 5-year period this $1.2 million magically turns into about $6 million or so of people's money that gets spent, and which you will propose, undoubtedly, to increase taxes to cover so that you can balance the budget.

We can balance this budget, and we can balance it without taking any more money out of Americans' pockets. And we can balance it by passing amendments like this and simply asking government to live with the money they have now. This is not a cut, just live with the money you have now.

Can't this General Counsel's Office, can't these attorneys operate for another year on the same amount of money that they got last year? I think they can.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for offering this amendment. Any time we can save $1.2 million, I think we ought to do it.

We have Americans sitting across our great fruited plain tonight listening to this debate. They've just gotten up from their dinner tables, trying to make decisions on how they can balance their own budgets.

When we first came to Congress, I'm a new Member of Congress. I came out of the Tennessee Legislature. When we came here, we talked about open government and transparency, and we're going to be the most honest government in Congress ever; also talked about gas prices are going to be brought down rather than go up. Those are just some of the things that were promised.

Well, American families are sitting around their dinner tables tonight trying to decide how they're going to balance their own budget, and they're looking to us here in the Congress to make sure that we don't put an extra burden on them by raising their taxes and raising these appropriation requests.

I came to the Congress out of the Tennessee Legislature, as I said, and I was known for open government and transparency. That's one of the ways I was able to win my election. And that's exactly what people want in this Congress. They want a Congress that they can feel good about, that we're going to be honest with them and we're going to spend their tax dollars wisely.

Ronald Reagan once said, we don't have a $1 trillion debt because we don't tax enough. We have a $1 trillion debt because we spend too much. And anything we can do to help control those tax dollars and that spending is exactly what we need to do.

We need that transparency and that accountability as we move forward, and we don't need secret slush funds. We don't need to come in after we pass bills, later on, and then drop in pieces of legislation called earmarks. That was another promise that was made during the last elections, that those would be open and transparent. We don't need to drop those in later, where the American people don't have an understanding.

They understand they've got to make their house payments. They understand they've got to fill up their vehicles and their cars with this gas that was going to have lower gasoline prices. They understand that. But they certainly need to understand, as well, what we're voting on. We need to be open and accountable.

It's interesting to me, just looking back at some of the things that were said by the Democrat leadership. Back on September 14 of 2006, the Speaker of this House said, this is a place where we really need to throw up the shades and pull back the curtains. We have to have the fullest possible disclosure. It has to be on earmarks and appropriations and authorizations and on taxation, and it has to be across the board with no escape hatches.

Well, I stand in support of this amendment, so we can make sure that we throw up the shades and make sure that we're held accountable.

I'd like, again, to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for her leadership on this amendment.

And with that, I'd like to yield my time to the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I thank my colleagues for coming and supporting my amendment tonight. I thank them for the points that they are bringing up.

The gentleman from Tennessee is doing an excellent job in his first year here in the Congress.

I also want to thank my colleague from California who made a really excellent point that is something that needs to be made over and over again. When we try to cut back additional spending, it is always a cut, not raising money. Not raising spending is a cut to Democrats. And I think that's a point that needs to be made over and over again. Not increasing spending is a cut. That's not the way the general public sees it.

I also want to point out the fact that we are working very hard to bring us to the point where we could have a balanced budget.

Americans do have to live with a balanced budget. Individual Americans have to. They have to live with the money they have now. But Congress doesn't do that. And this Congress particularly is looking for every way it possibly can to spend additional money and to tax the American public, which is certainly taxed enough.

This seems like, to the majority party, that this, again, is a cut. But

Everett Dirksen, one of my heroes, said, a million here and million there, and pretty soon you're talking about real money. That was during the time when they were not billions.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate your patience as some of us exercise our frustration and try and make a point or two. And I want to commend the gentlelady from Virginia for offering this amendment to cut $1.241 million from the Office of General Counsel and the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management account from the fiscal year 2008 level that's being proposed here.

It would still be an increase, but there's two areas that I want to highlight with my frustration, and one is, with an overall level of antagonism and kind of vitriolic partisanship that's occurring here, and I think a lot of it's a frustration or results from our frustration.

For example, in the last year or so, as our friends in the now majority, then minority, were bringing up and talking about how we were spending so much and that we were out of control, and I've got to tell you, I voted against some of our appropriation bills because I thought that they were too high.

The interesting part is when people in my district would come up, having bought into this rhetoric, I said, but you don't understand that we're fighting with them every day to keep it as low as it is. I said, if they're in charge, just wait.

Well, here we are with the first bill, and it's a 13.6 percent increase over last year's appropriation. And we had a speaker up here earlier that talked about building that base. You increase it 13.6, and then next year, when you increase it 13.6, just the exponential increases in the budget.

When you look at those that we passed last year, we are barely above the inflation rate in these discretionary accounts, but yet we were criticized by the now majority for being too ''spendy.''

So I see the irony, and most of it was, you know, we tried to tell people last year that this is just their campaign nasty rhetoric. But it seems odd to me that just their first bill they're going to increase it so dramatically.

Now, I'll tell you another area of my frustration was coupled with the criticism from the now majority last year about earmarks and the process. And we passed a bill last year that altered the process for earmarks, and it was one that I thought was very appropriate because it dealt with earmarks by spreading sunshine on the process. And I really believe that sunshine is always the best disinfectant. So we adopted a process that embraces sunshine. What it means is that somebody had to have ownership for an earmark request, and that the earmark request had to go through what we would deem regular order, which means you submit it to the appropriations subcommittee staff, then I would go and testify in front of that subcommittee on my earmark; we could have give and take and an intellectual conversation about that, and it would be then voted upon by that subcommittee, which would then raise up to the committee level where that earmark or that Member request would then be reviewed again.

The most important part of the process is when you get it out of the appropriations arena and bring it to the House floor where everyone can then see it and determine whether or not there should be an amendment to strike that particular provision from the appropriation bill. This is when everyone then gets to be part of the process of making sure that it's a valid, well, whatever is determined to be valid, but whether it's not, you know, a rainforest in Iowa City or some type of pet project like that.

I remember last year we voted probably almost on every appropriation bill at least a dozen amendments to strip out these type of really pet projects that just really didn't mean much for the Nation, but certainly may have meant something for a neighborhood. Now, most of those failed, although I voted in favor of most of them.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment. You know, I think sometimes we get a little crass around here and we think, oh, it's just $1 million, it's just $1.2 million. But the people back in the 19th District of Texas still think that $1.2 million is a lot of money. In fact, it's their hard-earned money that we're debating on the floor of this House tonight. I think sometimes we forget that.

One of the things that I am very proud of is the fact that our economy has been growing at a very strong rate for the last few years. We found a novel idea about leaving more of the American taxpayers' money in their pocket, and what happened? The economy started getting better, more jobs.

More people today, Mr. Chairman, own a home than any other time in the history of this country. More people working today than any other time in the history of this country. And why is that? Because we're creating jobs. And who are creating those jobs? Businessmen all over this country.

And one of the things that concerns me about this budget process that we've gone down, and it's been alluded to tonight, is really what we're talking about tonight is tax increases, because we know that this budget is going to be financed with more taxes.

□ 2030

And, quite honestly, the people in the 19th District of Texas believe they are paying enough taxes. In fact, they believe that Congress doesn't have an income problem. It has a spending problem. And it is one that they are looking to our leadership to begin to solve. As was alluded to a while ago, you cannot spend your way out of a deficit.

One of the things that concerns me most about this budget process is, we are also going to be asked to vote on things we can't see right now, but we are going to trust somebody. In other words, what we are going to do is, we are going to be asked to vote on these appropriation bills, and then in August the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is going to tell us what we voted on.

You know what? The people in the 19th District of Texas voted to send RANDY NEUGEBAUER to the United States Congress to review legislation, review appropriations, determine whether they think that that is in their best interest, and vote on it. And they kind of think that it would be a good idea, before I voted on something, that I knew what was in that piece of legislation. But yet we are going to have appropriation bills where we are going to vote on those, and then earmarks are going to be airdropped into those bills and mysteriously are going to be revealed to all of us.

Can you imagine being in your home district and the paper calls you up and says, ''I see what you voted on.'' And you say, ''I'm sorry. I haven't read the paper this morning. I haven't seen what I have voted on,'' because the earmarks were not disclosed in the bills that we are considering. Now, I don't know about in your home district, but in my home district that doesn't make a lot of sense.

What we need is transparency here. We have a lot of very smart people in Congress, and while the chairman may believe he is a very smart person, and he may be, I don't know, but I believe that I know more about the 19th District and some of the priorities in that community than the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. And the people in the 19th District are relying on RANDY NEUGEBAUER to make sure that that interest is represented here.

Now, one of the things that we have to begin to do is to do what we said we were going to do. And this group, when they got the leadership, they ran on a platform of we are going to be more transparent, that people are going to get to see all of the spending bill at one time, that they are not going to be in pieces and parts, and there are not going to be deals cut in conference; that when these spending bills are brought to the floor of the House of Representatives, we are going to know what is in those bills. And that should be the way it is.

But now, as we get into this process, we find out that, no, that is not the way it is going to be; that we have a new rule, and the new rule is that we will let you know when it is time for you to know.

Well, you know what? The people in America think that the time for a United States Congressman to know what is in a bill is not after he has

voted or she has voted on that bill, but while and before they voted on that bill.

We said we were going to come down and bring these bills onto the floor. We were going to look at them, peruse them, that we were going to have time to look at them. And we have not kept that promise, and that is a shame. It is a shame that the American taxpayers are getting rooked with this appropriation process.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here in this Chamber for a long time, and I was here in the minority back in the early 1980s when my colleagues over there were running this place. They ran this place for 40 years. For 40 years they ran this place, and they ran the budget right into the ground and raised taxes and spent more money.

But they became reformed, like some ladies of the evening are reformed. And they changed their spots and said, we have got to do something about spending in the Congress because the Republicans took over for 12 years, and they didn't like the way we ran this place. They said we were spending too much money, and they went on a tirade time after time, saying that they needed to be back in power because they were going to be fiscally responsible, and they were going to control spending, and they were going to do everything they did not do for 40 years when they had control.

I used to walk past my colleagues' offices when we were in charge, and they had big signs out in front of their offices: Today the national debt went up this much and today spending went up this much, and it is all because of the Republicans, they were implying.

Well, they got control back and what has happened? They have authorized $105.5 billion in new spending over the next 5 years. And they complain because we want to cut $1.241 million out of this bill. Just $1.241 million, not billions but a million. And you don't like that. And we are keeping the spending at last year's level.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle do not want to vote for a balanced budget amendment. They will tell you they want to balance the budget. But when a balanced budget amendment comes to the floor, they almost all vote against it because they know where their power lies, and that is in spending and taxes, spending and taxes; and that is what they are going to do.

The tax cuts that President Bush and this Congress, back in the early part of the Bush administration, put in place, they want those tax cuts to expire. And in Indiana alone, that means that most of the people in my State will have a $2,200 per person tax increase because the tax cuts expire. They want those to expire. They want to spend more money like they are doing right now. They want to extend spending over the next 5 years by $105 billion. And yet they are the fiscally responsible people in this body.

I would just like to say to my colleagues and anybody else who is paying attention that they really ought to look at history. They really ought to look at what the Democrats said before they took power, and then they ought to look very seriously at what they are doing right now. They want more taxes. They want more spending. They want more control. And that is exactly what they did the 40 years they had control before the Republicans took office and the Bush administration.

There is no question that when we were in charge, we spent too much money. But compared to them, we are pikers. And the American people are going to find out once again how much these people spend and what big spenders they are and what big taxers they are. It is going to happen.

Hopefully, the American people will get the message and put the right people back in charge.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentlewoman from North Carolina's amendment, and I too will echo the words of the gentleman from Indiana that it is disappointing to see what we are doing here tonight; when the American people spoke loud and clear last November for transparency, for more openness in government, and what we have is less transparency and less openness in government.

I think you will see tonight and tomorrow a series of amendments that will try to strike that balance that the American people spoke so loudly about in November.

Tax and spend is back. Today is just the beginning. I believe what we will see in the next 11 appropriation bills is a lot more spending that the American people are going to be very surprised about.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague from Ohio's yielding to me, and I appreciate the comments that he made.

I want to also echo how much I appreciate our colleague from Indiana, who has been in the House for several years and came through a time when the Democrats were in the majority. And as he points out, they were in the majority for 40 years, and they did spend this country almost into a situation where we could not get ourselves out of it. And I appreciate his bringing that up again. We need to do it over and over and over again, reminding the American people what they did.

I, frankly, thought that when they took the majority this time that they would act differently as they had promised in the election. But we now have what we know is a house of hypocrisy because they promised a lot to the American people and they have not fulfilled those promises.

I have been particularly disappointed in the Blue Dogs. As somebody has said, there are these charts all over our office buildings, and they tell us over and over and over that the current Federal debt is $8.8 trillion, roughly $29,000 for every United States citizen, and growing by $1 billion a day. But where are those Blue Dogs when we need them? Where are they, calling for fiscal restraint? They are going right along with their leadership, going ahead and increasing the deficit every day and doing all that they can to increase the deficit. I would like to know where they are and why they aren't being responsible, as they promised they would be.

And I want to give us another quote to tie into what my colleagues have been saying. This is from Speaker PELOSI in a floor speech she made on January 7: ''After years of historic deficits, this new Congress will commit itself to a higher standard: pay as you go, no new deficit spending. Our new America will provide unlimited opportunity for future generations, not burden them with mountains of debt.''

And yet, as has been pointed out over and over and over again, there has been at least $105.5 billion in new Federal spending over 5 years that has been authorized by the House Democrat leadership this year. That doesn't sound to me like we are committed to a higher standard of ''pay as you go, no new deficit spending.''

I am also concerned about what this is doing to the American public and how cynical it is making the people. They can't count on the Democrats to do what they said they were going to do.

We have also heard tonight that we are trying to slow down the process, and I checked about that in terms of what happened last year on this bill. It took 2 full legislative days to debate this bill last year during this process, and the Democrats offered over 70 amendments to that bill. I find it really ironic that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee now says to us, as the Republicans, that we are trying to slow down the process when we are exercising our responsibility as American citizens to try to slow down this incredible spending that the Democrats want to do, increase the deficit, increase taxes. They are saying to us, you are trying to slow down the process.

They wanted this week to do four complete appropriations bills. They frittered away their time for 3 months, blamed it on the minority, saying they are not in control of what is going on here.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to talk a little bit about what we as Members of the House owe the American public, what the people who elect this House deserve and expect.

The first thing they deserve and expect is honest conversation. They deserve fiscal responsibility. They deserve openness and transparency. They deserve fairness from us.

Now, the bill in front of us, the appropriation bill in front of us tonight, spends about $4.3 billion more than the same type of bill last year. That is almost a 14 percent increase. If you look at where the increase is, about $4 billion is in first responder grants. Now, that would seem on the surface of it to be adequate and fair. That is something that the American people might like. The first responders do expect and deserve good treatment.

But when we understand from the past appropriation processes that there is almost $5 billion left in this fund for first responders to draw from that they have not yet taken out from past appropriations and we go ahead and add $4 billion on top of it now, it causes the American public to say, Why? What is it that we are getting?

The American public will stand for things that seem right and seem justified, but in order to get the $4 billion to put into this fund, our friends on the other side of the aisle are increasing taxes, the second largest tax increase in American history.

Now, how is that important?

□ 2045

I will tell you that the Governor of New Mexico said it best: Lowering taxes creates jobs. The corollary of that is also true; raising taxes depresses jobs. Raising taxes stagnates the economy. It does away with the vitality that any country is looking for.

So, when Ireland wanted to improve its economic state, it began to lower taxes. When it lowered taxes on internal corporations, they had a surge of growth. But when they lowered taxes on external corporations, companies began to move to Ireland and create a grand, booming economy and new jobs in Ireland, and for the first time in the Irish history they have moved their economy tremendously forward because they cut taxes.

Now, what we are doing in order to create the $4 billion in just this one appropriations bill is to raise taxes. We are going to stagnate the American economy. We have created an about 7.7 million jobs in the past 2 or 3 years. It has been an excellent economy, one that started off in a recession, the recession that started at the end of the Clinton years, and that recession then moved forward. And 9/11 shocked us into the recession again; the Global Crossing scandal, the Enron scandal, the WorldCom scandal that shocked us into recession even further. But the Bush administration and this Congress passed two successive tax cuts which began to revitalize the economy, and that revitalization is now at risk because of the way that the Democrats in this Congress are willing to put $4 billion into this one fund that has a surplus of over $5 billion in it.

Now, the lady from North Carolina is taking a small attack on this whole increase. She's saying, quite simply, let's just don't pay the attorneys $1.2 million that they received. A $1.2 million increase is not needed for attorneys. The people in this country need good-paying jobs, they need a good economy, they need a sound economy and a good government, and that good government is being denied in the guise of providing another $4 billion into a fund that still has a surplus of over $5 billion to it.

So, tonight I would recommend that we all look carefully at the lady from North Carolina's amendment, and that we support it as the first increment of many in reducing the cost of this particular bill.

The deficit spending for the government doesn't occur one large lump at a time, it occurs one small piece at a time. And the lady from North Carolina has adequately stated, let's just not do it. Let's level fund. Let's fund at the same amount that we gave last year.

That is a reasonable thing for the American people to want to see. The American people deserve and expect this fiscal responsibility, for us to spend the money as if it were our own because they are trusting us with it. They put us in a position of stewardship over that money, and yet here we are throwing the money into a fund that is not being spent adequately yet. And in order to get more money to put in there, we are raising taxes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Well, we are right back doing what we said we were going to do because we think it's important. We are talking about cutting back the level of administrative costs that we had last year. And you know, for a whole year, almost 2 years, the now majority, then minority, told us what a lousy job the Department of Homeland Security was doing, and in some ways I agreed with them. Well, I don't give raises to people who do lousy jobs. I don't think that's the way you ought to do it. I don't think you just automatically get a raise in this world, that your department should automatically give an increase if you're not doing the job. And in some areas I think a message needs to be sent that you hold the line and do the job we paid you to do, and you will be doing what we want you to do, and then we will talk about what your needs are for the future.

But I think the present, going back to the 2007 budget numbers, is the proper thing to do. I support the gentlelady's amendment. It is about telling the American people that we are ready to tighten the belt and show fiscal responsibility. We are not willing to push spending levels so high, as this process is doing in the Democratic plan, to where, once again, if you look at their budget, and it has been talked about tonight over and over, if you look at it, it is an inevitable road to a massive tax increase, which, quite frankly, as my friend from New Mexico was saying, is not good for the United States.

So, once again, let's let the sunshine in. As the sun rises over the mountain, let it shine on this appropriation bill. And let this appropriation bill be open to all in the United States. And how do we do that? Well, one thing we've got to do is we've got to talk with the chairman; he has got to be convinced to put some light on the process of earmarks.

And I want to make something very clear, Mr. Chairman, nobody on this side of the aisle is fighting for their earmark. We are asking clearly, whatever the process may be, we want to be able to see it so we can do something about it. The American people told us, do something about earmarks. We wrote a law that would work, the Democrats agreed, and now all of a sudden the whole process is behind closed doors. And somebody, and I am not sure exactly yet who, will be behind those doors to make the decisions of how Member-initiated projects will be funded.

This debate is not about Member-initiated projects. The debate is about letting us see, while we still have a chance to do something about it, and don't airdrop this into committee where it can't be done. I don't think this is hard to figure out. I think this is an easy process, and that is a process that the chairman can work with us on and come up with a solution for.

It is important, Mr. Chairman, that we have sunshine upon the earmark process. And if we get that, I think we will have what the American people asked us for in the last election. It is very critical.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

You know, I tried listening to this debate and coming to a conclusion that we were discussing something important. But here's my feelings: If I was a highly paid Republican consultant, although that's redundant, but if that's what I was, I would say to you guys you are making a terrible mistake; somebody misinformed you on what bill this is. This is not the Labor-H bill, where you would go after labor unions, which you always do, where you would not care about funding programs for education, which you always do, where you would leave children behind for a long, long time.

I could understand if you did it there. If this was the VA–HUD bill, I could understand all these desires to cut because, what the heck, you send people to war, and then you don't want to fund the Veterans Hospital Administration. I understand that. You don't want to do housing. I understand that. If this was any other bill, I would understand the strategy. But this is the bill that every right-winged radio talk show host says you're the best on, homeland security, protecting the homeland, making sure that there is never another terrorist attack. And this gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) gives you a well-thought-out bill that takes care of the needs for protecting the homeland, and you spend the last X amount of hours trying to tear it apart because we are

spending too much time, and it is driving up the deficit.

Now, I don't know how many people were around when I spoke the last time, and I reminded you that there is a deficit; a deficit created by going into a war that was built on lies and bad information; a deficit created by refusing to bring the troops home now, or soon, like we had suggested, but keeping this war going and spending a lot more money; a deficit created by reducing the taxes of the richest people in the country, while squabbling over giving the little guy a minimum-wage increase.

So, all I want to tell you today, as a friendly person and kind, gentle-hearted person that I am, is that someone has given you some bad information. This is not any of those other bills that you are known for bashing. This is not the one that will leave children behind. This is the one that is supposed to be the hallmark of your existence as a party. This is national security. This is protecting the homeland. How could you cut this bill?

But you know something? Mr. PRICE is right. If you are not going to protect your administration's programs, then we are certainly not going to waste a lot of time over here trying to debate you on it. So, go ahead and destroy protecting the Homeland Security Department. Go ahead and turn your back on securing the motherland. Go ahead and do it all. We will just stand here and wait it out. It may take days, but there's where you're heading.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the rules of the House state that all discussions must be directed towards the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true.

Mr. MCHENRY. And Members should be reminded that discussions of debate on the floor should abide by decorum and direct their comments to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is correct. Many Members today have failed to live up to that rule. Members should be reminded that remarks are to be directed to the Chair.

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I greatly appreciate the compassionate concern of the previous speaker for the well-being of the Grand Old Party. It seems that compassionate conservatism these days is far more contagious than many expected and even I would have hoped. I will also tell you that prolonged exposure to the speeches of Ronald Reagan will quickly cure you of that.

I would also like to point out to the gentleman, through the Chair, that he points out the rich Republican lobbyists that this town is so awash in. Well, I have good news for him and bad news for the rich Republican lobbyists that are more highly paid these days than the Democrats, as they are now in the majority, which is why you will see so many foreign cars driving around with Kerry-Edwards bumper stickers on them in our Nation's Capital, if not in the Motor City where the UAW might find them.

I was told that we are antilabor. As the grandson and son of union members, whose voting record was better on CAFTA than 13 Members of the new majority, I take umbrage at that statement. As the son of schoolteachers, who has a good voting record on education matters, I take umbrage at that. And in terms of voting to send our troops to war and then not voting to fund our veterans, I would point out that in the new majority there are those who voted to send our troops to war and then voted not to fund our soldiers. So let us be careful with our accusations and how we impugn one's motivations.

Interestingly, we are not content with the war overseas, and now we see a case where we are going to engage in class warfare over here at home at a very time when we should be united.

It is these types of situations that, when I try to explain government and what I do to my wife and I's 10-year-old daughter Amelia, that I spend a lot of time scratching my head, which would explain my balding pate, because I find this place very frustrating.

To the gentleman, I know the majority has tried very hard to work on this bill, and it has been called a ''delicate, well-thought-out document.'' If that were the case, how can $1.2 billion be accepted in such a facile fashion at the drop of a hat to simply pacify a minority and to get them to stop addressing this bill? $1.2 million remains a lot of money. And it would be, I would hope, wrong of people to perceive that $1.2 million could either be taken from or put into a bill simply for reasons of convenience and operations of the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

But these are the problems that tend to come with governing, as my own party found out. We got to sit in power for 12 years, some of us for far less than that, and we watched and we watched and we watched as the spending and the debt continued to mount and our Nation's taxpayers and families and our party was no longer entrusted by the American people to govern. But I remember at the time I would point out that a lot of those appropriation bills that so many people decried throughout that election were vastly bipartisan exercises in governance, and that there were many votes on this side of the aisle for the excessive spending, and many votes on the other side of the aisle for excessive spending.

□ 2100

The rub then came when the majority party at the time, our Republican Party, was accused of spending too much on too many things and for deficit spending.

Today we flash forward, and what do we find? We find a situation where we have just recently passed a budget. I didn't vote for it. None of my Republican colleagues voted for it. But it was duly passed.

What did that budget do? That budget promised billions in new spending in reserve accounts. Billions in new spending. What else did it promise? What else did it promise? It promised the largest tax increase in American history to pay for it.

Now, today, as we go through this appropriation process, we see that some of the promises they are attempting to keep in the new majority. That would be the billions and billions in new spending. Does one not believe that they are going to do everything they can to go through and have the largest tax increase in American history to pay for it, or, in the alternative, they will continue to see the deficit and the debt mount?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her wonderful amendment this evening.

Mr. Chairman, I am new to this body, and one thing I found is that in Minnesota, we have a little bit different definition of ''transparency.''

''Transparency'' in Minnesota means an individual stands on one side of a divide, and they can look through to see something on the other. Here in the case of this bill, you have the taxpayer and you have Members of Congress trying to look through a divide, and what they see on the other side is a very interesting definition of ''transparency.''

Mr. Chairman, the first thing that they see is a slush fund for earmarks. And this is something I don't quite understand; the Democrat majority, they are leaving lump sums of money without a specified purpose in legislation being considered by this House and then later authorizing those funds for earmarks in a closed-door conference committee. It is just a real interesting definition of transparency, because the Democrats have created now, Mr. Chairman, a slush fund for earmarks which will be funded by the largest tax increase in American history. This is just so interesting to me, this new definition of ''transparency.''

Also a part of this definition is that earmarks will no longer be allowed to be challenged here on this House floor because under the Democrats' rules, Members will be prohibited from challenging individual earmarks in bills on the floor or debating their merit as long as there is a list of earmarks in the bill.

But what is interesting, Mr. Chairman, is that it won't matter if this list is flat-out wrong, if it is incomplete, or whether the earmark which is one that a Member would like to debate is missing from the list. It is just a real interesting definition of ''transparency.''

The ''truth in labeling'' that we are seeing in this bill is also interesting, Mr. Chairman, because earmark-laden bills can now be certified as earmark-free. Real interesting. I guess it depends on what the meaning of ''free'' is.

Democrats will be allowing their bills to be certified by the majority as earmark-free even if they contain earmarks. So as long as you take a magic wand, Mr. Chairman, and wave it over the bill, you can just say, ''Voila, it is now earmark-free.'' It is kind of like having fat-free french fries. It is something we would all love to have, but it just isn't possible. As long as any bill is certified by Chairman OBEY as earmark-free, then, under the House rules, it is earmark-free.

This rule was exploited earlier in February, Mr. Chairman, by the House Democrats when they passed their continuing resolution that contained hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayer-funded, hidden earmarks, kind of like those fat-free french fries.

The largest tax increase in history, Mr. Chairman, is in the budget that was passed by the House Democrats, and that will likely be the story. Even though the majority likes to claim otherwise, they will raise taxes by at least $217 billion, Mr. Chairman, in all likelihood most likely $392 billion, and will raise marginal rates, except for the 10 percent rate, and capital gains rates and dividend rates and prevent a full repeal of the death tax, items the American public have indicated they are not for.

Speaker of the House *Pelosi* had said earlier that the budget should be ''a statement of our National values.'' Well, not only is this budget, Mr. Chairman, the largest in American history, it will sanction the largest tax increase in history upon more American families, because people in Minnesota, Mr. Chairman, my home State, will be paying an average of more than $3,000 a year more to this town, Washington, D.C. Again, a very interesting definition of ''transparency.''

The budget is going to trigger more tax hikes, and it will greatly increase domestic spending. It will increase nondefense appropriations by $23 billion above what we spent in 2007. That is in addition, Mr. Chairman, to the $6 billion that the Democrats have already added to the omnibus bill and more than $20 billion in the war supplemental.

The American people, Mr. Chairman, are very concerned as well about the unlimited emergency spending, because the Democrat budget is going to abandon the emergency set-aside that was established in last year's budget resolution and change what Congress can call an emergency, unlimited exemption, exempting the Senate spending bill from any limits.

This is really, Mr. Chairman, putting the next election above the next generation, something that none of us should want to do. The Democrats in this bill, unfortunately, have ignored the warnings of the entitlement crisis. Let's not forget, we have heard from the Comptroller General David Walker.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. BACHMANN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Chairman, the Democrat majority has once again ignored the dozens of experts, including Chairman Greenspan, including the Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, and also the Comptroller David Walker, who have pleaded with us, pleaded, Mr. Chairman, with the Congress and given us repeated warnings about the unsustainable rate of entitlement spending.

This is our upcoming economic tsunami, Mr. Chairman. Their budget has turned a blind eye to the impending crisis that is coming upon this next generation. Who among us can look in the eyes of the next generation, knowing what we know of the bill that will be handed to them for the party that we are all having today? Unfunded net liabilities. And yet we can stand here and do nothing to address the concerns and put off any major reform for at least 5 years?

Now is the time, Mr. Chairman, to have true transparency, and I am sad to say that this bill does none of that.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many of our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, and I have been listening to this debate for the last 5 hours, have lamented our efforts to highlight objections to not only this bill, but also the underlying process by which all of the appropriations bills, 11, and then 12 later on, will be brought to the House floor this year.

I believe it is crucial that we take this opportunity to register our strong opposition to the process, while I rise in support of the gentlewoman from North Carolina's amendment to cut $1.2 billion out of this homeland security appropriations bill, and that is not a small chunk of change. But it is a process which we believe is neither fair nor open nor in the best interests of the American taxpayer.

Late last year the new majority in this House assured the American public that it would bring transparency and openness to the appropriations process and specifically to this practice which we and the general public very well know now, as they campaigned on this issue last fall, the practice of earmarking.

At a minimum we believe that this commitment, and I think the American people believe as well, or they wouldn't have gained the majority, that it would equal that of the Republican majority in the last Congress, that the sponsors of earmarks would be identified in the bills themselves, whether they were authorizing bills, appropriations bills, indeed even in narrowly drawn tax bills, so that Members could debate and challenge those earmarks if they were found to be egregious on the House floor. Apparently the Democratic majority has very different definitions of ''transparency'' and ''openness'' than we do and than the American people do that elected them to this new majority.

The respected chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, how long has he been in this body, 39 years? I think he is going on his 20th term. He has been a former member of and chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He is one of the most respected Members, one of the most knowledgeable Members. He clearly knows what he is doing in regard to not putting these earmarks in the appropriations bill, which he knew would be coming to this floor under an open rule so that we could have a free, a fair, an open debate.

We would accept some earmarks. They are not all bad. Certainly they are not all bad. But the ones that are egregious, that we should have an opportunity to debate on both sides of the aisle and strike.

Now, the chairman has said, well, you know, we are going to go ahead after we finish all these bills, these 11 bills, we are going to publish all of the earmarks that we are considering airdropping in the conference report. They are going to have transparency. They are going to see the light of day, because we are going to put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2 months from now, in August.

But that does not give the Members of this body on either side of the aisle an opportunity. Yes, you can see them, and maybe it will remove the opportunity for the Senate to use a point of order to strike some of these amendments that have been airdropped because all of a sudden they have been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That is not the same as having the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, on the floor to debate and to vote up or down some of these egregious earmarks.

Now, what I want to suggest in my time remaining, I want to suggest to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, why don't you simply then in August bring a bill?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair held in response to the gentleman from North Carolina previously, Members must address the Chair and not other Members. In the same vein, the Chair must correct the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, what I would suggest is that very easily a package of these earmarks, I don't know how many are going to be put in the final conference report; if there are 30,000 earmarks, maybe 15,000 of them in the aggregate in these 11 bills will be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then eventually airdropped in the conference report.

Well, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that a bill or resolution through the

Appropriations Committee could come to the floor of this House under an open rule, and let us at that point take each one of those earmarks, maybe specified for each of the 11 appropriations bills, and then have our opportunity to vote up or down.

I have been listening to the debate, again, like I said, for a couple or 3 or 4 hours, and nobody has made that suggestion. So I want to try to improve the process, Mr. Chairman, and I want to make that suggestion to the Democratic leadership and to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It is not too late to do the right thing. We feel like you have done the wrong thing and shut the process down. It is not what the people want, but it is not too late to see the error.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GINGREY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, again, the comments that these are dilatory amendments, the subcommittee chairman from North Carolina saying, well, you want to strike a little bit of change here and there, and you are just trying to slow the process down. In some cases, yes. In some cases, like the amendment that we are discussing right now, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, the gentleman from Washington Mr. REICHERT, who is a ranking member on the subcommittee, these are not dilatory amendments. These are important policy amendments.

But we are outraged by the policy. And to take my time and make the suggestion of what you can do to correct this, I hope you will take that to heart. I hope the chairman, Mr. Chairman, will take that to heart and give us an opportunity, if not now, at least in August, to vote on these earmarks. That is exactly what you promised the American people, and you need to deliver on that promise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to remind Members, as the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out, that remarks are to be addressed to the Chair.

The Chair will admonish Members not to direct remarks to other Members, to the Democratic leadership, or anyone other than the Chair. It is not that the Chair wants all of the attention, but the gentleman from North Carolina has insisted on the rules, and the Committee will abide by them.

□ 2115

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on this issue, and I commend the gentlewoman from North Carolina for presenting this issue.

The hour is getting late, but I think it is extremely helpful and extremely clarifying for those watching to appreciate that there is a distinction between the different folks rising this evening and drawing attention to the amount of spending.

The gentleman who is presenting this bill said in all sincerity that this bill wasn't about earmarks and it wasn't about ideology. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would beg to differ. It is all about ideology, and it certainly has a lot to do with earmarks.

The ideology we talk about being present in this bill and every other appropriations bill that I have seen that has been filed so far is that there is one side that believes that spending ought to increase to a fare-thee-well. And there is the other side which believes there ought to be responsibility to that spending.

We have already seen the majority party, so far this year, increase authorization for spending by over 50 billion new dollars. We have already seen the new majority adopt a budget which has, depending on who you talk to, the largest tax increase, or the second largest tax increase, in the history of our Nation. That tax increase is to pay for the spending.

So, yes, Mr. Chairman, it is all about ideology. It is also about earmarks because what we have been presented is a new policy by the majority party that allows for a slush fund, a slush fund for earmarks in virtually any appropriations bill that comes to the floor.

So I commend my colleague from Georgia who spoke just before me and offered a solution, an opportunity to bring greater sunshine and greater light to those earmarks. I think that was a well-thought-out proposal.

I suspect there are people watching and saying, what is it that we desire? Why is it that we are drawing attention to what we believe to be an egregious rule? Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest what we desire is a decrease in irresponsible spending. It is that irresponsible spending that is causing tax bills for Americans to mount up to unacceptable levels. And, consequently, we believe the slush fund for earmarks ought to be done with, ought to go away. The American people ought to know who is spending their hard-earned tax money, and they ought to be able to hold those folks accountable.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the solution to the dilemma in which we currently find ourselves is to have the chairman of Appropriations or somebody in leadership on the majority side say, we won't do that, we won't bring about any earmarks in a conference committee that aren't agreed to by each and every Member of the House individually. Individually, that's what we proposed. In fact, that is what we enacted in our own bill, in our own rules last session.

Mr. Chairman, there is a solution to this. There is an opportunity for us to move onward and make it so the American people are able to have their say, to have each and every one of their Representatives have their say about the kind of spending that is going on here in Washington.

And it is not just our side. If you take the words of the Members of the new majority from the not-too-distant past, after the recent election, when the the majority leader said, ''We are 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 is being done.'' That is a quote.

Here is another quote. ''Words will not do it. I have a good relationship with Representative ROY BLUNT. I have a good relationship with Representative JOHN BOEHNER. We'll work together. We'll include them in decision-making.

''To the extent that we create an atmosphere of mutual respect, the American people will feel more comfortable with Congress.''

Mr. Chairman, I suspect you know what I know, and that is that the recent data on the respect with which the American people hold this Congress and this majority is at an all-time low. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that one of the reasons that it is at an all-time low is because of the kind of policies that are being put into place by this majority that make it so that light cannot shine on the amount of spending that is being done in this Congress.

I urge adoption of the amendment. I urge a change to the earmark policy.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

First, I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for her amendment. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed by some comments I have heard from the other side of the aisle that somehow this is not a worthy debate. I believe one of my colleagues said, I thought I would come to the floor and find us debating something important.

How we spend the people's money, how much money we take from hard-working Americans is a very important matter. How much of the bread we take off of the table of that hardworking teacher in Malakoff, Texas, is a very important matter. How much money we take from the fireman, the fireman in Crandall, Texas, who is working to ensure our safety, and how much of the bread we take off of his table is a very important matter, Mr. Chairman. And not just how much money, but once we take that money, how we spend that money.

We know that the people, the people, decry how the practice of earmarks has been practiced in this House. And I wished when the Republicans were in the majority we would have done a better job. I was often disappointed. I, myself, don't request earmarks, although I know there are many that are worthy.

But at least when this party was in the majority, they woke up and heard the voices of people and said, we need reform. We need accountability. We need transparency. And Members were

given that ability to focus sunlight, sunshine, on those earmarks, and they were allowed a process by which to strike them from the bill.

Now I read a number of quotes from our new Democrat majority leadership. The Speaker said, ''I would just as soon do away with them,'' referring to earmarks. She said shortly after becoming Speaker, ''We have placed a moratorium on earmarks until a new reform process is in place to ensure the integrity of every earmark that is funded.'' A new reform process.

So now we discover, Mr. Chairman, that the new reform process is to take it out of the sunshine, hide it in the darkness, take away Members' ability to strike it from the bill, and give that, albeit apparently, to one individual who apparently is all knowing, all seeing, and all powerful when it comes to these earmarks.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that the American people will sit idly by for this practice. Already the Third Estate is letting the people know what is going on. I don't want to personalize the debate, but let me paraphrase from the Wisconsin State Journal. I won't talk about individual Members, but I will talk about the majority.

The Wisconsin State Journal: The Democrats are, and I paraphrase, ''now dodging the very reforms they helped to generate.'' This will ''prevent the public and most lawmakers from questioning earmarks until it is too late.'' Wisconsin State Journal, June 7.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer, ''Five months after,'' and again I paraphrase, the Democrat majority, ''took control, the promises remain unfulfilled.'' And what we have, ''That's a secretive process, and its final product gets a 'yes' or 'no' vote in each Chamber. This means earmarks will sail through before the press or even most Members of Congress can examine or challenge them.'' The Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 10.

The Mobile, Alabama, Press Register. ''Democrats work ATM,'' automatic teller machine. ''But now that they control the ATM, the Democrats are finding all sorts of excuses to keep the earmark dispenser open for business. Democrats are reneging on their vows of fiscal responsibility just a few months after they won their chance to load the ATM.'' The Mobile Press Register, June 8.

And the list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Chairman, there ought to be a message loud and clear from the last election. The people want to reform earmarks. This bill, this Democrat majority, this process, takes us in the exact opposite direction, and it is one more reason we need to support the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think at this time of night, it is good to remind those who might have been watching or listening why we are here. First, this bill is $2 billion over the President's request. So it is spending that we simply cannot justify moving forward with.

The second reason we are here debating and still on, I think, the first paragraph of the bill is that the majority has decided to keep earmarks secret until this bill passes and until we get to the conference report when it will be too late to amend or to strike or to challenge those individual earmarks. That is why we are here.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has said that if this process does not go well, we may just have to get rid of earmarks completely. That would be wonderful. I would gladly sit down for the rest of the appropriations season if we were to do that.

But if we are not going to get rid of earmarks completely, at least we should have a process that even the majority party has said that we need, one that has transparency, one where we actually know what is in the bills, one that has both transparency and accountability.

If you have transparency, if you have Members' names next to earmarks and an indication what entity that earmark is to support, that is a good thing. That is an element of transparency, and it is a good thing that the Democrats put that in their reform bill in January. It was a good move, and I think all of us applaud them for it.

But what good is transparency if you don't have accountability with it? What good is it to know which name is next to an earmark if that request letter is just buried over at the Appropriations Committee? And none of us have seen them; there are some 30,000 earmark request letters sitting over in the Appropriations Committee.

The distinguished chairman said last year that we simply had gotten out of control with earmarks and there is no way, with the staff that we have, to police these earmarks. He was right. He was right. If you don't believe him, you can ask a couple of the Members who are in prison today. We simply haven't policed that process very well.

I would submit it is beyond reason that the Appropriations Committee and its staff can alone police 30,000-some earmark requests. It is simply impossible. So why not release those letters and let the other Members see them? Some 30,000, if you do the math, that amounts to 73 earmarks or so per Member. You can't expect the Appropriations Committee to police those earmarks. It is beyond them.

I think they make a valiant attempt, and that is great, but it is simply beyond reason that you can police that many earmarks. So release them. Let others see them. Let outside groups and others help in that regard instead of keeping those earmark requests secret, and keeping earmarks out of the bills until those bills pass and then drop them in at a time when it is too late to challenge them.

If you want transparency, that's great. Let's have it. Let's also have accountability. That is what we want with this process, and that is why we are here tonight. That is why we are only on the first paragraph of this very large bill.

I would suspect until we reach an agreement that either we will have no earmarks, which would be the best in my view, until we reach that kind of agreement; or we will proceed under a different fashion, we will say we are going to have real accountability, real transparency,

I think we are going to have this same kind of activity.

□ 2130

Because I think that this institution deserves better. Certainly the taxpayers deserve better than the process that they have been given over the past several years.

So I'm pleased that the gentlewoman has offered this amendment. I do support it. There will be many more amendments, I believe, tonight. I plan to offer others myself.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

We've had a long discussion tonight about my colleague from North Carolina's amendment. I certainly thank her for offering it. I think we've had a healthy debate about the size and scope of government.

I think what the American people understand, Mr. Chairman, is that we should have this debate on the House floor. Mr. Chairman, our colleagues should have this grand debate about whether or not to increase the size and scope of government, even in areas of grave national importance. This is a serious debate. This is a very serious debate, and I think the American people should be proud of the kind of debate we're having today on the House floor.

As a conservative, I can see that there's waste, fraud and abuse in all areas of government, even in the Department of Homeland Security. I think we should be wise with how we spend the taxpayer dollar, even in the Department of Homeland Security.

Even if this President requested tons more money, billions more money, as a conservative I would say, no, Mr. President, we don't need those billions of dollars in new spending. And I must tell you, as a conservative I've been outspoken, trying to hold this President accountable when it comes to spending.

Yet my Democrat colleagues, Mr. Chairman, would say the President requested money, more money for the Department of Homeland Security. I think that was valid in this time of war, in this time of great national security issues.

The President requested more money for intelligence spending; yet this Democrat majority in this House, Mr. Chairman, said no to the President's increase when it came to intelligence spending. Instead, Mr. Chairman, the majority decided to spend intelligence money on this debate about climate

change, about global warming. I'm not exactly sure, Mr. Chairman, what this majority was thinking when they allocated intelligence resources, intelligence money to the debate on global warming, but they did. They said that was just.

When the President requested more money for homeland security, a $3 billion increase over last year's funds, the Democrats said that is not enough, and they went $2 billion over that. Mr. Chairman, even in Washington, D.C., $2 billion is a lot of money.

We know that the Department of Homeland Security's well funded, and what we're having a debate on here today, tonight, Mr. Chairman, is whether or not we should lard up the Department of Homeland Security with more bureaucrats at the top level; not people that are screening the airports at the lowest level, not people who are out gathering intelligence at the lowest level, but they're larding it up for the Secretary's budget, for the management's budget. They're not allocating money to get it out on the streets. They're allocating money for more bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C. And as a conservative, even if it's a Republican in the White House and a Republican administration, I will say no to that. We don't need more bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C.

We need more agents out on the streets tracking terrorists. We need more intelligence capabilities out in the streets, catching the bad guy, finding out what they're doing, how they're plotting and planning against us. That's the debate we should have here on this House floor, Mr. Chairman. That's the debate the American people want and deserve.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important debate about how we're going to allocate our homeland security dollars. Should we put it with more bureaucrats sitting in an office in Washington, D.C., or should we spend that money in a better way, to make sure when you go to the airport you have an airport screener, somebody to get you through that line effectively, people that are well-trained to track the bad guys through our intelligence capabilities, that actually have good plans in place if, God forbid, heaven forbid, we have another attack? We don't need more money for bureaucrats in Washington. We need more funding to get the bad guys.

Mr. Chairman, we have a serious debate here tonight, and I think this has been a very worthy debate of this House. My friends and colleague, Mr. Chairman, have all stated their opinions tonight, and I think there's a good consensus from the American people, good consensus from the American people that we need to cut spending to a greater degree.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the 110th Congress now under Democrat leadership, we're 6 months into this Congress now. If you think about it, that's one-quarter of the way toward the completion of this term. The American public at home should be thinking, what has this new Democrat leadership wrought in many different areas?

What has it wrought? The largest tax increase in U.S. history, the breaking of promises during the campaign of openness, the repealing of transparency that the previous majority had instituted, repealing of the openness in the area of earmarks and budget process reform.

And now on top of that, on top of the largest tax increase in history, on top of the repealing of transparency and openness, slush funds, slush funds in the very appropriations bills that the majority campaigned on that they would bring a new air of relief to this House.

The other side has said they were trying to slow down the process, that the amendments that we make are not about the bills. Well, Mr. Chairman, this bill is a homeland security bill, and as long as I have breath, I will come to this floor and speak about trying to improve homeland security in the legislation that passes this House.

I represent a district that was tremendously impacted by 9/11. I do not go to a county in my district where I do not meet victims of 9/11 or family members or people who did business with or are related with victims of 9/11.

While the rest of the world and the rest of this country may see 9/11 as something that is going by year after year and less and less part of their lives, mine is a district that remembers it every day. Mine is a district that remembers it every year still on its anniversary.

So, homeland security legislation, and amendments such as this one which work to try to improve that legislation, are incredibly important to me. And more important than that, it is incredibly important to my district.

This piece of legislation that's before us deals with the financial aspect of homeland security. Quite candidly, this is not just a matter of dollars and cents when we talk about dollars and what we spend here in Washington. What we spend here impacts upon the Federal budget, but more important than that, it impacts upon the family budget.

What the average family in Bergen County, Sussex County, Passaic County, Warren County have to do every day in their lives in order to get by is impacted by what we do on this floor and what we will do on this amendment later on tonight on how much we spend. It may be vast numbers here in Washington, but it is dollars and cents back at home.

I have the honor to serve on the Budget Committee, and on that committee for the 4-plus years that I've been here, I felt there was one thing that both sides of the aisle generally agreed to, I thought, and that was that we have a problem in this country with regard to our deficit. The difference, however, is on how to resolve that issue.

The one side, as we see now in control, sees that problem and continues to exacerbate it by spending more, more than the President asked for, more than this side of the aisle would suggest is needed, more than the American public would think that we should be spending on the American Federal budget.

We had looked to the other side after this last election to give us relief and give us reform, and what did they give us instead? The largest tax increase in history and significant spending on top of that. I guess the two really go hand in hand. If you are going to enlarge budgets without end, well, you're going to have to look back to the American public and ask them to dig ever deeper into their pockets, into their wallets and send it here to Washington. You're going to have to ask the American public to send their hard-earned tax dollars to Washington to spend on bureaucrats in offices and other such matters as opposed to allowing the American public to keep it for themselves, for their health care need, for their children's education, for their food and their housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman for her amendment, even though the amount that she's looking to reduce in the scheme of things is merely a de minimis amount as we look at it here in Washington.

But let me tell you when we get home and we are able to tell them that we were able to start the process of returning the dollars back to you, the American taxpayer, and still provide the significant and essential homeland security that is vastly important to the people in my district, they will say to this side of the aisle and to the other side of the aisle as well that they agree with us; job well done.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCHENRY TO AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a second-degree amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCHENRY to amendment No. 33 offered by Ms. FOXX:

Strike ''$1,241,000''

Replace with ''$8,961,000''

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us today is a second-degree amendment to my colleague from North Carolina's amendment to the bill.

This second-degree amendment is very simple, very straightforward. Instead of striking $1,241,000 from this legislation in the Secretary of Homeland Security's personal budget for his office, we've increased that number to actually $8.9 million.

What this amount difference is a result of the debate we've had here on the floor. What is very good is that we've had an open debate, an open rule, one of the rare that we've had in this new Democrat majority, Mr. Chairman. This open rule has allowed a free form of debate, which has allowed all my colleagues to engage in this discussion about decreasing the size and scope of government and curbing the excess of the growth of bureaucracy here in Washington.

As a result of this debate, I've analyzed the last amendment debates we had. My colleague from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) offered an amendment that would take the Secretary's budget back to the 2007 level. His amendment would reduce the spending by $9,961,000. Well, that amendment failed, unfortunately. I'm very happy, though, that my colleague from California offered it, though, because the House got to vote on fiscal discipline, and 201 Members of this body voted in favor of striking that $9,961,000 from the bill. Unfortunately, though, 221 voted ''no,'' so the amendment failed.

Well, watching the last series of votes, I also noticed that our colleagues voted to strike $79,000 from the Secretary's budget, as well as $300,000 from the Secretary's budget, which through this debate I really analyze that. I really had to think about those votes and see what the will of the body was on restraining government spending and the rise in growth and the bureaucracy here in Washington.

□ 2145

What I realized is that maybe my colleagues weren't ready to cut $9.9 million. But perhaps, just perhaps, we could try this out and see if my colleagues would cut $8.9 million. Now, it's not quite as much as I would like to cut from the fat of the Secretary's budget, but it's close. It's a savings to the taxpayers.

So let's try this out. Let's have a vote on this; let's have a debate on whether or not we can cut $8.9 million from a budget, if I may state, from a budget as proposed in this Chamber of $36 billion, if I have that correct. Can we cut $8.9 million from a $36 billion budget?

Well, my colleagues, 221 of them said ''no'' to this cutting $9.9 million. Let's see if they will cut $8.9 million; it's close, and it's $1 million. The American taxpayers understand the difference in $1 million. But if we could cut $8.9 million, I think we would be happy. It would be a step in the right direction.

I hope my colleagues concur.

My colleagues would say ''yes'' to cutting $300,000 from this $36 billion bill. They cut $300,000. They cut $79,000. But I wonder if my colleagues would, instead of cutting $1.2 million, which my colleague from North Carolina seeks to do, if they would cut $8.9 million.

Let's try this out. Let's have a debate on whether or not $8.9 million is enough money to cut from this $36 billion bill. Let's see if we can return that money to the taxpayers. Let's see if we can reduce the deficit so we can balance this budget. Let's see if we can cut spending so we can continue the tax cuts and continue the economic growth that we have seen over the last 5 years. Let's see if we can make sure that the American taxpayers get to keep more of what they earn. Let's see if we can cut off some fat, even just a little fat from the Department of Homeland Security. Let's see what we can do to reduce bureaucracy here in Washington.

I am not sure if $8.9 million is the right amount, but I would like to hear from my colleagues to see if they agree or if they disagree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCHENRY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MCHENRY. I would like to hear from my colleagues on whether or not $8.9 million, $8,961,000 is the right amount to cut from this $36 billion bill. I'd love to hear this debate. Some may say it's 10 million, others may say it's 6 million. Let's have this debate. It's only 10 minutes till 10:00 tonight.

We have plenty of time to continue this debate. The American taxpayers can watch us here on C–SPAN and see what good work we are doing here in Washington and see if we are being effective with their dollars.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a modest reality check. I hope that's helpful.

The gentleman from North Carolina gives an impression of great precision in wanting to cut $8,961,000, and he suggests that we might want to debate tonight whether that's exactly the right figure. He suggests that without indicating, as far as I can tell, any fact or any premise on which this very precise number is based. So we will await that with interest, exactly why this much and no more and no less.

Let me offer a little reality check in the form of the language from the committee report. Our committee recommended $14 million for the general counsel.

By the way, that's the start of understanding this. This isn't about bureaucracy, in general. It's not about government fat, in general. It certainly has nothing to do with entitlements. It's not even about the Secretary's office, in general. This is about the general counsel's office at the Department of Homeland Security. This figure was arrived at after close consultation with that office. We recommended $14 million for the Office of General Counsel.

Now, we didn't give them everything they wanted. President Bush requested $1.2 million above this. We cut that. We did not grant that full amount.

Now, 77 staff, 77 is what that appropriation pays for or would pay for. That's equal to the current on-board strength. We do say in the report, and maybe the gentleman disagrees with this, that as vacancies arise in the office, the committee directs the Department to fill the vacancies with positions dedicated to CFIUS reviews and fiscal law.

Now, CFIUS, you might remember, is the Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States, better known by reference, perhaps, to the Dubai ports deal. You will remember a great deal of discussion in this body on both sides of the aisle on how CFIUS needs to be beefed up and do a better job. We don't want to have another Dubai ports deal.

That's what we are responding to in consultation with the Department. They need some positions dedicated to those CFIUS reviews so that we do them right. Is there something wrong with that? Is there something wrong with the number 77?

That's the rationale. Since nobody else has provided it, I will. That's the rationale for what the committee has done here, as we said, not granting everything that the administration wanted, but trying to make certain that the staff has the strength they need to fulfill their present obligations and to move in this new direction which CFIUS has provided. I hope that's helpful.

Mr. TERRY. I move to strike the last word.

I do appreciate the gentleman's secondary or second-degree amendment. The good chairman stood up and gave an eloquent argument about what the primary and secondary amendment is not about. But what it is about, in my opinion, is the hypocrisy in two different areas, the hypocrisy of having boards out front of their offices talking about the mounting debt and then the first appropriation bill increasing the discretionary spending by 13.6 percent. Then, also, the hypocrisy of talking about a culture of corruption and how it spills over to earmarks.

Well, the way to cure that is transparency. The first appropriation bill out of the block hides them so we can't debate them on the House floor. That's what this is about. This is why we're upset and coming to the floor and discussing this issue. I'm very frustrated with this process of hiding these earmarks.

Well, they are not being hidden, they are just not being included in this bill so they can be dropped in at a later date, at a time when we don't have an opportunity to review them and determine them on an individual basis, the merits or lack of merit for any specific project listed. That's atrocious.

What's mostly atrocious and frustrating and hypocritical about it is the fact that these folks campaigned on reforming that, and they were the ones to throw out all the good forms of transparency so they can hide them from us.

That's wrong, and that's why we're down here. That's why we're down here, to show our frustration with blowing the lid off the spending now

and hiding these earmarks at a time when the people want to know what we're doing with earmarks here. They want them to stop. At the very least, they want to make sure that they're valid ones and not Members' pet projects.

Now, the gentleman from North Carolina with the second-degree amendment, you indicated you wanted to expand what Chairman PRICE mentioned as well.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague from Nebraska for yielding.

Let me answer the chairman's questions, because I do appreciate my colleague's leadership, and he has crafted, largely, a good bill.

My disagreements are oftentimes with my Republican administration, my colleague in the White House who is of my same party. What they have requested here is a good bit more bureaucracy at the top.

Let's face it, they have mismanaged the Department of Homeland Security. Look at the response to Katrina. I agree wholeheartedly with my Democrat colleagues. But I am of the opinion that simply because they have mismanaged does not simply mean you add to their budget.

I appreciate my colleagues' clapping. I appreciate my colleagues on the other side of the aisle clapping for me. That is so wonderful. I am excited about that. I am hopeful they will vote for my amendment, especially my good friends back there.

But let me tell you something. What I am attempting to do is get the numbers back to last year's spending level, to make sure we maintain this. My colleague from North Carolina said he spoke with the administration and realized that they wanted this amount of money. I have spoken with the taxpayers. They want some more of their money back. They don't want to deal with tax increases.

We need to get back to closer to last year's spending levels on management of the bureaucracy. We saw how the border is still porous. Let's put that money into the border.

We see how FEMA was mismanaged. Let's pour that money into getting people out there with supplies when catastrophic events come. But let's not spend on our bureaucracy here in Washington. Let's bring those numbers back closer to last year's budget levels.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you for your explanation. I think, coming here with amendments that cut the amount of this bill, even if we can reduce it from 13.6 to 13 percent or down to something reasonable like the rate of inflation, 2 or 3 percent or 4 percent, then at least that puts it in the realm of what's reasonable. But this hypocrisy is just really frustrating me.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I was watching this debate on my television in the office. I am not sure whether I was watching C–SPAN or the Twilight Zone.

When I hear some of our colleagues come to the floor and express their concern over earmarks, my question is, what is so important? I will yield to anyone on the other side. What is so important about any specific earmark that you have that it has to be rushed to passage tonight, that it cannot stand the scrutiny of this body?

If you can tell us what specific earmark you have requested that should not be studied, if my colleagues will remember, the problem was not that we studied earmarks; the problem is that they were bulldozed to passage without proper scrutiny, without proper vetting.

Well, guess what, we are running an intervention here. We are going to save you from yourselves. We are not going to allow you to continue to bulldoze these earmarks.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, we are not going to allow them to continue to rush these earmarks to passage without the proper scrutiny and to make sure the American people never again have to read headlines of Members who are incarcerated because of abusive earmarks. We will not tolerate those abuses.

So I would ask, I would yield time to the gentleman if will tell us specifically what earmarks he feels so passionate about that he has requested that should be passed tonight rather than being scrutinized by the professionals of the Appropriations Committee and debated.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to entertain this question. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I would say this. We have no idea what the earmarks are in this bill, because they are not in the bill.

Mr. ISRAEL. I reclaim my time. I will yield to the gentleman if he can publicize for us tonight what specific earmarks he has requested.

Mr. MCHENRY. You are asking the same question. We are asking because we don't see any earmarks in this bill because you intend to drop them in during a private meeting.

Mr. ISRAEL. I reclaim my time.

I will yield to the gentleman if he can answer this question. Does the gentleman know what earmarks he submitted to the committee?

□ 2200

Mr. MCHENRY. Yes, none.

Mr. ISRAEL. Does the gentleman from Nebraska know what earmarks he's submitted to the committee?

Mr. TERRY. Yes. I did not submit any.

Mr. ISRAEL. I reclaim my time. The gentleman has requested no earmarks in any appropriations bill on any appropriations bill? I'll yield to the gentleman. Ever.

Mr. MCHENRY. Yes, I have, and I publicized it at home. I publicize the ones I do ask.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the time.

Mr. ISRAEL. I will reclaim my time. The gentleman who has railed about the evil of earmarks has just acknowledged that he has requested earmarks. I would ask the gentleman what earmarks has he requested that are so important that they should not be studied by the Appropriations Committee so that we avoid the abuses of the last Congress? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCHENRY. I ask for full public scrutiny, not just a private meeting between party leaders in this body.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time. The gentleman still has not told us what earmark that he has requested is so vitally important that it should not be scrutinized.

Mr. BACHUS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I will yield to the gentleman if he can answer my question about what specific earmarks he has requested that are so important that they cannot be scrutinized. I will yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has just declined to yield to the gentleman from Alabama. He has said he would yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Has the gentleman yielded?

Mr. ISRAEL. I am yielding to the gentleman if he can answer my question.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, his question is impossible to answer. Under the rules of this House that the Democrats have written, they do not publicize the earmarks requested by Members.

Mr. ISRAEL. I reclaim my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking the gentleman to tell us, despite what he may, his interpretation of the rules, whether he knows what earmarks he has requested. He said he does know what earmarks he has requested.

I then asked him, Mr. Chairman, to share that information and explain why these should not be studied to avoid the kinds of abuses and jail sentences that occurred in the past, Mr. Chairman.

I will yield back to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized on the secondary amendment. Having not spoken on the secondary amendment, the gentlewoman is entitled to recognition for 5 minutes.

The gentlewoman yields to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the Chairman, and let me attempt to answer the question.

The question is really not whether the gentleman from North Carolina objects to an earmark. It's not whether the gentleman from New York is for an earmark.

Really, this is the people's House, and it's really up to the people to make the final judgment on each and every

one of these earmarks, and the people simply don't know what these earmarks are. This is the people's House, and we've been told there are earmarks in this bill, there will be earmarks added in conference. We're told that the professionals on the Appropriations Committee are reviewing these earmarks. They're making a determination. That's what it's about.

I grew up in Birmingham, and there was a Scripps Howard newspaper in Birmingham, and it had a searchlight on the front page. I'm sure some of you had a Scripps Howard newspaper in your community, and that was the truth going out, the light.

The gentleman from North Carolina says he doesn't know anything about these earmarks. I don't know anything about these earmarks. The gentleman from New York may know all about them. The chairman of the committee may know about them. But really, the truth is that who ought to know, and who has a right to know and a right to make that judgment in each and every case is the people we represent, the people of the United States. It's their money. It's not our money.

And that's what's so wrong with this process tonight. We are arguing among ourselves that this Member doesn't have the right, or this Member knows more than this Member, when the truth is it's the American people that have the right to know. They have the right to disclosure. This is their House. This is their money. And they have the right to make decisions about each and every one of these earmarks that some of us know about and some of us don't know about.

Now, I would say this. The American people don't know how many earmarks are in this bill or how many earmarks will be in this bill. We're going to be asked to pass, we represent, we each represent, 6-, 700,000 citizens, and we're going to be asked tomorrow or the next day to vote on this bill, to vote ''yes'' or ''no.''

We've already been told there will be earmarks added to the appropriation bill, but it won't be until all the bills are passed that they'll go to conference, and a few select Members, representing probably 10 percent of the American people, they will add the earmarks. The American people will not ever know what these earmarks are until they're passed into law.

Now, you know, I will tell the gentleman from New York, I don't care if you tell me about the earmarks.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BACHUS. I care about the American people. They have a right to know. They have a right to disclosure.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Let me, once again, not that anyone on the other side of the aisle is interested in listening to facts, but let me, once again, cite what the facts are. We keep hearing this mythical, robotic claim from the other side of the aisle that somehow these earmarks are going to be dropped in in conference.

Well, it is not our fault that you couldn't finish the budget last year and we had to finish your work. It is not our fault that you couldn't finish the work on the Iraqi bill for 2007, so we had to spend the last 3 months cleaning up your mess on that one.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. OBEY. It is not our fault that we had to spend at least 60 days answering questions from the San Diego prosecutor about shenanigans that occurred on your side of the aisle in the last year. That occupied the staff for an incredible amount of time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members have listened very courteously all evening. Members will not interrupt and heckle, on either side, the speakers.

The gentleman may proceed.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Has the Chairman not said——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state a point of order. A point of order is not a question. Does the gentleman have a point of order?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. The gentleman who is currently possessing the time has violated the rules by addressing Members other than the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair has tried to remind Members on both sides of that. The gentleman will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I won't say, I won't direct it directly to them. I will simply direct it to you.

It is not our fault that the San Diego attorney subpoenaed records from our committee relating to shenanigans that were conducted on the other side of the aisle in the previous Congress under Republican control.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I will not yield until I finish my statement. I would appreciate the same courtesy I've shown you.

Now, let me point out, the process that they've invented is not one that we have requested. What we have said is that, because of the urgency of substance, we decided we were going to leave pork projects behind for the moment. And what we've decided instead was to focus on oversight and producing substantive bills.

We've now also said that in order to assure that there is review of every project, that we are going to be filing, before the August recess, every single earmark that we expect to place in the appropriation bills. And Members will then have over 30 days to look at the process. They can complain about any earmark they want.

We are going to ask that it be open, not hidden, behind-the-scenes telephone calls. We're going to ask that people file in writing if they have an objection. We're going to ask the sponsor of the amendment to then respond in writing so that we can make a decent judgment about those earmarks.

Now, let me make another point. For people who are squawking about the fact that these earmarks aren't going to be in the bill originally, the Republicans did the same thing on the Labor-H bill in 1998, in 1999, in 2002, in 2004, in 2005. They did not have any earmarks in the Labor-Health-Education bill until the bill was in conference. The only difference was those earmarks were never reviewed ahead of time. These will be. Those earmarks were never in public view. These will be.

They also did the same thing in 2002 and 2003 when they couldn't even get a Labor-H bill through the House, and so they went directly to conference in an omnibus.

The difference between our process and the one they've been following is that there will be an opportunity ahead of time to know who has asked for these earmarks, and you'll be able to ask questions about it.

And I would assume that the leadership of both parties would take a look at the project list for both parties so that they protect this institution from the outrageous scandals that we had because of their mismanagement when they were running the show.

And I will stack my record on congressional reform against anybody on that side of the aisle any time. My entire career here has been defined by reform, and I don't intend to change it now.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just suggest that our former speaker does know the rules. He does put his time in on the work here. But by pointing out the exceptions, he also points out the vast majority of the time that the projects we had in the bill were in the bill. They could have been debated.

In the long process that the gentleman has now suggested we would go through, Mr. Chairman, the one thing that is not included in that process, where apparently people can file responses, they can do this, they can do that, they will not have the chance to debate on the House floor.

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

MOTION TO RISE OFFERED BY MR. BLUNT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 221, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

AYES—190

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

NOES—221

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—26

Arcuri
Bordallo
Braley (IA)
Clarke
Clay
Conaway
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Delahunt
Doyle
Edwards
Faleomavaega
Filner
Fortuño
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastert
Hunter
Lewis (GA)
Norton
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pomeroy
Radanovich
Sessions
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on the vote.

□ 2234

Messrs. DEFAZIO, SHULER, PALLONE, ALTMIRE and DOGGETT, Ms. WATSON and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. KINGSTON, WALSH of New York and WICKER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the second-degree amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) in regard to cutting something like $7.5 million out of this section of the bill.

The gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the subcommittee, spoke a little earlier in the evening and questioned the logic, you know, why that amount. Well, if you do the math and you look at that section, Mr. Chairman, that cut is about 7 percent. That amount reflects the same amount of overspending in this bill. The $2 billion is about 7 percent more than the President requested, and actually a 14.5 to 15 percent overall increase. So I think that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is absolutely appropriate in asking for a reasonable, fiscally responsible cut in a $120 million spending category.

Mr. Chairman, another North Carolinian was heard by me to say this morning, after the chairman of the Appropriations Committee had spoken and said what we are trying to do, what the Republican minority is trying to do is shut down the process. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Robin Hayes, said was, we're not trying to shut down the process, we are trying to clean up the process.

Just a few minutes ago, before the last motion, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee said, and I paraphrase, it is not our fault that the former majority couldn't get their work done in the previous Congress. Well, I would say to him, Mr. Chairman, it is not our fault that the new majority and the Appropriations Committee spent 3½ months debating an emergency supplemental for funding of our troops with benchmarks and timelines, Mr. Chairman, that would call for the withdrawal of our troops at a date certain, no matter what the situation was. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, there were a number of amendments in that process to bring the troops home immediately and not to give victory a chance. And, Mr. Chairman, it is not our fault that they refused to listen, this new majority, and insisted on milking this process for every ounce of political fodder that they could get out of it, knowing full well that in the final analysis they had a losing proposition. And they did lose that debate before we went home for the Memorial Day recess. So, that is not our fault.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee says, you know, we weren't able to put these earmarks in the appropriations bill under the sunshine and the light of day, as always has been done, because we ran out of time. And, Mr. Chairman, I have heard it said that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee feels very strongly that he wants to get all these bills done before the 4th of July recess to do just as good a job as our distinguished former chairman of the Appropriations Committee Mr. LEWIS did last year and the year before that in the 109th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is not our fault that the new majority wasted 3½ months and were not able to get these earmarks together in time to put in these bills like they should have done. That's not our fault.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time had expired, at which point the Chair recognized the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I have a privileged motion at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I have a privileged motion at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had recognized previously the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Members will suspend.

The gentleman from Georgia's time had expired. The Chair announced that his time had expired and recognized the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. GINGREY. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from California rise?

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

MOTION TO RISE OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 218, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

AYES—189

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—218

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—30

Becerra
Berkley
Bordallo
Boucher
Christensen
Clay
Conaway
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Delahunt
Doyle
Edwards
English (PA)
Faleomavaega
Fortuño
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastert
Holden
Hunter
Johnson, E. B.
Kilpatrick
Lewis (GA)
Miller (NC)
Norton
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Radanovich
Sessions
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 2259

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. CUELLAR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2300

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for your work on this bill. As you know, I chair the Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee, and I have been working on port security issues for many years, and I was extensively involved in the SAFE Port Act that was signed into law last year.

One important provision of the SAFE Port Act was the requirement that the Coast Guard implement a long-range vessel tracking system. More than 60,000 vessels traverse the world's oceans annually, and more than 8,000 deep-draft vessels call on United States ports every year.

Implementation of a long-range vessel tracking system is critical to ensure that maritime operations are conducted in a way that keeps our Nation safe and secure. In addition, it will make international commerce more efficient for our Nation's port operators.

Chairman PRICE, while your bill does not allocate a specific amount of funding for the implementation of the required long-range vessel tracking system, I have noted that there is a funding stream of $40 million for activities mandated by the SAFE Port law, and I want to clarify your support for the implementation of the long-range vessel tracking system required in the

SAFE Port law and that part of the $40 million in funding could be used towards meeting that mandate.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman for her inquiry and for her leadership on the Homeland Security authorizing committee.

As you stated, the SAFE Port Act established many new requirements related to port security. I agree that the implementation of a long-range vessel tracking system should be a priority, and that part of the $40 million in additional funding could be used to meet the long-range vessel tracking system mandated in the SAFE Port Act.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, thank you for that clarification and for your strong support for improving port security and the security of our country.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have a question I think the American people would like answered. It is a question that has not been asked tonight. We know Chairman OBEY, and we know he has taken a position that he is not going to publish or disclose these earmarks. He has expressed his opinion.

What we don't know, Mr. Chairman, is, the Speaker is not sitting in the Chair and we don't know where the Speaker stands on this whole procedure. We do know that the majority leader said that all earmarks would be published, there would be complete transparency. We know that he said in committee they would be debated. We know that the Speaker on a number of occasions, I think we have all seen those quotes, we have heard a few tonight, the Speaker make it clear during the campaign and after the campaign that all earmarks would be disclosed prior to any vote on the House floor.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is incumbent on the Speaker to come before this body and address the body and tell the body whether or not the procedure that we are witnessing, whether it is chairman of the Appropriations Committee has taken this on himself, whether he is doing it on his own accord, whether he has polled the Democrat Members to see where they stand.

But more important, we want to know where the Speaker stands. We want to know whether the Speaker consulted with the chairman, whether she has blessed this. We know what she said in USA Today. We know what she said in the Christian Science Monitor and what she said in a news conference just last month. We know that in a press conference on March 13, 2007, she specifically said that all earmarks would be made public before a vote on the House floor. We know that, so it is a mystery to us why we are going through this process.

Now, the chairman of the full committee said back in 1999 there was a bill, one bill, that the Republican majority did not publish the earmarks before the vote on the floor. We know that is part of his reason for doing this. But we also know that the Speaker of the House told the American people that this would never happen as long as she was Speaker. And she, as a late as a month ago, said there would be no votes on the House floor on an appropriations bill where earmarks were not published.

In fact, the gentleman from Illinois, the majority whip, says, if possible, we are going to put them on the Internet weeks before we vote on them on the House floor. They are not on the Internet. We don't know how many earmarks there will be, what earmarks are under consideration, the total amount of those earmarks.

But more importantly, we do know one thing, Mr. Chairman, we know that the Speaker of this House, the Speaker of this House said that this wouldn't happen. She said it many times on many occasions, both during the campaign when she asked the American people to turn the Republicans out and put the Democrats in.

And we know that from exit polls that many people went to the polls on election day with that promise in mind; and they voted for Democrats who now serve in this body under the assurance that this wouldn't happen, and it is happening.

Now, we know that the chairman of the full committee, we know his position. He said we just have to do. He talks about what we have done and what they have done. The important thing is the American people.

In fact, earlier tonight on one of the news network, it was not Fox, they asked: Where does Speaker PELOSI stand on this? The American people are asking, where does the leadership of the majority stand on this issue?

That is my question, Mr. Chairman. I would ask that before we proceed in this body, that the Speaker of this House come before this body and not tell, I don't care if she tells Republicans, I don't care if she further explains to Democrats, I want her to tell the American people why, only 3 weeks after promising that earmarks would be fully disclosed both in committee and on the floor of this House, that we backed away from this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MOTION TO RISE OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 220, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

AYES—187

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—220

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

Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—29

Bordallo
Boucher
Clay
Coble
Conaway
Conyers
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Delahunt
Doyle
Edwards
English (PA)
Faleomavaega
Fortuño
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastert
Holden
Hunter
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick
McMorris Rodgers
Norton
Peterson (PA)
Rangel
Sessions
Stark
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 2327

Mr. GOHMERT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''present.''

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCHENRY. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, under House rules, only a Member can speak one time on each amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has spoken on the secondary amendment. He has, however, not spoken on the primary amendment, which is still pending.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCHENRY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state it.

Mr. MCHENRY. The secondary amendment is before us here now. That is the operational motion.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MCHENRY. And so, therefore, since he has already spoken on the secondary amendment, he may not speak a second time on the secondary amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The underlying amendment remains subject to debate, and the gentleman is entitled to speak on the underlying amendment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to both the underlying amendment and the substitute amendment, and let me tell you why. I think it's important to put that amendment in context.

We had crocodile tears expressed here about the number of earmarks and what will happen to earmarks. Let me cite the record.

In 1994, the last year when Democrats controlled the House, earmarks were primarily concentrated in four appropriation bills. They were project-oriented bills like military construction, energy and water, Interior and general government. This Homeland Security bill had not even come to pass yet because it was before 9/11.

In the Labor-Health-Education appropriation bill the last year that the Democrats controlled, we had zero earmarks. The last year under Republican control that we had earmarks in the Labor-H bill, we had over 3,000.

In the Transportation bill, the authorizing bill, from 1956 through 1995, we had 20 separate highway bills pass this House containing a total of 739 earmarks. Do you know how many we had, Mr. Chairman, in 2005 under Republican control in just one bill? Five thousand.

□ 2330

Then we all remember the infamous 3-hour vote on Medicare part D.

I would ask my colleagues on this side of the aisle to keep this civil. If the other side wants to turn it into a circus, fine, but I think we ought to behave.

Let me say, we remember Medicare part D when the Republican leadership kept the vote open for 3 hours. Meanwhile, the newspaper stories told of how they promised earmarks in the transportation bill in return for votes on Medicare part D.

Last year, we had three major scandals. We had the Cunningham affair, then we had the bridge-to-nowhere, which caused a lot of heartburn around the country; and now, just recently, we have another story suggesting that the committee chairman then, the gentleman from Alaska, inserted a project for Florida.

Under Republican rules, as they existed then, nobody knew about any of that until about 2 years after the fact. Under the proposal that we are proposing for earmarks, you would know about that 30 days before they went into effect. That is a huge difference.

Let me also point out, in 1994, the four biggest appropriation bills that's Commerce-Justice, Labor, Transportation and VA–HUD. The last year the Democrats controlled the House, in 1994, the four major appropriations bills, Commerce-Justice, Labor-Health, Transportation and VA, we had a total of 764 earmarks. Those same bills, just one fiscal year ago, had 8,600 earmarks.

With all due respect, I don't want to hear any crocodile tears on the other side of the aisle with respect to the issue of earmarks. They have exploded under their operation of this House, not under ours.

In terms of what's going on tonight, I should make quite clear that the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) told me in January that the minority party would give us no procedural cooperation because they didn't like the way we had handled a continuing resolution. They wanted us to have a straight CR rather than thinking our way through priorities. Now they have simply moved on to another excuse.

So I would simply say, whether you vote for the underlying amendment or for the amendment to the amendment, these are not real amendments. It is clear to me that they have only one purpose, to bring this House to a halt, and they are looking for any excuse they can find.

They got a mighty weak one, but we are going to stay here until the job is done. This is the people's business. We are not going to be diverted by their trying to play Trivial Pursuit on this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I have voted every time to continue our process against my leadership. I was not going to say anything, but when you referred to the bridge-to-nowhere as a scandal, when you voted for it four times, most of the people in this room voted for it four times. It was always transparent. I was always proud of my earmarks. I believe in earmarks, always have, as long as they are exposed.

But don't you ever call that a scandal.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. That's hard to do.

I would suggest respectfully, again, let's keep our facts straight. Every one of you in this room, maybe, six or eight people, never voted for the bill that you are talking about. But you voted for it four times.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. It was transparent, as it should be tonight.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

It seems to me we are in some danger of forgetting what we are here about. We are here about the second-degree amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY). I rise in strong support of that amendment because it would restrain the excessive spending in this bill.

But it's more important that we talk about what we are really here about. What we are really here about is the people's business. What we are really here about is how we spend their money.

What brings us here tonight, in the middle of the night, is that the majority has proposed a procedure for handling earmarks which is inconsistent with what you told the American people. It is indefensible, and it cannot stand. You can recognize that. You can accept that fact tonight and change that procedure; you can accept that fact tomorrow.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SHADEGG. You can accept those facts tonight and change the procedure. The majority can accept that fact tomorrow and change the procedure. The majority can accept that fact next week and change the procedure, but the procedure will change.

I have the greatest respect for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I admire his energy, his tenacity and his passion. I understand that he believes he has proposed a fair system. I understand that he has just recited for us a history lesson about how earmarks were handled in the past.

But I would suggest to you that time moves on. The American people now understand earmarks in a way they did not understand. The American people understand earmarks, and they understand this process, and they cannot be fooled. You cannot take the process for disclosing earmarks and make those earmarks public after the bill has been debated.

There is not a constituent of yours that believes that makes sense. The American people understand that some people in this body believe earmarks are very good, and some people in this body believe earmarks can be very bad and very corrupt.

They are in unanimity on one point, and that is, they want to know what's in those earmarks. That means those earmarks have to be debated on this floor.

Now, I understand that the gentleman who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee believes that he can just vet them, and he can post them in August, but that obviates the most important part of this process. We do not engage in this process by adding language to bills, critical language to bill language that the American people don't get to see or know about after debate has occurred.

We didn't tell the American people that we would make the process open this year, that we would disclose every earmark and allow every earmark to be debated, because we don't run the place.

You run the place. You're in the majority.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Members will remember to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SHADEGG. The majority party told America that these earmarks would be openly revealed, and that means they have to be debated.

It doesn't matter. You can relent now, or you can go on and defend this practice through the press tomorrow and tell them that you want secrecy. You do not want a Member over here to be able to debate an individual earmark. You do not want that earmark revealed to the public today.

You do not want that earmark revealed to the public today. You want to put its being revealed off to some point later, when no Member can raise it or object to it, but the American people get it. The history lesson is nothing more than a history lesson.

Earmarks in this body must now be disclosed because the Speaker said she would disclose them. That's all we are asking for. We are asking that they be disclosed so the American people can see them, so that our constituents can see them, and so on this floor we can debate them and discuss them. The good ones will pass, and the ones that are corrupt or inappropriate will fail.

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

MOTION TO RISE OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 216, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

AYES—188

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—216

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman

Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—33

Bordallo
Boucher
Buyer
Clay
Coble
Conaway
Conyers
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
Delahunt
Doyle
Edwards
English (PA)
Faleomavaega
Fortuño
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastert
Holden
Hunter
Myrick
Norton
Peterson (PA)
Rangel
Sessions
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stark
Van Hollen
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 2356

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. And I yield the balance of my time to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, there's been a lot said tonight by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee about how the numbers of earmarks have gone up over the years, or went up over the years that Republicans were in charge. But nary a word has been said about the fact that the Democrats were getting a large proportion of those earmarks. So I think we ought to talk a little bit about the fact that Democrats were getting some of those evil earmarks that they campaigned so hard against last year.

For example, actually, in 1996, the first year that Republicans were in charge and did the budget, the number of earmarks actually went down. The last year that the Democrats did their budget, the earmarks were 1,439. The first year that Republicans were in charge, the earmarks went down to 958. Of the 958, the Democrats had 40 percent, 383.

Now, it is true that the number of earmarks went up over the years. In 1997 they went to 1,596. Democrats had 638 of those earmarks.

In 2005 the number did go up to 13,996, and Democrats had 5,599 of those. So if they were so evil in those days, it's hard to understand how you could have been claiming such a large proportion of them.

Obviously you all missed the point in the debate about these earmarks. Many Republicans believe in earmarks. We think that it is the right of the Congress to appropriate money to certain projects. That's not the issue.

The issue is you campaigned on transparency and changing the system.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will direct her remarks to the Chair.

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings.

Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 2007 No. 94

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JON TESTER, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, Your promises are sure. Bless our lawmakers in all their undertakings. In their friendships, keep them faithful and true. In their emotions, keep them calm and serene. Free them from anxiety and care. In their material things, give them contentment and generosity. In their spiritual lives, deliver them from doubts and distrust. In their work, give them guidance and success. And if misfortune comes, use the trials to bring them closer to each other and to You. Let nothing shake their certainty that You alone are sovereign over their lives.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JON TESTER 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 12, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JON TESTER, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TESTER thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 60 minutes. The Republicans will control the first half, the Democrats the second half. Following this period of morning business, the Senate will resume postcloture debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 6, the Energy bill.

We have consent to move to the bill itself after the caucuses end at 2:15 today. The motion to proceed will be agreed to, and the Senate will begin consideration of the energy legislation. Senators BINGAMAN, DOMENICI, we understand BOXER and INHOFE and INOUYE, or his designee, and STEVENS, will come and talk about this bill. Hopefully, they will do it this morning to lay the groundwork for this very important piece of legislation.

As with the competitiveness bill, this is a bipartisan bill. I remind everyone, matters that the Energy Committee reports out of their committee on a bipartisan basis are part of this bill. The same applied to Commerce; the same applied to the Environment and Public Works Committee.

Those matters the chairmen wanted out of those committees that were not bipartisan are not part of this bill. This is truly a bipartisan bill. There will be amendments offered to weaken the bill, to strengthen the bill—of course, the understanding of those words is in the eyes of the beholder.

I hope this will be a good, strong debate. I hope people will offer amendments. We have a limited amount of time to complete a lot of work. If there are long delays, people not offering amendments, I know the managers will be saying we have to end this some way, and the ''some way'' that we are always forced to look at is whether we want to have a bipartisan cloture vote on ending debate.

Let's have people who want to offer amendments do it as quickly as possible. I have asked the managers of the bill, rather than wait around for people who say: I don't know if I want a vote on this, we need more time—after there has been a reasonable amount of time discussing one of these amendments, the managers should move to table the amendment. If it is not tabled, nothing is lost. We need to move along and get this legislation completed as quickly as possible.

Gas prices are going down. They have dropped a few cents the last week or two, which is good. The cost of oil coming into this country has gone up. It is now at $67 and people are saying it is going up higher, which will mean there will be an increase at the gas pumps a month or so after the cost of oil importation increases.

Remember, we have an obligation with this legislation. This legislation, which some people say is not strong enough, if it passes, will cut the amount of oil we use per day in this country by 4 million barrels. Think about that, 4 million barrels a day. This is a step in the right direction. I hope we can do this.

The setting for this is, among other things, we use 21 million barrels of oil every day. We import 65 percent of that. As I said yesterday in illustration of how much this is, it is a ditch 150 feet deep and 11 miles long filled with oil. That is how much we use every day.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

We have an obligation to the American people to lessen our dependence, to make that ditch shorter and not nearly as deep.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

ENERGY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, with regard to the Energy bill the majority leader was speaking to, we have a pretty good sense on this side what important amendments will need to be disposed of. We hope to move forward on those amendments early in the process. Provided we are given fair treatment on getting up our amendments and voted on, I certainly agree with the majority leader this is an important issue, an issue that needs to be disposed of in the very near future. We will be working with him to get that bill to conclusion at the earliest possible time.

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 now be a period for the transaction of morning business for not to exceed 60 minutes, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with the first half of the time under the control of the Republicans, the second half of the time under the control of the majority, and with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

ENERGY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, a story in today's Los Angeles Times states that the approval rating of Congress is the lowest in a decade. The poll reported in today's Los Angeles Times says 27 percent of Americans approve of how Congress is doing its job, and most see business as usual. After Congress has diverted its attention from what I consider to be the most important domestic issue confronting the Nation today; that is, fixing our broken borders and actually enforcing our immigration laws, in order to have a vote of no confidence on the Attorney General in what is clearly a political exercise rather than anything that would produce a meaningful result, we now turn our attention to an important issue and one I hope Congress will embrace in order to address energy concerns in this country.

Of course, we all know—all we have to do is to drive up to fill up our gas tank—the price of gasoline has gone through the roof. While it is true that Congress can pass laws and Congress can even repeal laws that have been passed by previous Congresses, what Congress cannot do is repeal the laws of supply and demand.

It is important as we look at this legislation before us that we look at whether this legislation is, in fact, designed to fix problems. One of the questions I suggest we need to look to is, Does this bill increase supply? In a global economy we know there is going to be more and more competition for oil and gasoline. We know we are competing, not only in the United States, but literally with China and India, each of which have 1 billion people. Their economies are growing, and the number of people driving and their economic activity is directly related to access to a reasonably priced energy supply. We need to look to see what we are doing at home to try to increase supply.

We all know we are dangerously reliant on imported oil from dangerous parts of the world or from places such as Venezuela, governed by the likes of Hugo Chavez. Current energy policy in this country does nothing but make our enemies richer. It does nothing but line the pockets of people like Hugo Chavez or somebody like President Ahmadinejad in Iran—countries pursuing weapons of mass destruction.

We have to eliminate the schizophrenia that has characterized our energy policy in the past and look at what commonsense steps Congress can take in order to improve the supply of oil and gas, preferably from our own domestic sources at home, so we are less reliant on these dangerous rulers in other parts of the world for the very lifeblood of our economy.

By any measure, the bill that is now before us is an incomplete bill. It deals nearly exclusively with the demand side of the energy equation. While it is worthwhile to aggressively pursue better efficiencies and alternative sources of energy to meet our future energy needs, the provisions in this bill fail to address much of our current energy needs. It is a matter of simple economics. This bill will do nothing to deal with our current energy needs without addressing supply.

I fear this bill will also end up being even more expensive for consumers. Both the provisions in the bill and some of the expected amendments from the majority set up unreasonable mandates for renewable and alternative energy sources, which are more expensive. I do not question our need to produce more of our energy from clean and renewable sources, but I believe the winners and losers should be determined by the market, not by the Government. Indeed, this bill determines for Americans which fuels we will use, how much, and at what time. That is the last thing we need the Federal Government to dictate—to determine which fuels we will use, how much, and at what time—when public confidence in Congress under this new majority is at a 10-year low. The last thing we need to do is say: Give us the power to determine what fuels you will use, how much, and at what time.

I do believe there is great promise in renewable energy. I am proud that my State, Texas, continues its energy leadership. As a traditional oil and gas State, it now is the largest producer of wind energy in the country—2,749 megawatts as of last year. We are also the largest producer of biodiesel, an industry that has grown rapidly in just the last few years.

It is also unwise to turn away from proven and developing technologies to meet our Nation's clean air goals. For example, nuclear energy has the lowest impact on the environment, including land, air, water, and wildlife, of any energy source because it does not emit harmful gasses. It isolates its waste from the environment and requires less area to produce the same amount of electricity as other sources.

I wouldn't necessarily hold out other countries as a model for America when it comes to their energy policies, but I must say a country such as France that generates 80 percent of its electricity by nuclear power does represent a goal that I think the United States ought to strive for, particularly when nuclear power is cheap. It is conducive of a good environment, and it requires a lot less for us to produce in terms of cost and other collateral issues. I think this is one area where we clearly ought to be encouraging greater use of nuclear power, particularly when it comes to our electricity supply.

I want to say a word about coal. Coal should also continue to play an important role in our energy future. There are clean coal technologies being developed that could enable us to continue utilizing this abundant domestic resource and—this is important—improve air quality. Coal is also expected to remain one of the lowest cost fuels available.

I do believe with Federal investment in programs such as FutureGen, which is a $1 billion investment in clean coal-burning technology, we can use this 300-year supply of coal in our country in a way that is compatible with a good environment and allows us to maintain the diversity of our energy sources which are essential to the growth of our economy, as well as our national security, from the standpoint of depending less and less on people who are trying to do us harm for the very energy we need.

It is ironic at a time that we are engaged in the global war on terror that many of the state sponsors of terrorism, many of those areas that are in unstable regions of the world, from the standpoint of the global war on terror, are the very ones being enriched by our

current energy policies, which puts a lot of our domestic resources here at home out of bounds and depends, as I say, too much on imported oil and gas.

It is important to note there are some differences between the approaches of those of us in this Chamber on how we achieve that sort of energy self-sufficiency in this country, which I believe ought to be our goal.

It is important that we, as I said a moment ago, increase supply and that we not inadvertently or otherwise create disincentives for those currently exploring and producing oil and gas. On this side of the aisle, we support increasing America's energy supplies while reducing consumption.

For example, the bill we passed in 2005, under Republican leadership, provided incentives for domestic exploration of potential new natural resource supplies and aided the production of affordable domestic energy. Now we are seeing the new majority threaten to overturn several of those successful provisions.

Then when it comes to trying to increase supply of gasoline in this country by enhancing capacity of refineries, we have seen those efforts blocked by our friends on the other side of the aisle in the last Congress. Now the majority leader will be offering a substitute amendment, we are told, based on S. 1419 to H.R. 6.

This amendment by the Democratic majority leader contains some positive provisions. But, unfortunately, it is promise that is being oversold. Very simply, the legislation produces no new energy and may actually end up raising prices, not lowering them. The Reid substitute, in my opinion, does not produce a viable energy policy for the United States.

As a matter of fact, many of the proposals we will hear from the other side of the aisle may actually increase energy prices. For example, we are likely to hear a proposal for a 15-percent renewable portfolio standard which ignores clean energy sources such as nuclear power.

This proposal would cost consumers billions of dollars because States simply would not be able to meet it. The majority leader's substitute amendment will also, it looks like, ignore the need for domestic energy supplies and ignores the problem of refining capacity, which experts say is a leading cause of high gas prices; again, simply a matter of supply and demand.

With the static supply not catching up to demand, you are going to see gas prices go up. That is what we have all experienced at the pump. This bill makes no effort to increase domestic production and reduce our reliance on foreign oil.

This bill also does not pay enough attention to clean alternatives, attempting to mandate energy production solely from renewable sources. While alternative and renewable energy has made a great start in reducing our foreign imports needed for energy, it will be decades before we can produce enough alternative fuels to replace oil and other carbon fuels.

It is important we support efforts to increase the use of renewable and alternative fuels, but we should not be sold on unrealistic proposals that will suggest that somehow, in the short term, we are going to be able to replace our dependence on oil and gas, particularly in the transportation sector, where there is not any other viable alternative. It is unrealistic to think we can address our current dependance without producing as much of America's energy as we can here at home.

Overlooking sources of new clean energy demonstrates, once again, we are not paying enough attention to our domestic energy supply. Of course, gas prices are up to record levels, particularly since the new majority took over in November.

The Reid substitute does nothing to reduce them. We have seen gasoline prices increase almost 50 percent during the last 5 months. Now, when our friends on the other side of the aisle were put in control in last November's election, the price of gasoline was about $2.20 a gallon. Today it averages $3.15 a gallon. The proposals in this bill do nothing to reduce high gasoline prices. In fact, some of the amendments I am told that our friends on the other side of the aisle are considering would actually increase energy prices for the consumers.

Neither the Federal Trade Commission nor any State agency that has explored the issue has found any evidence that there has actually been price gouging. I am told there will be proposals to prohibit price gouging, which is already illegal I might add, but by new and vague standards which are impossible for anybody to determine whether their actions are covered, unless perhaps it is too late.

This is a diversion from the real energy problems. We all oppose price gouging. I know of no one who supports price gouging. But it is important we understand we need to find new ways to increase our domestic supply and particularly our refining capacities here at home. We see nothing but roadblocks thrown up every time we introduce proposals to try to encourage expansion of refinery capacity, which is the only way we are going to make more gasoline to keep up with the demand and hopefully keep prices down.

Now we will see alternatives offered during the course of this debate that will lead to increased domestic production of oil, streamlined refinery processes, and greater investment in research and development and clean vehicles. I think this is an important debate.

But we need to be careful about what we are doing again to make sure we do not oversell and underdeliver when it comes to energy policy, because, frankly, I think when it comes to the way the Congress has approached our energy needs, it has been more than a little schizophrenic. The consequence, I think we can all see, is that gasoline prices are too high because refinery capacity is too low. We have actually increased the danger, in terms of our security, by continuing to rely too much on imported oil and gas from dangerous parts of the world, enriching our biggest enemies. At the same time, we have put out of bounds too much of our domestic reserves.

So I hope as this debate goes forward, we will have a full opportunity to debate amendments and offer constructive solutions to this problem. That is why I think our constituents sent us here. If we do that, then hopefully this poll I mentioned at the outset, reported in today's Los Angeles Times that reflects 27 percent of Americans approve of the way Congress is doing its job, hopefully those numbers will go up as we produce constructive solutions to the problems that confront the American people and we do the job we are sent here to do by our constituents.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time is available to me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 13 minutes 40 seconds.

Mr. BENNETT. I listened with interest to the Senator from Texas. I wish to discuss basically the same thing, perhaps putting a slightly different twist on it. People look at the economics of energy and make this point. They say it costs something like a dollar a barrel to lift the oil in Saudi Arabia. That is the elevating price, a dollar, a dollar and a half, whatever. It doesn't sound like very much when oil is selling for something like $60 a barrel.

They look at the difference between the lifting cost and what we are paying, and then they look at the difference between the cost for a barrel of oil and the cost of a gallon of gasoline and they say: Somebody is making an awful lot of money here, and there has to be something wrong. There has to be someone hiding in the weeds who is profiteering off us. If we can find that ''someone'' and stop him from doing the profiteering, then everything would be fine, we would have plenty of oil, we would have lower prices at the pump, everything would be fine. There is a conspiracy going on. There is somebody somewhere who needs to be discovered, exposed, and attacked, and then everything will be fine.

Well, unfortunately, the real world does not operate like that. In the real world, there are reasons, valid reasons, for prices to be where they are and for the situation to be as it is. The fundamental fact, with respect to retail prices, that people forget, if indeed they even know, is this: The retail price is not set on the basis of what it costs to put a gallon of gas into the pump that you go to when you fill up your tank; the retail price is set by

what it would cost to replace the gallon of gas once it is gone out of the tank and into your gas tank.

That means whoever is setting the price is concerned with uncertainties that are there in the marketplace that will determine the future replacement cost. If there is a geopolitical uncertainty, Iran, Iraq, unrest in Saudi Arabia, instability in Venezuela, whatever it might be, the marketplace will say: We have to have the uncertainty return, we have to have a premium on what it would cost to protect us against the uncertainty because it may well be that supply is suddenly disrupted around the world, and if we are going to have an additional gallon of gas in that service station tank in the future, we are going to have to pay for that uncertainty there, so we will charge an uncertainty premium now.

This is the working of the marketplace. As I have said often, and expect to say again, we cannot repeal the law of supply and demand. We think we can. In Congress we keep passing laws that say we are going to set prices here and there. But whenever we try, all we do is produce one of two results. When we try to repeal the law of supply and demand, when we try to interfere with market forces, we either create a shortage or a surplus.

When we set the price artificially too high in the market, we create a surplus, as everybody wants to get in on the very good price, people want to sell for the highest price. We did that in Congress with respect to silver. We wanted to have silver mined in the United States. So the United States said: We are going to pay so much for silver. It was above the price the market would pay. We opened up silver mines, the Government ended up with a huge surplus of silver piling up in warehouses because we set the price higher than the market would put it.

When we set the price too low, as we have done with gasoline, with oil windfall profits, set the price too low, then we get a shortage; nobody wants to produce for that low price. So we can tell ourselves how wonderful we are. We can say we have the power to set prices by legislation, but if we set them in the wrong places, if we go away from where the market is, the market either gives you a surplus of things we don't need or we create a shortage.

We saw the impact of the shortage during the Carter administration. We all remember the long lines, where we were lined up to get gasoline. There was a shortage. It was artificially created. When Ronald Reagan became President, he said: No, we are going to let the market work. The shortages all went away. The lines went away. Interestingly enough, the prices actually came down in many areas of energy as the market then responded to the reality of demand.

Our problem now is we do not have sufficient supply to bring the prices down. One of the reasons, as the Senator from Texas made clear, one of the reasons is we do not have the refinery capacity we need. It is all very well and good to pump oil out of the ground, but the oil you purchase out of the ground cannot be put into your car. The oil pumped out of the ground has to be refined into gasoline. If it is not, it sits there accumulating until the refinery capacity can be brought on line.

We know that very well in Utah. We have a tremendous amount of production going on in eastern Utah now. As oil is available, it can come out of the ground. At the worldwide prices for oil now, even though it might be more expensive than $1.50, with oil selling at $60 a barrel, $70 a barrel on the international market, there is money to be made. There is oil to be produced in eastern Utah, but it is sitting there. It is not ending up in anybody's gas tank. It is not helping bring down the price at the pump. What is the matter? We don't have the refinery capacity to refine that particular kind of oil. There are refineries in Salt Lake City. They are operating at 90 percent capacity plus. They are refining oil that comes from Canada, because that particular kind of oil is easier to refine than the oil coming out of eastern Utah. If we could build a refinery in eastern Utah—and the economics are there to justify it—we could bring down the price of gasoline at the pump, because all of that oil would be turned into gasoline.

So why aren't we building new refineries? The regulations that come from the Federal Government are restricting refineries. People who own refineries are doing everything they can to expand them. The refinery capacity is up fairly dramatically, but the number of new refineries has not gone up dramatically. We are pushing to have the limit our ability to refine oil in the refineries we now have.

We are still told the real reason prices are up is because there is a conspiracy. There is price gouging going on. Last week the Washington Post commented on this issue about conspiracy and the people who are deliberately driving up the price of gasoline. If I may quote from the Washington Post editorial entitled ''Myths About That $3.18 Per Gallon'':

> Multiple investigations by the Federal Trade Commission since 2000 have come up, well, dry. Conspiracy theorists say this lack of evidence is proof that the regulators are in bed with the oil companies. But last year, California's Energy Commission undertook its own investigation of a May 2006 price increase—and found no smoking gun indicating market manipulation. Today's high prices are the result of a collision among consumers' increasing demand for gas, the shortage of oil-refining capacity and 50 states with different regulations that make it hard to trade gas across state lines.

That is the reality. It is a collision of increasing demand for gas, static oil refining capacity, and different State regulations. We should be dealing with that reality. Why aren't we? Back to the editorial:

> So why protect consumers from this vaporous phantom? Politics. More than 80 percent of Americans believe that high gas prices are the result of oil company shenanigans rather than market forces, according to the Opinion Research Corp. So passing legislation against gouging is a bit of theater that allows the political class to avoid the hard work of getting Americans to use less gas.

We engage in political theater all the time around here—that is our business—but occasionally, I would hope we would recognize reality, we would understand the price of gasoline is set by market forces that look at what it will cost to replace that gasoline.

I will make a last point. There would be more certainty about what it would cost to replace that gasoline if President Clinton had not vetoed legislation opening ANWR, making that oil available to us for our domestic supply. One of the things that was said at the time was, that is so far away in the future, that is 10 years away.

Well, it has been more than 10 years since he vetoed that bill. If he had not, we would now have the supply coming down from Alaska, saying we can mitigate the geopolitical uncertainties of oil in foreign countries by having this supply of millions of barrels available in the United States. The manufacturers of gasoline, refiners of gasoline, would say: We have a stable source of supply here within the United States. We need not charge as high an uncertainty premium as we might otherwise do.

There is no question it would have a significant impact on lowering gas prices, if only we had done it. The Congress did it. The President vetoed it. Now the leadership of Congress continues to oppose ANWR. One of the arguments is: That is more than 10 years away.

We did it more than 10 years ago. We need to do it now for the advantage of people 10 years ahead.

This is not to denigrate the good things in the Energy bill before us. This is not to say conservation is not important. This is not to say alternative sources of energy are not important. But this is to say we need to look at the whole picture and recognize we cannot conserve our way into a solution. Just because conservation is a good idea doesn't mean increasing the source of supply is a bad one.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the energy legislation that will be the topic of the Senate this week. It is critically important. I congratulate the cochairs of the Energy Committee, particularly Senators BINGAMAN and DOMENICI, for the work they have done, along with other committees, including Commerce and the Environment Committee on which I am privileged to serve.

We are dealing with a critical national crisis. In some ways, if we can adopt bipartisan, strong energy security legislation, we will have dealt with the most serious challenge facing our country. Because in dealing with our

dependence on foreign sources of oil and reducing that dependence, we can make our economy more secure, protect American consumers from the painful price spikes in the cost of gasoline and home heating oil and other fuels they have become accustomed to, and that not only drain individual budgets but hurt our national economic growth potential and reality.

Second, we will make our Nation more secure. Because no matter how strong we are militarily or even economically, if we end up depending so much on foreign sources of oil, our independence can be compromised. We cannot tolerate that.

Here is the reality. Ninety-seven percent of transportation in the United States is fueled by oil we buy from a unified global oil market. Saudi Arabia holds 20 percent of the world's oil reserves. Iran has 10 percent, led by a man who today repeatedly says to crowds in Iran, imagine a world without America; 10 percent of the world's oil reserves are in Iran. Venezuela, led by a virulently anti-American president, holds 6 percent of the world's oil reserves; Russia has 4.5 percent; Libya, 3 percent; the United States today has 1.5 percent of the world's oil reserves. We cannot leave our national and economic security dependent, therefore, on a resource that lies largely in the hands of others, including other nations that are either volatile or undemocratic or aligned against the United States.

H.R. 6, which combines the work of three or four different committees, contains many significant provisions that would reduce our Nation's oil consumption. I truly commend the heads of these committees, the chairmen and ranking members, for bringing this legislation forward. This may be the only opportunity we have in the 110th Congress, certainly the only opportunity we will have in this first year of the 110th session, to confront our energy dependence and deal with it. Therefore, it is very important that we work hard to make this bill as strong as we possibly can and, of course, as bipartisan. Our constituents, our Nation just watched the Senate unfortunately grind itself into gridlock over the comprehensive immigration bill. Let's not turn that show into a double feature with stalemate over energy security legislation as well, certainly not as prices soar and American consumers sour.

I want to speak briefly in favor of a bipartisan consensus amendment I and others will introduce as part of this debate. I am speaking on behalf of a bipartisan and geographically diverse group of Senators led by Senators BAYH, BROWNBACK, SALAZAR, COLEMAN, and many others. We will offer an amendment to replace the gasoline savings goal of H.R. 6, the underlying legislation, with title I of our so-called DRIVE Act. DRIVE, in the strange world of acronyms, stands for Dependence Reduction Through Innovation in Vehicles and Energy. This is the successor to an earlier version—which title didn't make a good acronym, but which title I loved—which was the Set America Free Act, because right now we are not free. We are dependent on others for our energy. The DRIVE Act's title I, which we will introduce as an amendment, would direct the executive branch of Government to identify within 9 months and to publish within 18 months Federal requirements that will achieve a 2.5 million barrel-per-day reduction in U.S. oil consumption by 2016, a 7 million barrel-per-day reduction by 2026, and a 10 million barrel-per-day reduction by 2031. That is about 50 percent of the per-day oil consumption of the United States today.

This amendment would also direct the Office of Management and Budget to publish an analysis identifying the oil savings projected to be achieved by each requirement to be created and demonstrating that the listed measures will, in the aggregate, achieve the overall specified oil savings.

Finally, the measure includes specific requirements for the executive branch to evaluate, review, and update the action plan so we can achieve these critical national goals.

The targets for savings in H.R. 6 are expressed in terms of American gasoline consumption. The amendment would express them in terms of what we think is a more relevant standard which is overall oil consumption, because reducing gasoline use can be achieved by increasing the use of diesel which, of course, is also made from oil. So oil consumption reduction is, in our opinion, the more appropriate goal for this law, and that is why we are going to introduce this as an amendment to H.R. 6. The gasoline savings goal in H.R. 6 amounts to about a 20-percent reduction in projected oil consumption by 2030, 23 years from now. The oil savings requirement in our amendment amounts to a 35-percent reduction in projected oil consumption in 2030. That is a significant increase in reduction and one we can achieve, if we set the goal as high as it should be, high enough to cut our dependence on foreign oil and free America from that dependence.

I believe there is broad bipartisan support in the Senate for these stronger targets. Indeed, the fuel economy and renewable fuels provisions already found elsewhere in H.R. 6 will themselves go a long way toward achieving the stronger targets. The DRIVE amendment's cosponsors believe that we need targets that will keep the pressure on the Executive branch to use the authorities Congress has provided to achieve robust oil savings.

The DRIVE Act has 26 cosponsors, including 6 Republicans. Thus, the language of our DRIVE amendment is bipartisan and consensus-based. I hope my colleagues will adopt it overwhelmingly.

I would like to explain my opposition to an amendment that I understand will be offered, an amendment that—while intricately drafted—has the sole purpose of opening the Arctic Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling.

Most of my colleagues have been through enough Senate debates over this issue to know that it is highly controversial and deeply divisive. I believe that if an Arctic drilling amendment were added to this bill, it would prevent Senate passage of otherwise bipartisan legislation that could reshape—but not despoil—our energy landscape.

I myself filibustered the last bill to which an Arctic drilling provision was attached.

Let me just repeat a fact that I stated at the beginning of my remarks: The United States holds just 1.5 percent of the world's oil reserves. Oil is a global commodity—like wheat or corn, gold or copper—that essentially has a single world benchmark price.

That means we could drain every last drop of oil from U.S. territory, despoiling our last stretches of wilderness in the process, and U.S. production still would amount to no more than a trickle in the stream of global supply.

We would do irrevocable damage to our natural heritage without having an appreciable effect on the price that Americans pay for oil, and without reducing our crippling oil addiction by one iota.

It is time we face up to the fact that we cannot drill our way out of this problem. The only effective and permanent solution to high gas prices—the only effective and permanent solution to energy dependence—is to dramatically reduce our oil consumption. H.R. 6 takes an impressive step in that direction. The DRIVE amendment would lengthen that step to a stride. But adding an Arctic drilling provision would kill the entire enterprise, leaving us in the same, unacceptable situation we find ourselves in now. So I respectfully ask that my colleagues vote ''yes'' on the DRIVE amendment, and ''no'' on any measure that would open the treasured Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling.

The American people are energized on this issue. Let's not let them look to the Senate and think they have hit a dry well of gridlock.

Mr. President, I note the presence of one of my colleagues on the floor who I know wants to speak during this half hour of morning business, so I will say, very briefly, we have an opportunity to do something right for the American people, if we can work across party lines—and none of this should be partisan—to get this done.

Again I note in that regard, with some regret, some of my colleagues have indicated an intention to once again introduce an amendment that would open the Arctic Wildlife Refuge to oil and drilling. Obviously, they have a right to do so. This has been debated often in the Senate. My only word of caution is I fear such an amendment, if it is attached to this

bill, may doom the overall bill; therefore, we would all lose as a result of it.

I say to my colleagues, we have a fresh opportunity here, a kind of fresh start. This institution is in need of a bipartisan agreement that solves some real problems, such as the cost of gasoline and home heating oil and other fuels the American people are facing. So it is not just that the institution would benefit in its credibility with a bipartisan agreement on this critical issue; the country needs us to show leadership on this issue. I am confident, as we begin this debate, we can rise to the opportunity.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin.

SOMALIA

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, later this week, Somalia's fragile Transitional Federal Government, also known as the TFG, is expected to convene a National Reconciliation Conference originally intended to negotiate genuine power-sharing arrangements, establish a credible political process, and prevent Somalia from descending back into chaos and lawlessness.

Unfortunately, this conference has been postponed again—for the third time. Equally disappointing is the failure of the TFG to take the critical steps needed to broaden its base and ensure genuine negotiations occur when, or if, the conference actually takes place.

I have been watching Somalia closely for quite some time and I am deeply concerned that the small window of opportunity we saw earlier this year is closing quickly—if it has not already closed. To date, the power struggle between the Ethiopian-backed TFG and various clan-based and extremist militias in Mogadishu runs parallel to a brutal crackdown by Ethiopian and Somali troops that led to enormous civilian deaths and displacement. The increasing prevalence of suicide bombings and other guerilla tactics is a serious setback for Somalis, and for our own national security interests on the Horn.

The United States should be encouraging and supporting efforts to facilitate a government in Somalia that is widely perceived—internally and externally—as legitimate. Unfortunately, this effort is complicated by the Aministration's flawed and self-defeating approach to counterterrorism. By bringing long-term stability to Somalia, we can help root out global terrorists who thrive on instability and weak or failed governments. Pursuing individual terrorists is not a substitute for addressing the conditions that allow safe havens to persist.

There is no quick and easy answer to Somalia's problems. But there are a few things we can, and must, do better if Somalia is not to descend further into a bastion of instability with potentially dire consequences for our national security and that country's future. We must redouble our efforts and work with international and regional communities—and in particular with the Ethiopians—to ensure this National Reconciliation Conference not only occurs, but that it brings together a broad range of actors to create a framework for a government that is capable and committed to overcoming divisive clan dynamics, protecting human rights, and isolating and eliminating elements of extremism.

The United States has been forthcoming with financial resources for this conference, as newly appointed Special Envoy to Somalia Ambassador John Yates recently reported. Indeed, we are supplying half of the conference's budget through the United Nations Development Program. These resources are significant, and while I encourage other donors to step up to the plate before it is too late, financial assistance is not the only deficit Somalia's political project faces.

Equally worrisome is the lack of consistent messages from the international community as to what this conference is expected to achieve. I am concerned that the focus on getting the conference up and running—while critical—has nonetheless sidelined the need for it to produce the blueprint—the blueprint—for rebuilding Somalia.

Along with appointing a new diplomat and providing substantial funds, this administration, as well as the broader international community, needs to set clear expectations for the TFG to make sure recent history in that country is not repeated.

It is important to note that these are only the latest efforts to cobble together a viable political path for Somalia. Over the past decade, there have been approximately 14 other similar initiatives, all of which have failed. If the fragile political space created by the TFG closes, we are going to be stuck back at square one with the same disastrous results we have been dealing with for more than 10 years.

The upcoming reconciliation conference is only one benchmark of steps forward for the TFG. It is critical that all Somali stakeholders are included and that they own the process, that international organizations are invited to observe and offer advice, and that an outcome document laying out a roadmap for a sustained and pervasive process is produced.

Even if this public event meets all these goals—which remains far from clear—to be truly successful, it must also set the stage for what will be needed down the road, including the restoration of infrastructure and institutions required in a functioning state, the provision of services and security to citizens, and the weaving of Somalia's complex social fabric into a viable civil society.

The road to peace and security in Somalia is long and riddled with obstacles, but we must not stray from the goal. This most recent postponement illustrates the consequences of insufficient influence and inadequate policy coordination by the U.S. and the international community.

Accordingly, we must strive to produce a cohesive policy and effective action by clarifying our objectives, coordinating closely with our allies, and creating benchmarks with consequences. The United States and others—especially Ethiopia—must use whatever leverage they still possess to demand and work toward demonstrable progress towards a sustainable political solution for Somalia.

Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator from Washington for her courtesy in letting me go first.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

ENERGY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor, like many of my colleagues today, to talk about the direction—I should say new direction—we need in our energy policy. I know the President of the United States is coming up to meet with my Republican colleagues for lunch today and to talk about both immigration and energy policy. I hope the President will emphasize how important it is we get an energy bill but certainly that we get an energy bill that sets a new direction in America.

Obviously, the history and strength of our Nation lies in our ability to continually invent new ways of doing things. We are great as a nation in doing that. Whether it is building the most reliable electricity grid in the world, laying down a massive Interstate System, or helping to create the Internet, our people have marched forward in new, breathtaking directions. These achievements have historically provided our Nation with immense prosperity and a quality of life we all cherish.

The problem is our basic energy and transportation system is 50 to 100 years old. Today, we are faced with two choices: whether we are going to continue to operate the energy system that is a relic of the past century or we are going to create a new roadmap for the future that will allow Americans to again be global energy leaders. It is that simple.

Some will say our energy and transportation system is working fine and we should leave it the way it is. We have a lot of special interests swirling around Washington, DC, right now hoping we do not make much progress. But I would say we do not have to look any further than the pocketbook of Americans to know we are feeling severe impacts on our economy and our environment, and that doing nothing is not an option.

We are selling out too much in saying we cannot make aggressive change. We are shelling out too much to fill up

our gas tanks, and our local communities are losing too many jobs. All the while, we sacrifice more and more what is an engine to the U.S. economy; that is, affordable energy supply.

We cannot continue to drive forward only looking in the rearview mirror and saying we are going to be dependent on foreign oil. We need to do better.

Over 100 years ago, many of our homes were lit with kerosene. If you think about the early days, we traveled not by automobile but by foot or on horseback. Then a new industrial revolution took place, and it was, as the Presiding Officer knows, driven by newly invented coal-powered steam engines. It played an incredible part in our country's history.

Then a number of scrappy entrepreneurs came along, people such as Colonel Drake in Pennsylvania, who drilled the first oil well. Americans went on to capitalize on that new fuel to power our industry and provide great mobility for our people in this Nation.

Other entrepreneurs, such as Thomas Edison and his colleagues, were working on ways to harness electricity for light, sound, telephones, and transportation.

Shortly after that, Charles Baker and his daughter switched on the first electric power generation in the Northwest—something that still provides cheap, affordable electricity to us in the Northwest.

Well, today it is time for a set of new, scrappy entrepreneurs, those who are going to lead in industry and help us get ready for a new energy infrastructure, and to take our country in a new direction. Improvements and changes are desperately needed to retain our standard of living and to make the United States an energy leader again.

Just like 100 years ago, these entrepreneurs are working today throughout our Nation. Farmers, such as those in Minnesota, are now supplementing their income from farm products by putting wind generation on their farms. A California professor is inventing new technology to enable the manufacture, in any industrial park, of new alternative fuel from simple plant material. In Spokane, WA, energy investors are focused on building a smart electricity grid that is going to allow consumers to save more.

What the Government did at the dawn of the last century was to help in the energy transformation. What we need to do today is to enable this energy transformation to take our country in a new direction. We need to embrace the new technologies that keep more energy dollars in America's pocketbook. The next chapter in American's energy story needs to be less about record oil profits and more about how we are going to help the American consumer keep energy dollars here in America and grow the American economy.

It is time Congress and the Federal Government start leading. The longer we put up with the status quo, the farther and farther behind our people and businesses are going to fall, and the more unconscionable the profits oil companies and foreign interests make, the more challenging it is for the United States environmentally, internationally, and economically. America's goal—here on the floor of the Senate, our role as a Government entity—should be to set the goals where our Nation needs to go and how our constituents will benefit.

We should not pick technology winners or losers, but we should make sure there is a level playing field so there is new investment in energy strategies. We are here to put those elements in place that will help catapult America into being an energy leader.

I know many of my colleagues have talked about energy independence. But we are talking about keeping energy dollars in America's pocketbook. I say that because so many Americans are feeling the price at the pump. Right now, they are feeling that price at the pump because America spends $291 billion per year on importing foreign oil. Over 60 percent of our total consumption is coming from foreign sources, and that is only going to increase.

The production of 36 billion gallons of biofuels by 2022 would help us reduce foreign imports by over 1 million barrels a day. That is why this underlying legislation is so important.

But what should our goal be? Our goal should be a 20-percent reduction in gasoline consumption by 2017. That is what this underlying bill gets at, and that would help consumers achieve a $2.50-per-barrel reduction in world oil prices because the United States would get into the homegrown fuel business. But we have to do more than just alternative fuel; we have to become more fuel efficient. That is why this legislation is so important, because it would actually help us save $25 billion annually to consumers from raising the fuel efficiency standard of automobiles from the current 25 miles per gallon today to 35 miles per gallon.

I know this will be one of the most contentious votes on the Senate floor: whether we have the will to raise fuel efficiency standards for our entire automobile fleet in the United States. But it is the fuel efficiency that will help deliver America that $25 billion in annual savings to consumers and help us achieve that 20 percent savings in foreign oil consumption.

We need to keep putting more energy dollars into America's pocketbook by other means of efficiencies. The efficiencies in this legislation push for standards for appliances, to help make a smart electricity grid that will help us in delivering distributed generation; that is, generation closer to home, so we are not building a new powerplant and transporting that energy supply across several States or across sections of America but, instead, getting generation built and delivered in the closest areas to the consumers. Smart electricity grids and efficient technology will help us save $12 billion in improved efficiency for the U.S. household, which will save U.S. consumers about $100.

These are important improvements. They may not sound like the sexiest parts of our energy package, but there are real dollars and real savings here for America in the long run. If we just take what California did as a State over the last several years—they, by mandating building codes and energy efficiency, reduced their energy consumption by about 20 percent and have one of the best energy efficiency systems in the Nation, and we in the Federal Government should follow.

We should follow as a Federal Government by also achieving energy efficiency for the taxpayers because the U.S. Government is our largest energy user. The fact is, we have over 500,000 buildings in the United States. Making them more energy efficient would give us a 30-percent reduction in the Federal energy use. The President should lead that charge. But we are making sure in this underlying bill that we are mandating new energy efficiency titles led by my colleagues, Senator BOXER and Senator BINGAMAN, to make sure the taxpayers will get almost $4 billion in annual savings if we achieve these Federal energy efficiencies.

Also, we must protect the consumers from price spikes. We all know that consumers have paid an increased price at the pump and that gas prices are at an alltime high related to where they were just 5 years ago. This underlying bill makes price gouging—the manipulation of energy prices—a Federal crime. To try to manipulate supply and artificially impact markets is something that should have strong criminal penalties, and that is what this underlying legislation does.

We also make sure we are making the right technology investments. I said earlier that technology could help the United States achieve greater efficiency and keep more energy dollars in America's pocketbook. We believe that over $700 billion in increased economic activity can be the result of investment in good energy technology. It could also create more than 5 million jobs here in the United States by 2025. But that means taking the investments that are given to the oil industry now, which is making record profits, and instead investing them in new energy technology that will lead to job creation and energy savings. I know that in the Finance Committee we will be discussing these ideas in the very near future, and I hope they can be implemented with the underlying bill we are going to be considering in the next 2 weeks.

But we have to keep in mind, as we look at the alternatives for creating energy, that we have to be smart about protecting our environment. We want to keep more energy dollars in the

pockets of the American consumers and American businesses, but we will not achieve that if we look for solutions that are actually going to add to our CO_2 problems in the United States.

Let's be clear: There are great technologies that will help us in reducing greenhouse emissions. There are others that will be less appealing. I know it will be hard for my colleagues in areas where technology has not yet reached this point to be a market driver. More work needs to be done. But we should not be, in looking at our incentive policies, chasing technology that will not help us achieve the leadership the United States would like to see in fuel technology.

We know that cellulosic ethanol, which is the goal of this underlying bill—and I was proud, in the 2005 act, to write the cellulosic mandate as part of the underlying legislation. Cellulosic—plant-based ethanol—plant-based ethanol from gasoline today would be a 90-percent reduction in our CO_2 footprint. We want to go in that direction as a nation, using plants to create a fuel source for America. We want to do that not only for what it achieves for us in reduction of CO_2 but because it also doesn't compete with our food source in America and drive up food prices.

Biodiesel, another great reduction in greenhouse impact at 67 percent, is an area in which we can, for our large industrial users, provide an alternative fuel to help our economy grow. Sugar-based ethanol, at 56 percent, as the country of Brazil is doing, is again a reduction in the CO_2 and an opportunity to scale a technology to help an entire nation.

We also know that for us, electricity, or plug-in hybrids, could see a 46-percent reduction.

We know we will have a very interesting debate on the Senate floor about corn-based ethanol, and we will have to be honest about where corn-based ethanol can take us in the future. It is not the alternative fuel that will help drive our economy.

We know corn-based ethanol will not be the technology that continues to have the opportunities for us that these other advanced fuels do. So we need to be smart about the investment strategy.

I need to say a little about the coal to liquid or carbon sequestration issues. That technology does not yet exist for the breakthrough we would like to see. It will actually add—add—to our CO_2 emissions if people deploy this technology today as a solution for us in trying to get off foreign oil.

So we need to be smart about our plans. We need to make sure we are keeping more energy dollars in America's pocketbook. We need to make sure we get on to this next chapter in American history and make sure we are not continuing 3 years from now to talk about record oil prices but about how American consumers are paying less at the pump, getting more alternatives, and that new jobs are created by the new direction in an energy economy we are about to see unfold.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

CREATING LONG-TERM ENERGY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE NATION ACT OF 2007—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 6, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6) to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for a period of up to 20 minutes on the legislation and that following my remarks, Senator ALEXANDER speak for a period of up to 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise today to praise the progress this body is making toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil. In 5 short months, we have assembled and advanced a package of energy proposals that will strengthen the foundation of a new, clean energy economy for our Nation.

Senator BINGAMAN and Senator DOMENICI have led us to where we are today, as have the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee, the Environment and Public Works Committee, and the Commerce Committee. The bill before us today, H.R. 6, is a product of many minds and many good ideas.

The extraordinary progress the Senate has made in the last 5 months responds to a seismic shift in how Americans are thinking about energy and about our world. At no time in our history—at no time in our history—has energy been so clearly a matter of national security, of economic security, and of environmental security. The issue before us is fundamentally about the security of the United States of America.

Think back to 2000. At that time, it seemed that the threat of Islamic radicalism was confined to foreign soil. Few understood the urgency of combating climate change at that time. Gas prices at that time were $1.20 per gallon. That price cloaked the real costs and the real danger of our dependence and our addiction to foreign oil.

Today, this is all different, and fortunately, today, the people of America and this Senate are recognizing it is all different. In every corner of American society, the conventional wisdom about our energy policy has changed. The fact is, our dependence on foreign oil affects the lives of Americans each and every day. It touches our security, our pocketbooks, and our conscience.

Most strikingly, oil has become a major factor in global security. Our dependence—our dependence—our overdependence makes us vulnerable and weakens our standing in the world. Since 2001, China and Russia have partnered to lock up oil in central Asia, rolling us out of that region. Venezuela has wielded its resources to buy off its neighbors and to divide our hemisphere. Iran has used its oil resources to court Russia and China, convincing them to oppose our diplomatic efforts to stop Iran from building nuclear weapons.

Countries that wish us harm know about our addiction. They know any disruption in supply sends gas prices through the roof and slows our economy. They are happy—they are happy—our enemies are happy to profit from our addiction. Oil money lines the pockets of terrorists, extremists, and unfriendly governments. It funds the Hezbollah rockets and militias in Lebanon today. It reaches bin Laden, it reaches al-Qaida, and it finances the militants in Nigeria who kidnap and terrorize westerners.

The sad truth is that today we are funding both sides of the war on terror. We spent over $100 billion last year to fight the extremists in Iraq and Afghanistan, extremists who are funded indirectly through the oil revenues we finance out of this country and around the world. This situation is absolutely crazy.

To make matters worse, our oil dependence is causing economic pain for Americans. With gasoline over $3 a gallon and holding, $50 and $80 visits to the gas stations for family members to fill their cars are straining family budgets and frustrating small business owners. Across my State, the farmers and ranchers whom I fight for every day here are budgeting for the harvest, and they are having to budget for numbers that are astronomical that they never saw before. The question they ask themselves as they go to bed every night is whether they are going to be able to make enough money to pay off their operating line at the end of the harvest season.

Americans want affordable alternatives at the filling station.

So far they have few. We must move forward in providing those alternatives.

The third reason we are on the floor today with this legislation is our bill will help jumpstart a new energy economy. That new energy economy is

based on the environmental security threats we see from global warming. Climate change now stands as one of the greatest moral challenges of our time. It is an issue we are obligated to confront.

The desperation and disaster brought by Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Rita, and a series of prolonged droughts, floods, and fire storms over the past several years have driven climate change to the center of American consciousness. We cannot afford to leave our children a legacy of an environmental disaster. We need to begin to work on that problem now, and this legislation begins to do that with respect to carbon sequestration.

This is not the beginning of our efforts here. In 2005, this Chamber, with most of the Members who are still here today, worked in a bipartisan fashion to pass the 2005 Energy Policy Act. The bill before us today is a significant step forward toward tackling the national security, economic security, and environmental security implications of our oil addiction. The 2005 Energy Policy Act was a first step in moving us in that direction.

We approached the 2005 Energy Policy Act much as we have this proposal today. It was a work Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN did—Senator DOMENICI was chairman and Senator BINGAMAN as ranking member, and now their roles are reversed. They said we have an energy problem and we can craft a better energy policy, and that received nearly 80 votes in the Senate. It is that same bipartisan approach that they have taken to this legislation. Other committees also contributed to the legislation before us today and have also taken that kind of approach. That is why, at the end of the day, we will succeed in moving forward with energy legislation in the Senate.

The bill in the 109th Congress, the 2005 Energy Policy Act, was perhaps the most important energy legislation passed in 20 or 30 years in this country. During that time, I traveled to all 64 counties in Colorado and spoke to the people of my State about that bill. By and large, they appreciated the balanced approach we took to the 2005 act. The bill kick started a renewable energy economy, made big investments in technologies, took a cut at consumption with smart efficiency measures, and it made sensible additions to our domestic oil and gas supply.

There remains much to be done, and that is why we are here today. We should not forget our bipartisan work of 2 years ago, which planted the seeds for our new energy economy; and today, in the week ahead, and in the following week, we will have an opportunity to build on the success of 2 years ago.

The new energy economy is in fact taking root. I don't think you will find a better example of how quickly Americans can change their approach to energy than in my State of Colorado. We have sparked a renewable energy revolution in Colorado in just 2 years, and the benefits have already touched every corner of my State. Our farmers and ranchers are leading the charge. In Weld County, Logan County, and Yuma County, which are remote and far away from Denver, we are seeing biofuel plants spring to life, creating new markets and new opportunities for our rural communities. So the ''forgotten America,'' in fact, is having new opportunities created for them because of the fact that we are embracing the clean energy revolution. Today, we have three ethanol plants that are already in production, where there were none 2 years ago. We have several others that are under construction and are being planned.

But it is not just biofuels. In the San Luis Valley, where my family has lived, ranched, and farmed for five generations, Xcel Energy just broke ground on the largest solar plant in North America. More and more wind turbines are turning on the plains of southeastern Colorado, powering front range homes, while providing incomes for the ranchers who own the land. Indeed, the current program with respect to the construction of wind energy farms in Colorado will mean that very soon we will be producing the same amount of electricity that is produced from three coal-fired powerplants in Colorado. That is enormous progress in a very short time.

How did we spark that renewable energy revolution in Colorado? The Energy Policy Act of 2005 helped, but it is not the only force of change. The National Renewable Energy Lab in Golden is the crown jewel of our labs, and it is a hub for innovation for our clean energy future. The President of the United States has visited NREL. Many colleagues in this Chamber have visited NREL. We do all we can here to support the work that the researchers are doing there today. We have created the Colorado Renewable Energy Collaboratory, which binds the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden with the Colorado School of Mines, Colorado State University, and the University of Colorado. The collaboratory is an engine for ideas, technologies, and talent, and making sure those technologies are being deployed out into the private sector.

I have held a renewable energy summit in Colorado in each of the last 2 years. We have tried to connect the business community and those people with the ideas to make sure that deployment occurs. These summits have been a huge success and were attended by the business community, environmental interests, farmers, and ranchers. This last year, we had over a thousand people who attended that summit, which was sponsored by the Governor of Colorado, Governor Ritter, as well as mayors and other leaders throughout the State.

In Colorado last year, 2007, we actually moved forward in enhancing our renewable energy standard, our renewable portfolio standard for our State. The renewable energy revolution underway in Colorado makes me all the more excited about the bill we are considering today. Its provisions are sensible and, by and large, they are bipartisan and should be noncontroversial.

The bill includes 3 key components. First, it dramatically increases production and the use of biofuels. The bill will quintuple the existing renewable fuels standard to 36 billion gallons by 2022, 21 billion of which must be advanced biofuels such as cellulosic ethanol. That is more than enough to offset imports from Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Libya combined. I will say that again. The 21 billion gallons of advanced biofuels, combined with what we produce from corn ethanol, will get us to 36 billion gallons. That amount of production from alternative biofuels is enough to offset our imports from Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Libya combined. I make that point to underscore the importance of the biofuels and alternative fuels title in this legislation.

Second, H.R. 6 also helps us reduce our dependence by making better use of what we have. The transportation sector accounts for a full two-thirds of our oil consumption. It offers the cheapest and best opportunities for saving fuel. The bill helps automakers retool their vehicles by providing items such as loan guarantees for hybrids and advanced diesels. The bill will also make a reasonable increase in CAFE standards. The bill increases and incentivizes the engineering capabilities of our automakers.

Finally, the bill before us also begins to address the environmental consequences of our energy policy. The debate about how to tackle the threat of global warming will have few easy answers. It will be a difficult challenge for us when we get to specifically addressing the issue of global warming later in this Congress. But one thing we can do today is to determine how we can store the carbon we are currently putting into the atmosphere. Carbon sequestration technology is neither new nor complicated. It has been around in the oil fields in America for 50 years. We need to take that technology and refine our techniques for storing it and determine where we can store the carbon that is currently being emitted from powerplants and other sources around our country. This bill will help start us in that direction.

Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Six minutes.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I want to say I am very proud of this bill. I know a lot of work has gone into this bill. It is an impressive and thoughtful next step toward reducing our dependence upon foreign oil. In the coming days, I hope we can find ways to strengthen this legislation in some specific ways.

I want to speak very briefly about four amendments that several of my

colleagues and I will be offering in the several days ahead.

The first amendment I intend to offer is the 25x'25 resolution, which establishes a national goal of producing 25 percent of America's energy from renewable sources, like solar, wind, geothermal, and biomass, by 2025. That resolution is a vision for where we want to get as Americans. It is sponsored by a great group of bipartisan Senators, including Senators GRASSLEY, HAGEL, HARKIN, LUGAR, OBAMA, and the Presiding Officer, Senator TESTER. That legislation was introduced earlier this year as S. Con. Res. 3, and it has received widespread backing. It is endorsed by 22 current and former Governors and many general assemblies from across the country. Nearly 400 organizations, from the Farm Bureau and the Union of Concerned Scientists, to John Deere, to the Natural Resources Defense Council, have embraced 25x'25 and the vision incorporated in that amendment. I hope we can include that in this legislation.

The second amendment, which I will mention briefly, incorporates provisions from S. 339, the DRIVE Act. That is legislation which Senators BAYH, LIEBERMAN, BROWNBACK, SESSIONS, and 23 other Senators have been working on for a long time. It has a robust mandatory oil savings plan. The DRIVE Act aims to increase our Nation's energy security by cutting 2.5 million barrels per day from our Nation's oil use by 2016, and 10 million barrels per day from its oil use by 2031. I am hopeful these provisions will also be added to the bill.

Third, Senator BINGAMAN and I and others will be introducing an amendment to create a national renewable energy standard. Many States, such as Colorado, already have a renewable energy standard and are reaping the benefits. I know there will be debate and discussion about how exactly we move forward with the renewable energy standard. But I believe the time has come for our Nation to adopt a renewable energy standard in the same way many States have done, including my State of Colorado.

For example, a renewable energy standard of 20 percent by 2020 will reduce emissions of carbon dioxide by an estimated 400 million tons per year. That is equal to taking 71 million cars off of America's roads, or planting 104 million acres of trees. While we look at this renewable energy standard, I know we will have a debate about whether we can improve upon what we have done here. I look forward to that debate.

Finally, the Presiding Officer, Senator TESTER, from Montana, and I will be introducing an amendment to make better use of America's vast coal resources. Coal is to the United States what oil is to Saudi Arabia. The vast resource of coal from the great States of Montana, Colorado, Wyoming, West Virginia, and throughout our country, is something we need to use. But as we use our coal resources, we need to make sure we are using them in a smart way so it doesn't damage our environment.

The amendment we will introduce will provide loan guarantees to build coal gasification facilities. We also will have standards in there with respect to life cycle greenhouse gas emissions from those facilities to make sure they are 20 percent lower than emissions from petroleum fuels. I appreciate the great work of my colleagues who have worked on that amendment.

How we improve our energy security and reduce our dependence upon foreign oil is the central national security, economic security, and environmental security challenge of the 21st century. It will determine whether we will continue to be entrenched in conflicts over resources in every corner of the world. It will determine whether we will triumph in our fight against oil-funded extremists and terrorists. It will determine whether our economic fortunes will hinge on the price of oil that OPEC sets, or whether the United States will stand proudly and independently as the world's innovator for clean energy technologies; and it will determine whether we will succeed in leaving our children and grandchildren a world wrought with environmental dangers, or whether we can correct our path in time.

I thank my colleagues for their great work on this bill, and I look forward to a productive and thoughtful debate and a successful conclusion to energy legislation in the days and 2 weeks ahead.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for his courtesy in arranging for me to speak next. The Senator from Colorado and I and the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, who is here, the chairman of the Energy Committee, Senator DOMENICI, the ranking member, and Senator LIEBERMAN, who has already spoken, were at breakfast this morning at our usual Tuesday morning bipartisan breakfast. And Senator BINGAMAN expressed the hope, as I am sure he will on the Senate floor when he speaks, that we can make the kind of progress this year that we made 2 years ago on the Energy bill. And I hope so too.

He talked about how difficult it was and how impressive it was for four committees, plus the Finance Committee, all to make a contribution and how we might be able to make progress with alternative fuels, with energy efficiency. The more we learn about energy efficiency, such as with appliances and lighting, and the more we can do in accelerating research on how to recapture carbon, the better off we will be.

Earlier this morning, Senator LIEBERMAN of Connecticut said in that spirit of bipartisanship that he hoped one amendment would not be added to this bill, and that would be an amendment calling for the drilling for oil in the Alaska wildlife area. That is a controversial piece of legislation.

I want to make a similar suggestion in the spirit of bipartisanship. I note my friend from New Mexico is on the Senate floor, and I hope the Senate would not agree to and maybe we would not even have to debate, the amendment that Senator BINGAMAN offered before in the last Congress and which he plans to offer again which would require a 15-percent so-called renewable portfolio standard in every State. I wish to spend a few minutes this morning talking about why I believe it is important that we not adopt that amendment.

I am reminded of a story about a Tennessee mountaineer who was convicted of murder, and the judge sentenced him and told him his choice was to be hanged or be shot.

The defendant thought a minute and said: May I ask a question, judge?

The judge said: Of course.

My question is, Do I have another choice?

Mr. President, we Tennesseans feel the same way about Senator BINGAMAN's proposed renewable portfolio standard which would require us to make 15 percent of our electricity from renewable fuels, mostly wind power. That would raise our taxes, it would raise our electric rates, it would run away jobs, and it would ruin our mountaintops. That is not the kind of choice we like to have.

Forcing Tennesseans to build 40-story wind turbines on our pristine mountaintops or pay billions of dollars in penalty taxes to the Federal Government amounts to a judge giving a defendant the choice of being hanged or shot.

In Tennessee, the wind simply doesn't blow enough to produce much electric power. Residential homeowners cannot afford these new taxes, industries will take their jobs to States with cheaper power, and tourists will spend their dollars where they can see the mountaintops instead of giant wind turbines.

There is, in this case, a better choice, fortunately, and that choice is for clean, reasonably priced energy in the Tennessee Valley from conservation and efficiency, from nuclear reactors—a new one of which just opened within the last few weeks in our region by TVA—and by clean coal. Because of its nuclear and hydro plants, Tennessee is already on the honor roll, ranking 16th among States in production of carbon-free electricity. But we are one of 27 States that would not meet the standards under Senator BINGAMAN's amendment, which he expects to offer during this debate.

This is real money. The Tennessee Valley Authority suggests that by the last year that this new standard is in effect, it would cost Tennesseans at least 410 million new dollars a year.

What could we do with that kind of money? If the goal were clean air, we could give away 205 million in $2 fluorescent lightbulbs per year, producing

energy savings equal to the combined output of almost two of the three units of TVA's Browns Ferry nuclear plant. In other words, the $410 million could buy enough fluorescent lightbulbs to equal two nuclear reactors. Or the $410 million would be the equivalent of 3,700 megawatt wind turbines that would span a 550-mile ridge line, more than twice the distance from Bristol in the northeast part of Tennessee to Chattanooga, which is about the only place in Tennessee that wind power could actually go, along those ridgetops. Or with $410 million, we could pay the $100 per month electric bill for Tennessee's 2.5 million residential TVA customers for 1½ months each year. Or if the goal is simply clean air, it would be better, I respectfully submit, to spend the $410 million purchasing one new scrubber each 9 months to clean emissions from TVA's coal-fired powerplants. I strongly back renewable power wherever it makes sense. In our State, I have worked hard to expand solar energy. The solar energy industry gave me an award last year for that work. I was the principal sponsor of the tax credit for homeowners to put solar panels on their homes. I have worked with the Tennessee Farm Bureau to encourage the use of biomass as a renewable energy. But this—and I will try to be a little bit more specific in the next 10 or 12 minutes—this proposal amounts to a wind portfolio standard which simply does not fit the Tennessee Valley nor, I submit, any other part of our region. It simply does not work in the Southeast.

Why is there a wind portfolio standard? There are other forms of renewable energy, of course, but they don't all fit in the definition, nor do all types of clean, carbon-free energy fit within the definition. Seventy percent of our carbon-free electricity in America comes from nuclear power. About 33 percent of TVA's power is carbon-free nuclear power. That doesn't count within the Bingaman definition. Neither does the existing 7 percent of clean, completely clean power that comes from hydro, from dams.

That makes about 40 percent of TVA's electricity carbon, sulfur, mercury, and nitrogen free, ranking it 16th among all the States in terms of producing carbon-free energy. As I said, Tennessee is on the honor roll. Yet we Tennesseans would still be subjected either to these taxes or putting these wind turbines along our scenic mountains, which I will discuss.

According to the Energy Information Agency assessment of the Bingaman proposal, 4 years ago, wind and, to a lesser extent, biomass are projected to be the most important renewable resources stimulated by the renewable portfolio standard.

There is some other evidence that biomass will be stimulated, but I think it is a fair comment to say that this is mostly a wind portfolio standard. And my argument is, that may be fine in North Dakota—which the Senator from North Dakota says is the Saudi Arabia of wind—maybe it works there, and maybe North Dakotans want to see the wind turbines there, but it doesn't work in Tennessee and in most of the Southeast because the wind simply doesn't blow enough to produce much electricity.

The National Academy of Sciences says 93 percent of potential wind energy capacity occurs west of the Mississippi River. We can see on this chart that in this white area, that is where there is the least amount of wind. There may be plenty of it somewhere else but not in Tennessee and not in the South. There is only one wind farm in this entire southeastern part of the United States. That is a TVA wind farm on Buffalo Mountain, which I will show in just a moment.

TVA had hoped that the wind on Buffalo Mountain would blow to produce electricity about 35 to 38 percent of the time. They have been disappointed that it only blows about 19 to 24 percent of the time. And in August, when we are sitting on the porches sweating, perspiring, and wanting our fans on and air-conditioning on, the winds on the only wind farm in the southeast—Buffalo Mountain—blew just 7 percent of the time. That is not an estimate. That is an actual count from TVA and the wind farm.

So the only places in the southeast region, if we can go to the next chart, that have wind resources are the ridges and the crests. Maybe unlike Iowa and North Dakota where they can have large wind farms, maybe even in Colorado they can have large wind farms, but in Tennessee, the only places that wind possibly works are on the ridges and the crests. In addition to being the places with the most wind, the ridges and the crests are also in the most visited national park in the United States, the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Those are the highest mountains in the Eastern United States. They run up through Pennsylvania as well. They are the Great Smoky Mountains and the mountains around them. They are the reason most of us live in those areas.

It is quite a sight to see when you put wind turbines on top of those mountains. It is a sight that I would rather not see. Here is West Virginia, which is north of the southeastern part of the United States. Basically it cuts off the whole tops of those mountains. In my opinion, it makes strip mining look like a decorative art. These are 400- or 300-feet turbines. These are not your grandmother's windmills. They are white and large and have flashing red lights on top of them. You can see them for 10, 12, 14 miles away.

Then, since they are on remote ridgetops, they have to dig large power lines down through whomever's backyard to get there. It is quite a dislocation in the scenery. So one would think there would have to be a big payoff before we would take some of the most beautiful parts of the United States and basically ruin the mountaintops.

Here is what it looks like in Tennessee. You can get a little sense of how big these turbines are. In Tennessee, we like football and we can put things in perspective, sometimes putting things in football terms. Each of these wind turbines is twice as tall as the skyboxes at Neyland Stadium, which is the second largest football stadium in the United States. Penn State has one, I guess, about the same size. These rotor blades, which go round and round, stretch from the 10-yard line to the 10-yard line. I can see these turbines from the Pellissippi Parkway in Tennessee from about 14 miles away. This is at about 3,500 feet. These are some of our most beautiful vistas in Tennessee.

The problem is, even here, which ought to be a prime spot—this is the reason TVA put the turbines here—it didn't work very well. It was a disappointment. As I mentioned, in August, the wind turbines only operated 7 percent of the time. Wind tends to be strongest during the winter months and at dawn and dusk, but demand for electricity is highest during the summer and during the day. Basically, when we need the wind, it doesn't blow. And a point that many people often miss is that you can't store it. Unlike more conventional forms of power, you use it or you lose it. So it is of minimal help.

Also, it is more expensive. I have a chart showing the expense. Let's take nuclear power which produces 70 percent of the carbon-free electricity in the United States today, and wind, which is also carbon free. Actually, both are completely free of carbon, sulfur, mercury, and nitrogen, which are the problems for clean air in the Tennessee region. Let's compare a 1,000-watt nuclear plant reactor and a 1,000-megawatt capacity wind farm. The 1,000-megawatts is about the size of a new nuclear reactor. The new Browns Ferry plant in Tennessee that opened the other day is 1,280 megawatts. This column is the number of hours per year for both nuclear and wind. And this second column is the capacity factor.

In plain English, this is how much they operate. For TVA, its nuclear powerplants, which produce about one-third of our electricity and most of our carbon-free electricity, the nuclear powerplants operate 92 percent of the time. The wind turbines operate, at best, 24 percent of the time in the Southeast, in the area we know about. Remember, there is only one wind farm in the Southeast. We have it, and that is what it does.

The cost of electricity is up to twice as much for wind over nuclear. That is what people in the utility industry call the all-in cost—that is, including the cost of building the facility and the cost of operating the facility.

So the brief analysis is that wind is more expensive, on a per unit energy generated basis, and produces much less energy than nuclear power, for example. In addition to that, if we build

the wind turbines, we still have to build and operate the nuclear powerplant because, as we pointed out, the wind turbines only operate about 22 percent of the time.

My hope would be that we would not have a one-size-fits-all national mandate on States that are seeking to create clean energy. Tennessee wants to do its part. As I said, nuclear power creates 70 percent of the carbon-free energy in the United States. It produces 33 percent of the carbon-free energy in the Tennessee Valley through TVA, and TVA just opened a new reactor and they are planning more. Why would we impose on a State which is already leading the country in terms of helping to produce clean energy, carbon-free energy—why would we impose a mandate on that State that would raise its rates or impose new taxes and drive away jobs from industries that cannot afford to pay the higher rates and at the same time put on our mountain tops, from Bristol to Chattanooga, these huge wind machines that destroy the view?

We have 10 million people every year who come to Great Smoky Mountains National Park, nearly three times as many as come to Yellowstone. They come to see the mountains; they don't come to see the wind turbines. I guarantee, if we continue to provide incentives and mandates to put up these 300-, 400-, 500-foot-tall wind turbines with red flashing lights, that is all the visitors will see when they come to Tennessee. They will not be able to see anything else.

I am eager to work with Senators BINGAMAN and DOMENICI on the Energy bill. I had the pleasure, the last 4 years, of serving with them on that committee. I admire the way they work together. They made a point 2 years ago of saying that when we go too far in either direction, we will pull back a little bit so we can make sure we have a good, strong bill. I believe the bill in 2005 was underestimated. I believe the bill produced in 2005, produced by Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN and the Senate working with the House, literally set America on a different course in terms of producing large amounts of reliable, affordable, clean energy. It helped us do that in a way that would keep the costs of natural gas down, which was very important to us at that time and still is today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Southeastern Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners expressing the same views I have just expressed, that such a mandate would cause us to end up paying higher electric prices with nothing to show for it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Finally, I would like to reiterate what we could better do with the money. I see the Senator from North Dakota here. I mentioned a little earlier that he has said North Dakota is the Saudi Arabia of wind, and I admire North Dakota for that, I admire him for his outspoken advocacy of that, and I hope all the giant wind machines go to North Dakota. That is where I would like them to be, just not in Tennessee—not just because of how they look but because in our neck of the woods they do not work. They raise our taxes, or they raise our rates, or they destroy our mountains, or they run away jobs from industries and tourists who do not want to be part of that. I would rather see us look for better ways to spend those dollars.

As I suggested earlier, we could take the same amount of money we would be taxed, if we choose not to build these, by providing 205 million $2 light bulbs, which would be the equivalent energy savings of almost 2 nuclear reactors, or it would be the equivalent of 3,700 of these wind turbines, which would run along the ridge tops from Bristo to Chattanooga, or it would pay the monthly electric bill for Tennessee's 2.5 million TVA residential customers, every Tennessee residential customer, for a month and a half, or it would put a new scrubber on TVA's coal-fired powerplants every 9 month period.

I am afraid this is an idea looking for a problem to solve. It may solve it in North Dakota, it might solve it in New Mexico and perhaps it does in Colorado, but it does not in Tennessee. It raises our taxes, raises our rates, ruins our mountains, and it sends jobs away, runs them away.

I hope, in a spirit of bipartisanship, perhaps the Senator from New Mexico, one of our most thoughtful Senators, the leader of this debate, will decide there are other things we can focus on rather than a one-size-fits-all mandate which may work in some States but does not in my State.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

SOUTHEASTERN ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS,

Little Rock, AR, May 31, 2007.

DEAR SENATORS BINGAMAN AND DOMENICI, AND CONGRESSMEN DINGELL AND BARTON: The undersigned state utility commissioners are writing to express our concerns about the nationwide, mandatory federal renewable portfolio standard (RPS) being discussed/introduced by Senator Bingaman. As state regulators, we are responsible for ensuring that retail electricity consumers receive affordable, reliable electric service. We are concerned that a uniform, federal RPS mandate fails to recognize adequately that there are significant differences among the states in terms of available and cost-effective renewable energy resources and that having such a standard in energy legislation will ultimately increase consumers' electricity bills.

The reality is that not all states are fortunate enough to have abundant traditional renewable energy resources, such as wind, or have them located close enough to the load to render them cost-effective. This is especially true in the Southeast and large parts of the Midwest. Even in regions of the country that do have access to wind energy, there is frequently stiff local opposition to building huge wind turbines, significant costs for the additional transmission needed, and reliability concerns. As a result, some wind renewable energy projects do not get built, while others take years to build. The availability of other renewable energy resources, such as geothermal, is even more limited.

Because of the limited availability and cost-effectiveness of traditional renewable energy resources, we are deeply concerned that our utilities will be forced to buy renewable energy credits from the federal government or from renewable energy generators in other regions of the country. Correspondingly, our retail electricity consumers will end up paying higher electricity prices, with nothing to show for it.

Renewable energy resources may be able to make a significant contribution to energy production in those regions of the country that have abundant renewable resources. In fact, over 20 states and the District of Columbia have already seen fit to approve their own RPS programs based on the resources available to them. Moreover, those states have included a wider array of energy resources in their definitions of eligible renewable resources than the proposed federal RPS mandate, Some states consider power produced from municipal solid waste, small hydroelectric facilities or coal waste to be renewable energy. Other states count expenditures on demand-side management or alternative compliance payments toward meeting the state RPS requirements. None of these alternative renewable energy resources, however, would receive credit under the Senate version of a federal RPS program.

While state public service commissions and energy service providers should certainly consider available and cost-effective renewable energy resource options as they make long-term decisions for incremental energy needs, the imposition of a strict federal RPS mandate, as contrasted with a state-driven cost-effectiveness determination, will only result in higher electricity prices for our consumers. Because the availability and cost-effectiveness of traditional renewable energy resources varies so widely among states and regions, we believe that decisions regarding renewable energy portfolios should be left to the states. If, however, the Congress desires to address renewable energy objectives in the upcoming Energy Bill, we urge you to expressly allow each individual state to determine the extent to which renewable energy can be reliably and cost effectively utilized within that state.

Sincerely,

(Signed by Members of the Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee commissioners.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I see my colleague from North Dakota wishes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be here supporting a piece of legislation which I think advances this country's energy interests. I am a member of the Senate Energy Committee. I have worked with Senator BINGAMAN and Senator DOMENICI not only on the previous Energy bill in 2005 but on this Energy bill, and I think this is a good bill. We are going to improve it some on the floor of the Senate, but it came out of the Energy

Committee as a bipartisan bill and one I think will improve the energy policy in this country.

Energy is a very important policy. We don't think about it much. I know most all of us get up in the morning and we just flick a switch someplace in our house. That switch turns on lights and we turn on the television set, it turns on all the things we use all day. While we are sleeping, the air-conditioner is running. We have all these conveniences, and we do not necessarily understand that all of it comes from somewhere beyond a switch. So energy has been pretty easy for this country. Now we are running into some interesting questions and challenges. We have to develop a more thoughtful, more sensible energy policy for the long-term future.

There is an airplane which is now parked in a museum. I believe it was tail No. 27,000, an old 707 that used to be Air Force One. It was the Air Force One that flew President Reagan around, and others. It was the Air Force One that was in Dallas, TX, in fact, the day John F. Kennedy was assassinated. One of its last trips before it was retired to a museum was a trip to Asia. I was a member of that delegation, going to meet with the President of China and others.

In a cabin on that little old airplane flying over the Pacific one night, about 10 or 11 o'clock at night, one of our Senate colleagues, John Glenn, was sitting there with us. I was peppering John Glenn with questions about his circling the Earth as an astronaut back 40 years prior to that time. I was a young kid and I had been listening to the radio that day, and I listened to this account of this astronaut circling the Earth. The whole world was focused on what this astronaut, up alone in *Friendship 7*, a tiny little capsule, was doing.

I asked him a lot of questions about it that evening. I had the opportunity as a new Member of the Senate with my colleague John Glenn to pepper him with a lot of questions. One of my questions was this. I said: My understanding back then was that the city of Perth, Australia, when you were orbiting the Earth that night, turned on every light in the city as a signal to the astronaut flying alone orbiting the Earth. Do you remember the ability to look down and see the lights from Perth, Australia?

He said: I do, I do. I remember this brilliant light coming up from Perth, Australia, where all the citizens decided to shine up a light to this astronaut flying alone on *Friendship 7*.

The only evidence of life on Earth as he orbited the dark side of the Earth was energy, light—human beings turning on a light switch and lighting a city to light the way for an astronaut orbiting the Earth.

Energy is a significant part of our lives every single day and virtually in every way. As I said, we take it pretty much for granted.

Let me talk about the challenges, if I might. One of the significant challenges is oil. We have this big old planet of ours. We have roughly 6.5 billion neighbors on this planet. We circle the Sun. We have this prodigious need for oil, so we stick straws in the earth, called drilling rigs, and suck oil out of the earth. We suck about 84 million barrels of oil a day out of this planet of ours—84 million barrels a day we suck out of this earth.

We use 21 million barrels in this country alone. In this little patch of ground called the United States of America, we have built an unbelievable economy, dramatically improved the standard of living over a long period of time, and we have an unending thirst for oil. So one-fourth of all of the oil used on this planet is used in this country, this place on the globe.

Unfortunately, a substantial amount of the oil is under the sands of the Middle East and in unstable parts of the world. Here is what happens. When we import oil, here is what we use the oil for: 67 percent is used for transportation. So nearly 70 percent of the oil we use in this country is used in the vehicle fleet or for transportation. One of the things we are discussing here in the Energy bill is this issue of trying to make these vehicles more efficient. If we use 70 percent of the oil in this country for transportation and we have had very little change in efficiency of vehicles, then the question should be and is, Should not we make vehicles more efficient?

Here is an example. This is a chart you can't see particularly well: Auto Fuel Efficiency Versus Performance. Do you see what has happened on the blue line, performance—zero to 60 in a nanosecond? Increased performance, more power, more speed. What has happened with respect to miles per gallon? Just like that, right flat across.

Part of that is the consumer. The consumer wants to buy big, heavy cars, fast cars. I understand that. In fact, here is a survey. I was very surprised. CNW Research pointed out that overall fuel economy—this is a couple of years ago—is No. 12 in concern by consumers. I am sure it has changed now. But cupholders and sound systems ranked above the issue of overall fuel economy. I expect that is not the case now when you are driving up to the gas pump and in some vehicles putting in $40, $50, $60 or $70 worth of gasoline into that vehicle. So perhaps that has changed.

But this legislation does a lot of things with respect to energy. It requires an improvement in the efficiency of vehicles. I know automobile companies came here last week. I had a chance to talk to the CEOs of the three big U.S. auto companies. I know they are taking the same position they have always taken—not now, not us, not today.

The fact is, we must, it seems to me, insist that our vehicle fleet be more efficient. Because nearly 70 percent of the oil we use in this country is being used in our vehicles, the only way we are going to try to extract ourselves from being addicted to foreign oil is to begin to make changes in a range of areas, and that includes making cars more efficient. That means a higher mileage per gallon standard.

We have a circumstance, as I indicated, where a substantial part of the oil is put in one place on this planet and the dramatic need for oil is in another place. Much of where we get our oil is in very troubled parts of the world. We could, one day, wake up with terrorists attacking a refinery somewhere and a shutoff of the oil to this country from foreign sources, and this country would be flat on its back. This country would have its economy in tatters. That is why we need to be much less dependent, we need to find a way to be independent of the need for oil from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, Iran, Iraq, Venezuela—all the places in the world that are unstable, where we have a great reliance on oil. That is at least part of what this bill is about.

I am going to talk about several other things as well, but I, along with my colleague, Senator LARRY CRAIG, a Republican—I am a Democrat—we joined in introducing something called the SAFE Energy Act, Securing America's Future Energy. The Energy Security Leadership Council is a group of really interesting people including some CEOs of major corporations and flag officers in the U.S. military. They studied these issues for several years and put together a plan.

That plan is recommendations to the Nation on Reducing Oil Dependence; trying to make this economy of ours less oil intensive.

I introduced a piece of legislation with Senator CRAIG that implements most all of these recommendations. I would commend it to my colleagues because I think it makes a lot of sense. It talks about expanding the supply of energy, especially renewable energy; also talks about finding additional supplies. We believe we ought to be able to explore and drill more in expanded areas, particularly in the Gulf of Mexico, because there are substantial reserves of oil and gas in the Gulf of Mexico that are attainable without ruining anybody's view or creating other problems.

We believe that in addition to renewable energy and the production of renewable energy, all of the biofuels are necessary. We believe that CAFE standards, or at least automobile efficiency standards, are necessary as well. This piece of legislation brought to the floor of the Senate includes all of them.

Let me continue to talk about oil for a moment and say that when I was a little boy, I remember they drilled one oil well near my hometown in southwestern North Dakota. I lived in a town of 300 people. There wasn't a lot to do, obviously, in a town of 300 people.

So when they brought in a drilling rig and constructed a drilling rig and

started to drill for oil about 3 miles from town, I will never forget as a little boy going out there in the evenings in my parent's car. We saw all these lights on the oil rig at night. We sat there and looked at it. That was entertainment.

We did that night after night. We figured at some point they were going to strike oil. We didn't want to be too close to the rig, because the movies showed that when you strike oil, you get a gusher.

But we watched. We would drive out there and park, the whole town would go out there and park. We would watch that oil well. Nothing was happening, of course, nothing you could see. We saw the lights. That was a whole lot more than was going on in town.

Well, it turns out it was a dry well; never drilled another one. But that was my experience. As a young boy, my father also managed a gasoline station. So I pumped a lot of gas as a young boy. Some say that my occupation hasn't changed so much being in the Senate, but I contest that, of course.

My point is this: Oil is central to our lives and will remain central to our lives, but we need to find a way to reduce our dependence on the sources of oil that come from very troubled parts of the world.

In North Dakota, for example, in western North Dakota, we now have what is called the Bakken Shale, which could, we hope—the U.S. Geological Survey will determine this—but it could contain dramatic amounts of recoverable oil.

Incidentally, I was in western North Dakota visiting with Marathon Oil that is now drilling. It is unbelievable what they are doing. They drill 2 miles down—2 miles down—then take a giant bend and drill 2 miles out. One drilling rig. They go down 2 miles and then bend it and then drill 2 miles out. It is unbelievable technology.

We hope there is additional production here in this country. That is one way to be less dependent on foreign sources of oil. We can take a look at where you can get additional oil. I mentioned the Gulf of Mexico is a substantial opportunity for us as well. But there are a lot of things for us to do and do well, if we are going to be less dependent on foreign sources of oil, also, if we are going to have an energy policy that has much more credibility than our current policy.

Now, the Congress passed what was called the Energy Policy Act of 2005. We did a number of things there. I was one of the Members of the Congress who, at that time and since that time, one of I guess four or five of us in the Senate who tried to open up what is called Lease 181 in the Gulf of Mexico. We succeeded in doing that. It is a smaller tract than we had hoped, but that also will contribute to the production of additional energy here at home.

Some say our energy strategy for the future must be ''digging and drilling.'' I call that yesterday forever, digging and drilling. Yes, we are going to dig and, yes, we are going to drill. But if that is all we do, we lose. Everything we use in this country every day needs to be more efficient. Our refrigerators, our air conditioners, our vacuums, everything needs to be more efficient. That is No. 1.

We have had very big debates on strange-named things such as SEER standards. I mean how many people have heard of SEER 13 standards for air conditioners. But it makes a big difference in the number of powerplants you have to build in this country based on the standards for efficiency for all the things we use with respect to appliances.

In addition to all that, we at the same time have to rely on other sources and other types of energy; wind energy as an example. Well, my colleague from Tennessee apparently does not like wind energy. God bless him. He has a right not to like wind energy.

It seems to me it makes a lot of sense with a turbine, the much more improved turbines and technologically capable turbines, to extract the energy from the wind and turn it into electricity. Yes, it is an intermittent source of electricity because you do not produce it when the wind is not blowing. But in some States, my State in particular, which is ranked by the Department of Energy as having the largest wind energy potential, taking energy from the wind and producing electricity with that energy makes a lot of sense.

We have an exciting experiment going on in North Dakota that I have been involved in: taking energy from the wind through a wind turbine, turning that energy through a turbine into electricity, using electricity through the process of electrolysis to separate hydrogen from water. You use an intermittent energy source to produce hydrogen and store the hydrogen. That is pretty unbelievable. Yet we can do that. We can do that, and it is going make us less dependent on foreign sources of energy.

Now one of the proposals that will be offered by my colleague, Senator BINGAMAN, which I intend to be here and support, and I believe several have spoken in opposition to it, is what is called a renewable portfolio standard. Not a very sexy name, in fact we should rename it, renewable energy standard of some type.

But it is simply this: With respect to electricity that we are creating in this country, 15 percent of that electricity should come from renewable sources. Establishing a national standard, a goal, what is it we want to meet? Where do we want to go? An old saying: If you don't care where you are, you will never be lost.

Well, I mean, if we do not care where we are, we will never have a standard that we will miss. But how about ascribing a standard for this country that forces us to reach a little bit and says that, for every kilowatt hour of electricity we are going to use, 15 percent of what we produce is going to come from renewable sources of energy.

Once again, it relieves and begins to withdraw our heavy dependence on foreign sources of oil because a substantial amount of our electricity now comes from fossil fuels, from natural gas and coal and so on.

Now, the issue of the renewable portfolio standard, I understand, is going to be controversial because some do not want the Federal Government to be involved in requiring something such as this. But, frankly, I don't think we have much choice. The other issue that will be involved in with this bill, which I support, is a renewable fuels standard. That renewable fuels standard is one that calls for 36 billion gallons of renewable fuels by 2022. Now, I helped write the last renewable fuel standard. It was the first one we ever established. It was 7½ billion gallons by 2012.

We are going to be at 10 billion gallons, exceeding that standard in a year or two. We believe we should aspire to achieve much more; a renewable fuels standard, using the biofuels; yes, the production of ethanol; growing energy in our farm fields on a renewable basis, you can do that year after year; the ethanol that can come from cellulose that I believe has great capability in our future. All of that is good for this country.

It is good for our farmers, good for our consumers, it is good for beginning to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil. Now, we have a lot of issues we are going to be discussing, some controversial, some perhaps not, but my hope is that in the coming week and a half or so we can finish this Energy bill.

I wish to show a couple of charts again. First of all, the amount of oil we use in this country. Those are million barrels per day. I mentioned we suck 84 million barrels of oil out of this little planet of ours. Look at what we use in the United States. Our population uses one-fourth of all the oil that is taken out of this planet every single day.

I mean, that is an oil intensity for our economy that, in my judgment, needs to be changed. Then, finally, let me say again, if 70 percent of that oil, nearly 70 percent is used in that vehicle fleet. If in that vehicle fleet we have seen all those improvements in acceleration, for example, and no improvement with respect to miles per gallon, then we better figure out how we address this in a different way.

One other item I am going to talk about for a moment is something called SPR. One of the problems with this life is there are so many acronyms and so many shorthand names for things, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We are doing something that makes a lot of sense to me. We are taking oil and sticking it underground and saving it for a time when we might need it, a security reserve of oil. The Strategic Petroleum Reserves makes sense to me. In fact, we increased the

amount of that SPR authorization in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. But with respect to our original goal, we are 97 percent there—97 percent. I do not think it makes any sense at this point to increase it, despite the authorization, I do not think it makes any sense, when the price of oil is where it is, very high—the price of gasoline is extraordinary—I do not think it makes sense to be taking any oil out of the supply chain and sticking it underground.

Yet our Government continues to do that. I know we have not been purchasing oil at this point. They suspended that through the summer driving season. But we are still taking about 8 or 9 million barrels of oil and putting it in SPR as part of the payment for royalties in kind. I do not support that either.

The President is asking for a near doubling of SPR in the next appropriations cycle. I am not going to support that. I am going to write the bill. I will be writing the bill as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that funds that. I am not going to increase that because I think at a time when gas prices are going through the roof, the last thing we ought to do is take oil out of the supply, because all that does is put upward pressure on gas prices. So I believe that is another thing we might wish to consider in this discussion.

Finally, the issue of energy is one that I know consumes perhaps less attention from time to time than others, because we take it for granted. We turn the light switch on, we get in our car, we do all these things, all of it powered as a part of our energy need, and we do not think much about it. But if, God forbid, somehow all of it were turned off, and we had an example a few years ago, I think we were out of energy in the capital region for 5 or 6 days, then all of a sudden we understood what energy means to our daily lives.

If ever we would see gas lines around the block again, we would understand what this addiction to oil means for our daily lives. Now, I said earlier that if our entire approach with respect to energy is digging and drilling, that is yesterday forever. I do not mean we will not continue to use fossil fuels, I believe we will. Fossil fuels will be a significant part of our future.

That means oil, coal, and natural gas. I am going to spend a lot of time and money as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee dealing with this issue of clean power and clean coal technology because we have to be able to continue to use that resource. But it is also the case that we have so much more to do. Because for decades we have been told that you cannot do renewables, renewables are a pat-on-the-head sort of thing. If you are talking about renewables, good for you, God bless you, but you ought to go to a library someplace and visit with your two or three friends about these things; it does not matter to America's future. That is total nonsense.

Renewable energy is very important for this country. It is long past the time that we get about the business of dealing with it. Yes, it is hydrogen and fuel cells, which I feel very strongly about. It is wind and solar. It is geothermal. It is a wide range of issues dealing with renewable energy that I believe will contribute to this country's energy security. I believe it will give us a much better and a much stronger energy policy.

I see my colleague from Idaho is here. As I indicated earlier, he and I have introduced a piece of legislation that a fair part is included in the bill that was reported out of the Energy Committee. I am also on the Commerce Committee, which has reported a portion of this bill as well.

I believe we need do a lot of things well in order to make this country less dangerously dependent, as we now are, on foreign sources of energy. That is our goal.

I believe our plan does that. I believe the bill that is brought to us from the Energy, Commerce, EPW, and Foreign Relations Committees advances this country's interest.

My hope is, in the coming week or two, perhaps a week and a half, as this is being considered, we can improve the bill even more.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota and I over the years have coalesced around a variety of issues we have been successful on on some occasions in causing to become public policy. Earlier this year—and Senator DORGAN has already mentioned it—we coalesced around three concepts we thought were critically necessary in a current and future energy portfolio and, therefore, the public policy that drives it. We recognized that efficiency would be and must be a part of the equation, that clean energy, the biofuels, must be a part of the equation for the future to make us less dependent. But also something that must be a part of the equation is production of current known and future sources of hydrocarbons. In other words—I will quote the Senator from North Dakota—you can't conserve or drill your way out of the current $3-plus gas we have and the greater dependency we have on foreign nations to supply us, but a combination of both into the future brings us to where this great country ought to be from the standpoint of a national energy policy.

The Reid bill, the Bingaman bill that has been introduced on the floor, S. 1419, is about the future. You can stand on a hilltop and see it out there 25 or 30 years into the future. But the man or woman of the American economy today who is at the gas pump and filling his or her car or truck wants to know about tomorrow and next week and next year. Are gas prices going to continue to go up? What is the problem here? Why isn't this great Nation more self-sufficient? And for those who study energy a good deal and see a 60-percent reliance on foreign production, shouldn't we be worried about national security? Shouldn't we be worried about the emergence of petronationalism, about a little dictator down in Venezuela jerking the tail of a great country because he supplies 17 percent of our total foreign imports? Yes, we ought to be concerned about that. We ought to be angry about it.

The reason we grew complacent, the light switch would always produce a light or the gas pump would always produce inexpensive fuel, is because it has always been there. What a large part of Americans didn't know is that politically and in a public policy way we began to set in place a series of things over the last 20 years that flattened production, made it less profitable, created self-reliance, and didn't compete and keep up with the amount of consumed energy we were requiring of a growth economy. As a result, we hit the wall. The wall is $3-plus gas. All power bills are going up. Energy is a part of America's disposable income and is becoming an increasingly bigger part. Americans are sitting now scratching their heads and saying: Are we going to have to change our lifestyles because energy is going to cost a lot more?

My wife and I and a group of Senators, the week before last, traveled in Europe. As we landed at Andrews Air Force Base, got in our cars and headed home, I turned to my wife and said: I see we are back in the land of the big cars.

That is part of our addiction. We love our big cars. We had been traveling in Luxembourg, France, and Italy, and by definition, it is the land of the little car. Why? Because gas over there from a gallonage point of view is about $7.50 a gallon. It is at least double plus a little more of what we are currently paying today. As a result, Europeans significantly over the last 20 years have changed their lifestyles because they couldn't afford the energy. I am not going to apologize because America consumes a lot of energy. We are nearly 26 percent of the world economy. We consume 26 percent of the energy base. Why? Because we are 26 percent of the world economy. It takes energy to produce jobs, to produce products, to create an economy. We are driven by energy. It is going to cost more to stay at 26 percent if we don't develop good public policy that gets us through tomorrow and takes us into the future in a way that the consumer can understand and appreciate.

Consumers are angry today, and they have a right to be. They look at very large profits on the part of the oil companies and say: Look, it is their fault. Those profits are driven by demand and the ability to supply. There are no gas lines today because there is energy at the pump, but we are paying more for it. The Senator from North Dakota is

right, the politics of this issue would change again if there were long gas lines at the pump and they were paying $3-plus a gallon. So the supply is there in the current form, but 60 percent of it comes from a foreign nation somewhere in the world. Most of those supplies and those foreign nations are in very precarious political situations. It is a very unstable world out there from whence these supplies come. As a result, the futures market anticipates that and builds a margin in to offset the risk to deal with the demand.

What am I saying here? I am saying to the Senate today that S. 1419 is a piece of the total, but it isn't where we ought to be tomorrow. Tomorrow ought to be about energy security and energy production. You don't talk green, although you have to talk green and should talk green. You don't talk cellulosic ethanol being in production in 10 years at a rate of 15 billion gallons a year because it won't be, because the technology isn't there, although we are driving there. Energy efficiency, a CAFE standard, is a place we ought to go. I for the first time join with the Senator from North Dakota in a 4-percent mandatory efficiency. That takes us down the road. But that is out in the future. What about tomorrow? What about knowing where our current oil reserves are, the 15 or 20 billion barrels or more of oil that is in the Outer Continental Shelf that may be very accessible in a clean and environmentally sound way? What about expanding our refinery capacity? Because in this transitional period of the next two-and-a-half to three decades, where more cars will be electric, more cars will be hybrid, we will be producing 20 percent of our liquid transportation fuels from corn-based ethanol, cellulosic-based ethanol, to get to the 30 to 32 billion gallons a year. What about all of that? That is our future.

My consumers in Idaho want to know about tomorrow. The Reid-Bingaman bill has nothing to do with tomorrow. We simply cannot ignore the next 10 or 15 years and jump into the future. We have to continue to produce and we need to produce. We have to continue to refine the hydrocarbons to supply the gas, and we need to expand that capability. It better be on shore. It better not be in Venezuela or in Kuwait or Saudi Arabia or someplace else that is at this moment, at best, politically unstable, let alone Iran and Iraq. That is where our dependence lies today. To fail to address that in the Senate is to fail to address the No. 1 question of a great nation: How do we stay great? How do we stay at 26 percent of the world GDP? How do we stay generous to the rest of the world? We produce and push a lot of new technology, and that is in part what the Reid bill is about. That is all going to be transparent and giveable to the rest of the world. When we lead on energy in all aspects, the rest of the world benefits because we share it.

Therefore, as this bill comes to the floor, there is a great deal that has to be done. We need a new RPS, renewable portfolio standard, wind, solar—a great idea, an old concept. Today's energy world is about cleanliness. Why not a new standard? Why not a clean portfolio standard instead of a renewable portfolio standard? Include wind, include solar, include sequestration of carbon, include efficiencies, include nuclear, include hydro. Let's get on with the business of being clean. If Senator REID wants to come to the floor and talk about climate change, then he ought to be talking about all of those other things that drive the economy toward a cleaner energy future, not command and control but incentives, creativity, bringing off the laboratory shelf and into production the kind of things we know are already out there.

Coal to liquids, what is wrong with that? Some environmental groups are wringing their hands and saying: There might be a problem there. We know it will burn 90 percent cleaner. That is not a problem. It is only in the mind of some idealist that it isn't perfect. How do you get to perfection? You start by adjusting and changing and improving. Today we are tremendously proud of our ethanol production in corn. But it has been 20 years in refinement and development to the distillery that is set up tomorrow somewhere in the Midwest. It is going to be so much better than the distillery that went into production a decade and a half ago. That is what this bill ought to be about, and it isn't there today.

What about the tax incentives, and what is the Finance Committee going to do? None of that is there.

This chart illustrates the problem. Here is the line for demand; here is supply. This is the hydrocarbons. That is pretty simple. Where does this margin come from? Offshore, foreign countries. High risk, less national security. Why do a lot of military leaders and those who look in broader terms support what BYRON DORGAN and LARRY CRAIG did today in the SAFE bill and those three factors about production, efficiency, and biofuels? They support it because of national security, taking this out of the equation, getting us back into production.

You have heard me talk a lot over the past about the Outer Continental Shelf and the billions and billions of gallons of oil that is out there. We have allowed States to say no even though it is a national, Federal resource. Last year we picked up a little bit right here in lease sale 181, but here in the eastern gulf are phenomenal resources, billions and billions of barrels of oil that are very accessible, achievable in a sound environmental way, and we are still saying no. We are still saying, let a tinhorn dictator in Venezuela jerk us around.

Here is another problem. The Cubans have said: Come drill us. The world is coming. The world is drilling in Cuba today. Vietnam came in last week. Spain, Norway, Malaysia, and Canada are 45 miles off our shore drilling for oil, but we can't drill. It is the ultimate ''no'' zone of politics. The ''no'' zone went up decades ago when the technology wasn't there to achieve the environmental standards upon which we demand and insist. The technology is here today. But the politics of Florida won't allow us to touch this. So the American consumer simply says: OK. I am going to pay more. I am going to pay another 50 cents a gallon so Florida can have its political way or anywhere else, for that matter, along the eastern seaboard or as it relates to this equation over here, the western coast, Alaska. Or have we come to a turn in the road where technology allows us to go there in a clean way and bring down that dependency, allows us to thumb our nose, if you will, at the foreign sources?

Here is the other side of the equation. Nearly $300 billion a year leaves our shore to go to another country to buy their oil, and some of those countries are buying guns and shooting at us. How smart we aren't to allow that policy to continue to prevail.

That is part of the debate in the coming weeks as it relates to 1419. It is not a complete package. It is way out into the future. It is not about tomorrow. It is not about national security. It is not about production. If we don't have those factors in a bill, this Senate will not serve its public and the American consumer in a responsible way in sustaining and building a great nation.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO HONOR AIRMEN, SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES LOST IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have reached another tragic milestone in the Iraq war: 3,500 American troops have now been lost. Every one of those 3,500 is a hero. But every brave man and woman who continues to serve and protect us is a hero as well.

This is a somber time. At a somber time such as this, words betray our grief and our gratitude. So I ask my colleagues to join me in a moment of silence to honor the memory and sacrifice of every airman, soldier, sailor, and marine we have lost in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will observe a moment of silence.

(Moment of silence.)

Mr. REID. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. President, would the clerk report what is now before the Senate or what should be before the Senate.

CREATING LONG-TERM ENERGY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE NATION ACT OF 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 2:15 having arrived, the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6 is agreed to and the motion to reconsider is considered as having been made and laid on the table.

Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6) to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1502

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have amendment No. 1502 at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1502.

Mr. REID. 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 is printed in the RECORD of Monday, June 11, 2007, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. REID. 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.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to discuss one of the provisions of this Energy bill that is now before the Senate. This is the provision that would increase the fuel efficiency of our Nation's fleet of vehicles. These provisions were approved by the Commerce Committee with substantial bipartisan support. They are known as the Ten-in-Ten Fuel Economy Act.

I come to the floor in place of Chairman INOUYE, who is ill today and has asked me if I would mind describing the provisions of this legislation, and, of course, I am delighted to do that. The legislation is supported by a bipartisan group of Senators, including Senators STEVENS, SNOWE, DORGAN, COLLINS, DURBIN, BOXER, CANTWELL, CARPER, KLOBUCHAR, and KERRY.

The basic premise of the legislation is to increase the fuel economy of cars, SUVs, and light trucks by 10 miles per gallon over 10 years—that is the ''10 over 10''—and to do this by 2020. But the bill does do more than that. It continues beyond 2020 and increases fuel efficiency by 4 percent a year through 2030. This is with the addition of the Dorgan legislation which the Commerce Committee added to Senator SNOWE's, Senator INOUYE's and my 10-over-10 bill in the Commerce Committee.

Some would have liked this legislation to go further, perhaps to 40 miles per gallon or more. Others do not want any significant increases. But I think this legislation strikes the right balance, and it sets forward a significant, achievable standard for the future.

It would be the first major fuel efficiency increase in the past 25 years. Can you believe it? With all the talk and all the discussion in the past 25 years, nothing has been done to increase fuel efficiency. I have been working on this legislation in one form or another—first, it was with Senator SNOWE as an SUV loophole closer. We have been doing this for more than a decade now.

But the simple truth is that today the technology exists to accomplish the goals of this legislation. It can be done without reducing safety and with significant benefit to our economy and our environment. It does so in a way that gives auto manufacturers the flexibility and the time they need. I hope they listen to this because I think they have a misimpression of the bill. This is not according to just us, but it is according to the experts—the National Academy of Sciences, the International Council on Clean Transportation, and experts at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. So it is time to break the logjam.

We all know our Nation faces stark energy challenges. Gas prices have risen to above $3 a gallon—more than doubling in the past 5 years. Global warming is real, it is happening, and it is having an impact on the world around us. The United States needs to address the transportation sector's emissions of carbon dioxide. Transportation, in 2004, accounted for 28 percent of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. With a war in Iraq and tense relations with Iran, we need to move away from our dependence on foreign oil. Through this legislation, we believe we can have a significant impact in each of those areas.

By 2025, increases for cars and light-duty trucks would save 2.1 million barrels of oil per day. That is nearly the amount of oil imported daily from the Persian Gulf, so it would be a savings, by 2025, of about what we import each day now. That is consequential. It would reduce carbon dioxide emissions—which is the primary global warming gas—18 percent from anticipated levels in 2025. That is the equivalent of taking 60 million cars off the road in a year. And—and this is a big ''and''—it would save the consumer, the driver, the family, a net $69 billion at the gas pump. That is based on a $3.08 a gallon gas price. That is the recent average price nationwide. So with gas costing $3.08 a gallon, the net consumer savings—if this bill were in place—would be $69 billion. This would mean, if you go to the individual or the individual family, it is a savings of $700 to $1,000 a year for families with children, depending on the price of gas. So the time has come to act.

Now, here is what the measure would do. I hope people will listen. It would set achievable fuel economy standards for all vehicles, increasing fleetwide average fuel economy for all cars, SUVs, and trucks by 10 miles per gallon over 10 years—or from 25 to 35 miles per gallon by model year 2020. So 25 to 35 miles per gallon by 2020, and it is 2007 today. It would provide for an additional 4-percent annual increase after that until 2030. It would require the Department of Transportation to improve the fuel economy of medium and heavy-duty trucks over a 20-year period—not tomorrow, not today but over a 20-year period—for the first time in history addressing this particular area of concern.

America, do something about your heavy trucks, and over the next 20 years try to see if you can't make them more fuel efficient.

The key to this bill is it changes the way automakers are allowed to meet these standards in fairly substantial ways. I wish to describe them.

The provision provides the time and the flexibility needed for automakers, we believe, to meet these standards. This is where Detroit does not listen. We believe—we sincerely believe—it creates a level playing field for all automakers. Let me describe how.

Under the existing CAFE system, each automaker must meet a 27.5 miles-per-gallon standard for their particular fleet of cars. This current system disadvantages American companies that build larger cars with lower gas mileage. So we admit the present system disadvantages American automobile makers.

But under the newly proposed system contained in this bill, the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration would have broad discretion to divide vehicles into classes based on their attributes, such as size. So a small car in a small-car class is evaluated against other small cars—not a small car evaluated against a Navigator or a Cadillac but class-by-class evaluations. This requirement would no longer apply to each automaker. This is additional flexibility. Different automakers will meet different standards, depending upon the mix of cars they choose to make.

From 2011 to 2019, the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration must set fuel economy standards that are the maximum feasible

and ratchet these standards up at a reasonable rate.

By 2020, the total average must meet the 35 miles per gallon—the total average. Some cars will be below it, and some will be above it—as long as the total average meets the standard. This gives Detroit the flexibility they say they need. I do not know why they will not understand it.

This effectively gives the automakers 13 years to get the job done, and it means fuel economy will increase across all classes—from the smallest sedans to the largest SUVs. It may be different by the class, but, nonetheless, it would increase, so that the average fuel economy would be 35 miles per gallon. At the same time, the measure establishes a credit trading program under the direction of the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, known as NHTSA. NHTSA would design, run, and operate this credit trading program.

The provision was strongly recommended by the National Academy of Sciences in 2002. It would give an automaker a financial incentive to exceed the standards. If it does, it could sell credits to another automaker and profit from having a more fuel-efficient fleet. So that an automaker that makes a car that attains 37 miles a gallon can sell that differential to someone who cannot quite make it.

It would also allow the banking of these credits for up to 5 years—insurance if a company falls below the standard in a later year. If an automaker cannot meet the standards in a given year, they can purchase these credits, use bank credits, or borrow from projected surpluses from future years. So the bottom line is this is a practical, workable system which ensures substantial increases in fuel efficiency. Quite frankly, it is a major improvement over the current system, which has a much more rigid approach.

I want to say something. In all the time I have been working on this legislation, nobody from the automaker community has ever come to me to say: Look, we like this, but we don't like this. If you just changed it this way, it would appeal to us.

We have bent over backward to try to accommodate a bill to meet what for the past years—every time this comes up on the floor, I hear them argue: You can't evaluate small cars against big cars. Well, we don't do that in this bill.

Another thing we have done—and this was pursuant to Senator STEVENS' request and interest in the committee—this measure provides an off-ramp in 2020 in the unlikely event that there are substantial unforeseen costs.

The measure would give NHTSA the authority to set a standard lower or higher than the 35 miles per gallon in 2020. The authority could be invoked only if a thorough review of the costs of putting new technologies in our automotive fleet exceeds the agency's best estimate of the value to the Nation of setting the standard at this level. So that is the off-ramp. There can be an evaluation, a kind of cost-benefit look at the situation, and there would have to be clear and convincing evidence that the costs exceed the benefits. Obviously, we wanted to make it somewhat difficult—not a rollover so everybody could get out of it—somewhat difficult.

NHTSA would have to take into consideration billions of dollars in fuel savings, national security implications of reducing our dependence on foreign oil, the effect of global warming and air pollution, and, on the other side of the scale, additional costs to manufacturers and consumers. Given all of the clear and meaningful benefits, we believe automakers can and will be able to meet these standards, actually with little difficulty, but the provisions give NHTSA discretion in the event it becomes clear automakers cannot meet the standards down the road.

So that is what the bill does. The fact is, this legislation is past due. Our Nation has seen gas prices skyrocket over the past 5 years. It now costs $50, $60, or $70 to fill up a tank with gas. In my State of California, this is a big deal. People often have to use at least 2 tankfuls of gasoline, so instead of a tank at $20, if it is a tank at $70, instead of 4 times 20, which is $80, it is 4 times $70, just to drive to work.

In the long term, a key to reducing gas prices is to reduce demand for gasoline. By increasing fuel efficiency, we can reduce consumption and thereby reduce demand. Americans understand this. That is why, in poll after poll, the American people overwhelmingly support increased fuel efficiency. A poll published in April of this year by the New York Times and CBS shows that more than 90 percent of Americans favor legislation for acquiring more fuel efficient vehicles. Ninety percent. That is amazing. People want more fuel-efficient vehicles. A poll commissioned by the National Environmental Trust shows that more than 80 percent of truck owners favor higher fuel economy standards. That was done between April 28 and May 1 of this year. These results are consistent all across ideologic and geographic divides. Simply put, Americans by large majorities want improved mileage on their automobiles.

Now, some question whether the standards in this legislation are achievable. You have only to look at what other nations are doing to see that, in fact, they are. Canada has proposed raising its fuel economy standard to 32 miles per gallon by 2010—32 miles per gallon by 2010. Australia's fuel efficiency averages 29 miles per gallon and is expected to rise to 34 miles per gallon by 2010. Europe's fuel efficiency currently exceeds 40 miles per gallon, and that is expected to increase over the next few years. Japan's fuel efficiency averages 46.3 miles per gallon and is expected to rise to 48 miles per gallon by 2010. Even China will have a new vehicle fleet averaging 37 miles per gallon—not in 10 years, not in 5 years, but next year. So these standards have to be met by American automobile manufacturers manufacturing in China next year. They will have to meet 37 miles per gallon.

In the United States, it is 25 miles per gallon. This is really unacceptable. These higher standards are being met abroad by the same automakers who claim it is impossible to do it here in the United States. This includes BMW, DaimlerChrysler, Ford, General Motors, Porsche, Volkswagen, Honda, Mazda, Nissan, Subaru, and Toyota. All have agreed to push fuel economy well above 40 miles per gallon in Europe but say they cannot achieve these standards in the United States. Does that make sense to anybody in this body? I think not. Does it make sense to anyone in America? I think not.

Now, also, the simple truth is that the technology exists to achieve a 35-mile-per-gallon standard by 2020. Existing technology can do it. So as Detroit complains it can't do this or it can't do that, the National Academy of Sciences says it can.

This is what they tell us:

> We can increase the fuel economy—

This is what they say can be done, the National Academy of Sciences—

> of mid-sized SUVs to 34 miles per gallon with existing technology, large cars to 39 miles per gallon with existing technology, minivans to nearly 37 miles per gallon with existing technology, and large pickups to nearly 30 miles per gallon with existing technology. When you average all of this together, you will find that the fleet could achieve 37 miles per gallon, 2 miles more than this measure envisions.

This is a conservative estimate. The National Academy of Sciences study measured cost-effectiveness based on $1.50 per gallon as opposed to today's $3 per gallon. So now you can see how conservative it is. The academy didn't consider hybrids and other emerging technologies such as the popular Toyota Prius, just the standard American automobiles. So it is quite possible that even greater increases in fuel economy could be achieved.

Now, how can this all be done? By using existing technology and simple design improvements. Let me give my colleagues some of the things for which the technology already exists: better aerodynamics, alternater improvements, engine friction reduction, using more efficient transmissions, electric power steering, electric water pump, reduced engine friction, and using only engine cylinders that are necessary. These changes still could be made to great effect.

A 2006 study by the Canadian Government concluded that the cost-effective technologies identified by the 2002 National Academy of Sciences report remain available and more cost-effective than ever. Our current fleet is more powerful, accelerates more quickly, and brakes more effectively. But with all of these advances, there is one critical design feature we have not improved at all in 25 years: Today's cars get the lowest number of miles to the

gallon since 1988. That is 20 years ago—the lowest number of miles to the gallon since 1988. This has to change.

I would say to all of those who want to fight this because they think it is too strong and because Detroit objects to it that the handwriting has been on the wall for a long time and Detroit has not come in and made a suggestion. All of this scientific evidence indicates that Detroit can meet these standards, that the technology exists to meet these standards, that they are doing it in other countries but for some reason they have buffaloed the Congress of the United States into believing you can do it in China, you can do it in Europe, but you can't do it in the greatest economic power on Earth—the United States of America.

Some also say we can't increase fuel economy without reducing safety, but this also is simply not true. A recent study by groups, including the International Council on Clean Transportation, has concluded that no tradeoff—no tradeoff—is required between fuel economy and vehicle safety. The conclusion of this report is consistent with the conclusion of numerous other studies. Let me quote directly from the report:

> Vehicle fuel economy can be increased without affecting safety, and vice versa.

That is on page 2 of their report.

> Advanced materials allow vehicles to be both bigger and lighter, providing multiple ways to improve safety and fuel economy without sacrificing functionality. Fuel economy can be dramatically improved without compromising safety. Safety can be bolstered without sacrificing fuel economy.

That is on page 17 of their study.

There is technology in place today to be used to increase safety without sacrificing fuel economy. Let me just give my colleagues a few examples: seatbelt reminders, window curtain airbags, lower bumpers, electronic stability control, improved body structure, seatbelts that tighten if a vehicle were to roll over. It seems to me that is such a simple thing, that if automobile manufacturers wanted to improve safety, they would do that.

We saw what happened to a former colleague of ours who was not wearing a seatbelt. Nobody can challenge that seatbelts don't make one of the biggest safety improvements in the history of the automobile. When the Governor's crash took place, everybody else essentially was OK in the car except for Governor Corzine, and he didn't have his seatbelt on. If anything is clear evidence of the safety of seatbelts, this is it. So safety can be improved without an effect on fuel economy.

This legislation includes a provision that will help improve safety. It directs the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration to issue a rule that seeks to reduce incompatibility between SUVs and passenger vehicles. This could be done through measures which ensure that bumpers hit bumpers in the event of an accident. I just saw this coming to work today, where a Sedan had rear-ended an SUV, and you saw the difference because of the inequality of the bumpers. This happened just a few blocks away.

In response to the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the Ford assembly plant in Richmond, CA, switched from making cars to assembling Jeeps, tanks, and armored cars. By July 1942, just 6 months after the bombing, the Richmond Tank Depot and the women who worked there were supplying our Armed Forces with the best military hardware in the world.

Technology, paired with American ingenuity and hard work, helped us prevail in that struggle and has been a key ingredient of America's unprecedented wealth and security.

Today, we face a much different threat. It is the threat of our Nation's addiction to fossil fuels—to oil—and what that will do to our economy, to our environment, and to our foreign policy if we don't change our ways.

These are serious questions and they deserve a serious response. Increasing fuel economy is not a silver bullet. I am the first one to say that. It won't solve problems by itself. However, it is a major piece of the puzzle. We have the best universities in the world, the strongest financial system, and the best workers. We can do this. We can make these improvements. We can lead the way. We have only to find the political will.

I am very proud the bill before us now contains this legislation. I believe, as I have tried to describe—and I apologize for the length of this statement—that it is compatible with the needs of Detroit; that the legislation is drafted to respond to those needs by the class-to-class comparison, to avoid what always has been in every discussion on this floor the greatest threat to Detroit, which is to compare a small car to a large car and, therefore, make it difficult for them to manufacture large cars. This will not do that. I hope it will be voted on.

I very much thank the Chair. I know Senator SNOWE was going to come to the floor and, hopefully, she will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1505 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1502

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up amendment 1505 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 1505.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I want to explain this amendment, but first I will yield to the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the senior Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I thank Senator INHOFE for yielding to me. I am going to take a very few minutes. I have not had a second round on this. I assume both of us will. I have to leave the floor shortly for another meeting. I will stay here up to the last minute. I want to make a couple statements about the bill, as introduced, and what it does in terms of the transportation, gasoline, and diesel consumption in the country.

We have just had the Senator from California explain an amendment that is no longer an amendment; it is in this bill. The Senator expressed in a very profound way, in a very lengthy explanation, this provision which the Senator from California originated. But we must understand that, today, it comes to us from the Commerce Committee, wherein the Feinstein proposal is encapsulated in the bill that was managed in committee by Senator INOUYE and Senator STEVENS.

I believe Senator FEINSTEIN would join us in giving our appreciation and thanks to the Commerce Committee for the courage they showed. They met to try to help us put together a bill that would address the energy problems of our country and, obviously, immediately we ran into provisions of the law, or matters of law, that had to be changed, which were not part of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

The big one out there is what do we do about CAFE standards. What happened before is we had a big hoopla on that, and we will probably still have it, so the Senator from California ought to be ready. Obviously, even though she did not amend, it is in the bill. Those who don't like it will offer an amendment to the bill striking or modifying that provision of the CAFE standards of America that is in the bill.

Over all these years, we have been going back and forth, never getting anything done—until this year. Clearly, this bill before us, which took the CAFE standards and finally said we are going to adopt the changes recommended in the Feinstein bill, which have been bantered around—we are going to adopt it in the language of the Commerce Committee and send it over to the leader, and it will be incorporated in the bill. So when the bill comes over, it has whatever was done in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, to save our consumption of gasoline and related products. It has the CAFE standards and a couple of other provisions. I want to say that I believe the bill before us includes the CAFE standards we have spoken of, which were put in the bill by the Commerce Committee, headed by Senators STEVENS and INOUYE.

In addition to that, which is by itself one of the biggest modifications of our

gasoline usage in this country and, obviously, it has a ways to go because it might not clear the Senate later today, or tomorrow, or whenever we figure out that the Senators who want their amendments finally come up. But as before us, this is the largest transportation savings of fuel in history. CAFE standards all by themselves would have been a very big achievement. Everybody knows that. That is in the bill. So there is one.

Secondly, we adopted just about what the President spoke of in his State of the Union Address with reference to biofuels and a new standard for those set forth in the 2005 Energy bill; that is, the big bill. We started down the path of biofuels, but all we had in there was corn-produced biofuels. What we have done in this bill is mandated 21 billion gallons which has to come from cellulosic ethanol by 2022. So the total biofuel required in our bill is 36 billion gallons. Let's hope—I think it will—that we will produce the little, tiny, remaining technology breakthrough, which we are putting everything in, and if that works, we will be on our way to the breakthrough that will permit us to use the cellulosic ethanol I have been speaking of. That will permit us to reach this new high standard of 36 billion gallons.

Remember, we get the CAFE standards, which have been explained, which reduce the amount of gas and diesel used, and then we have this gigantic breakthrough that we expect, and this tremendous amount of fuel that will come from biomass, which I stated to you was 36 billion gallons. Then this bill has a giant set of mandated efficiencies, increases in efficiencies, the biggest we have ever had. In fact, $12 billion will be saved by our consumers from the efficiency provisions, the big items you buy at your hardware store or big chain store, the items you use in your kitchen and that you wash your clothes with—those big items have the new efficiency standards, and we have been toying with them for years. Senator BINGAMAN has been trying to get them done. They are in this bill.

People might still take them out in the next week, but I don't think so. I think this bill will stay as it is. It is bipartisan. The provisions I am talking about, so far, came out of the Committee bipartisan. CAFE did not come out of our committee, but it came out of Commerce bipartisan, with a very huge majority.

I am pleased that right away when we finish that, we get on with the next thing the bill ought to have in it, and that is some new production. That brings the Senator from Oklahoma in, who has been for a long time trying to get us to do something about the refining situation in our country. I am not even totally familiar with the Senator's amendment. He has given it to us and submitted it to the Senate. Senator BINGAMAN and his staff are looking at it. We will be looking at it. I don't know when we will vote on it. With his permission, I assumed he would not be upset if we set it aside and go on to some other work and then call it up in due course in the Senate. We will do that after the Senator is finished. We don't think we are going to vote on it right away because we have to study it, and the Senator would not have wanted it otherwise. Senator BINGAMAN wants to look at it.

There is another matter that was also in this Commerce bill. It has been packaged. We have Energy matters, Commerce matters, and I note that Senator CANTWELL is standing on the floor. She had something to do with an amendment in the Commerce Committee that has to do with trying to—if there is gouging taking place out there in the hinterland of America, this amendment she and I will talk about when we are finished with Senator INHOFE's amendment will tell everybody what is in the bill about antigouging that the distinguished Senator worked on. It is mostly hers. Others might have added something, but we will talk about it, so that we put together what will be the package we can all understand—that is, the Energy and Commerce package, plus whatever else came in through the Environment and Public Works Committee—a smaller portion. Put all that together and it is a pretty good bill.

With that, I yield the floor and thank the Senator from Oklahoma for having given me a chance to speak.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, reclaiming my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I appreciate having had the opportunity to yield to the Senator from New Mexico for his explanation. I think it is very important that we understand there are a lot of good things we are looking at in this bill. But he so accurately points out that the big problem we have today—not 10 years from now—is supply. We need to do something about the supply. The bill doesn't adequately address that.

The amendment I have called up, No. 1505, is essentially the same amendment we considered in my Environment and Public Works Committee during the years I served as chairman. It is one of these things where it is very difficult to figure out why anyone could vote against it, because it is permissive, it allows States to do things; it doesn't mandate.

I was pleased to hear the majority leader recognizing that the United States has become too reliant on foreign sources of energy. Unfortunately, the majority's bill presently doesn't improve the situation. Indeed, it could actually worsen it. The fact is that Americans are paying more at the pump because we don't have the domestic capacity to refine the fuels consumers demand. So we are talking about two ways to resolve the problem of supply. One is production, and the other is you can have all the production in the world, but if you don't have the refining capacity, you cannot get it refined and into use.

Some Members' answer is more hybrids than SUVs, but that ignores the profound impact high fuel prices have on our economy. According to the Department of Labor's recent numbers, about 3 percent of the Nation's inflation is directly attributed to high fuel prices. That means whether your constituent drives a gas guzzler, a hybrid, rides a bicycle, or walks, they are paying the same for high fuel prices.

In order to lower those prices, we have two options. We can increase the capacity at home or import more from abroad. The LA Times wrote in May 25, 2007, that ''gas supplies are tight because the United States lacks refining capacity, and every time a refinery shuts down for maintenance, or because of an accident, prices rise. Americans are starving for affordable energy, and the majority's bill tells them to go on a diet. That is good. We want to have these things to help with our consumption. But the Energy bill really does nothing today in terms of taking care of the supply problem we have.

The good news is it is not too late to do something to improve the situation. It is in that good faith to improve the energy security position of our country that we are offering the Gas Price Act. The lack of domestic refining capacity is not new to many Members, the public, or even to the Federal Reserve. In May of 2005, Chairman Alan Greenspan stated:

> The status of world refining capacity has become worrisome and the industry is straining to meet markets which are increasingly dominated by transportation fuels that must meet ever more stringent environmental requirements.

While chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, I held a series of hearings to look into this issue. The very same month I held one of those hearings, the senior Senator from California, who was on the Senate floor speaking a moment ago, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, made this statement in a letter to the Governor of California. It says:

> I can see where the cumbersome permitting process, with uncertain outcomes, would make it difficult to plan and implement projects . . . I encourage you to improve the speed and predictability of the permitting process, and believe that this will allow business and government to focus on their limited resources on actions that most benefit the environment.

That is the statement Senator FEINSTEIN made in a letter to Governor Schwarzenegger. I wholeheartedly agree with that statement.

The amendment that Senator THUNE and I are offering today will improve the energy security of the United States, and it will do so in complete compliance with environmental laws and in concert with State interests.

In her letter to Governor Schwarzenegger, the senior Senator

from California was correct in recognizing much of the permitting decisions are by States and not by the Federal Government. That is why we work very hard to recognize the importance of State and local groups in making those decisions.

The Environmental Council of States, which represents State departments of environmental quality, said as much. Keep in mind, this is the council that represents all the different State departments of environmental quality, as well as noting that the Gas Price Act does not weaken the environmental laws.

Similarly, the National Association of Counties stated:

> It goes a long way in addressing the concerns of local governments during a refinery siting, ranging from the importance of considering local needs, concerns, and honoring a county's land use authority.

It is important to point this out because it seems that time and time again, some of the Members of this body hide behind the vague concerns over the environment in defending their failure to improve U.S. energy security. After working with a variety of stakeholders, this bill achieves both goals. It increases energy while preserving local governments and environmental quality.

The fact is, like it or not, the United States needs to increase its domestic refining capacity if we are to solve the economic struggles facing every family.

The amendment we are offering today redefines and broadens our understanding of a refinery to be a domestic fuels facility. Oil has and will continue to have a role in the U.S. economy, but the future of our domestic transportation fuel system must also include new sources, such as the ultraclean synfuels derived from coal and cellulosic ethanol derived from homegrown grasses and biomass.

Expanding the existing domestic fuels facilities or constructing new ones is a maze of environmental permitting challenges. This is what the Senator from California was talking about a few minutes ago in trying to encourage Governor Schwarzenegger to streamline this permitting process.

This amendment provides a Governor with the option of requiring the Federal EPA to provide the State with financial and technical resources to accomplish the job and establishes a certain permitting process for all parties. The public demands increasing supplies for transportation fuel, but they also expect that fuel to be good for their health and for the environment.

To that end, the amendment requires the EPA to establish a demonstration to assess the use of Fischer-Tropsch diesel and jet fuel as an emission-control strategy. Initial tests found that Fischer-Tropsch diesel significantly reduces criterion pollutants over conventional fuels and could easily be transported with existing infrastructure.

It should be noted that the ongoing tests at Tinker Air Force Base in my home State of Oklahoma found that Fischer-Tropsch, or coal-to-liquid aircraft fuel, reduced particulates 47 to 90 percent and completely eliminated the SO_X emissions over fuels that are used today.

I might add, this is a technology that is here. It needs to be improved upon. We are currently flying a B–52 that has eight engines using this type of fuel.

Good concepts in Washington are bad ideas if no one wants them at home. As a former mayor of Tulsa, I am a strong believer in local and State control. This is something that is controversial in Washington. There are a lot of people in this body who don't think any decision is a good decision unless it is made in Washington. I am the opposite. I feel closer to the people. They should be more involved, and that is why we structured it the way we did.

The Federal Government should provide incentives rather than mandates on local communities. Increasing clean domestic fuel supplies is in the Nation's security interest, but those facilities can also provide high-paying jobs to people in towns in need.

Our amendment provides financial incentives to the two most economically distressed communities in the Nation, towns affected by BRAC and Indian tribes, to consider building both liquids and commercial scale cellulosic ethanol facilities. Here we are talking about people who have gone through the BRAC process, people who have in their States facilities that were military facilities that were closed during the base realignment and closure process.

I am very proud my State of Oklahoma is the leader in the development of the energy crops for cellulosic biofuel. The key now is to promote investment, and nothing would speed the rapid expansion of the cellulosic biofuels industry more than investments by the Nation's traditional providers of liquid transportation fuels.

We have in the State of Oklahoma the Noble Foundation, Oklahoma State University, and Oklahoma University—all very much involved in the development of cellulosic biofuels. It is a technology that is coming. We know it is. I guess what we need to do is understand, while it is coming, we still need to run this great machine called America.

Many integrated oil companies have formed and substantially expanded their biofuels divisions within the past year to prepare for the eventuality of cross-competitive cellulosity biofuels. Oil companies invest in exploration because their stock prices are affected by their declared proven reserves. Creating a definition of renewable reserves would create a similar incentive for them to invest in cellulosic biofuels.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 directed the Department of Energy to accelerate the commercial development of oil shale and tar sands. Given the country's interest in developing renewable alternatives to fossil fuel, it is logical that the SEC would develop criteria in cooperation with biomass feedstock sources in its hierarchy at the same time.

This is Congress's least expensive way to jump-start the cellulosic biofuels industry. Increasing capacity to produce clean fuels at home is critical in making America more secure. Passing the Gas Price Act would be a material and substantive action toward this majority's stated goal of energy independence. To vote against it underscores something altogether. They like higher gas prices at the pump.

What we are talking about is something that is permissive. It allows States to opt out, if they want, and it streamlines the permitting process. It requires EPA to establish a demonstration to assess the use of Fischer-Tropsch diesel and jet fuels. It will help in our refining capacity, if we are talking about refineries for petroleum or refineries for biofuels or any other kinds of refineries.

To have a comprehensive Energy bill, we need to do what we have done, what we have already done in this bill, but the problem is here today, as was pointed out by the Senator from New Mexico. We have a supply problem, and that supply problem is here and now. The gas price amendment to expand our refining capacity would dramatically and immediately relieve that problem.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. INHOFE. Again, there are two supply problems—one in production and one in refining capacity.

I will be glad to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I told Senator BINGAMAN that I have to leave the floor for about 20 to 25 minutes, and I need somebody here.

Mr. INHOFE. I will be happy to do it. Let me repeat what I told Senator BINGAMAN privately. I have no intention of bringing up this amendment for a vote now. We will set this amendment aside for other amendments and then hopefully we will have several lined up tomorrow. I think tomorrow we will start these votes.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is what I wanted to tell the Senator. Madam President, can the Senator from Oklahoma stay in my stead?

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I will stay in his stead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I know there are others waiting to speak. I don't want to delay the proceedings greatly, but I do have some concerns. I would like to ask a couple of questions of the amendment sponsor, if I can.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mrs. BOXER. Because there is so much concern about this amendment

from within this committee and others, I would like to have a vote on this amendment. I don't want to take a lot of time. But I am wondering if my friend will propound some type of unanimous consent request so that the Senators on the floor can respond to the presentation by Senator INHOFE, but then give him time. I just think it might make for a more even flow.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, let me respond. I think the simpler thing would be to have the Senator from California, who is the chair of the committee of jurisdiction, go ahead with any statement she wants, and I will withhold my questions at this point. I know there are others wishing to talk about CAFE standards.

The Senator from Oklahoma has indicated a willingness to set his amendment aside. He is not pushing for a vote at this time. Why doesn't the Senator from California go ahead and speak in response to the amendment at this point, and then perhaps we can have the other Senators who want to talk about CAFE standards talk about that issue, and we will see what other amendments we can also line up.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, of course, I support Senator INHOFE's right to offer this amendment, but, to me, it is a disastrous amendment because it is a taxpayer giveaway to the oil companies. And I will explain why it is a total taxpayer giveaway to the oil companies that are making more money now than ever in history.

It doesn't do one thing to expand energy supply—not one thing. It shortcuts many environmental laws, which I will not go into at this time, but if we get further time, I will do that. It shortcuts many environmental laws that protect the air quality which is so important to our families. In California, 9,900 people every year die of particulate matter in their lungs. We cannot afford to say we are going to forget about air quality. That is a disaster. We don't want to become a China where they don't care about their people and their people suffer. We don't want to go there.

In the Energy bill in 2005, oil companies got a huge break, and it was made very attractive for them to open new refineries. My staff informs me that not one company has taken advantage of this break. So there is nothing that I think suggests that even going as far as Senator INHOFE goes, which is a total giveaway, will result in increased energy supply.

This bill never made it out of our committee when the Senator was chairman. It was never offered in the committee since I have been chairman. And if it were to be offered, it would go down.

Let me tell a story about Bakersfield, CA, where Shell Oil owned a refinery. We were all saying how important it was to continue the production of gasoline. In California, 2 percent of our gasoline supply came from this particular refinery.

Guess what. Shell Oil announces they are shutting down the refinery.

We were stunned, and we said: Why?

They said: We are not making a profit.

Guess what we found out. They were making a huge profit.

Then they said: We can't find a buyer.

We said: Really?

We went to the attorney general. We said: Can you help us?

He got involved. At that time, it was Bill Lockyer. Guess what. Somebody stepped forward to purchase the refinery.

Shell Oil wanted to shut down the refinery because they wanted to manipulate the supply. It is as simple as that—more money in their pocket, vertical integration. These are the people we want to reward with the Inhofe amendment? I think not. I think quite the opposite. I think we ought to agree to Senator CANTWELL's antigouging amendment. I think we would want automatic investigations by the FTC. That is what I think we would need.

I wish to address some other aspects of this bill. As I understand it, there is an aspect of this bill which I want to make sure my colleagues understand before they come to vote on it, if, in fact, we have a vote. When I say this is a taxpayer giveaway, I mean what I say. There are expedited permits, waiver of all kinds of environmental laws, there is access to Federal lands, free. I say to my friend from New Mexico, can you imagine any other industry that gets free access to Federal lands? Not only do they not have to pay for the land, but they get 88 percent of the costs of the refinery if they are on Federal land and 100 percent reimbursement if they are on Indian land. What a situation—at a time when oil company profits are going through the roof and CEOs are coming before us and putting their heads down as we look at the amount of bonuses they are getting—into the tens of millions of dollars. This is the time to give them Federal land for refineries, which they have shown they are not interested in building? Waive all environmental laws to the detriment of the health and safety of America's families? Reimburse them for 88 to 100 percent of the cost of building their plant? What a deal. If people vote for this, I have a little piece of land in a very rocky part of California I could sell you. This makes no sense at this time.

I say to my colleagues, it is very important that we have supply. I am supporting this new fuels mandate. I see wonderful opportunities in the area of cellulosics that I think are fantastic, very exciting. I am willing to invest in research so we can use coal in a clean way. These things are all exciting. This is an opportunity for business. We don't have to give away the store to the oil companies to build these refineries when, again, I have experience that tells me they are actually shutting down refineries.

In California, the case in point is the Shell oil refinery in Bakersfield, one of the biggest scandals we had there, with nontruths coming after nontruths.

''We don't really want to close it down, but we have to because it is not profitable.'' Oh, yes, it turned out it was profitable. They just want to manipulate the supply.

''We can't find a buyer, we are looking high and low and can't find a buyer.'' In 3 weeks, the attorney general found them a buyer.

Here is the point about this Energy bill which Senator BINGAMAN is managing. It is the product of three or four different committees, and the bills that are included in the majority leader's package are bills that came out of committee. They have gone through the committee. They have been debated, they have been discussed, and they have been voted out. This particular plan of my friend's—he has every right to offer his amendment. I defend his right to offer it. But it never passed our committee even when the Republicans were in control. It certainly would not pass out of committee today. It is a taxpayer giveaway with absolutely no proof that refineries would be built.

I stand so strongly against this bill, on behalf of the American taxpayer as well as in behalf of the American families who want their health protected and do not want us to waive every single environmental law that protects the quality of the air they breathe inside their bodies.

I yield the floor. I will be back to respond to the comments of my good friend from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me respond.

I am not sure what bill the Senator from California is talking about. She didn't really describe this bill at all. Let's go through very quickly her four points, if the Senator from California would like to listen.

First of all, the EDA portion provides grants to local communities, not oil companies. This is not grants going to oil companies. Maybe the Senator from California has not gotten emotional in experiencing what has happened when there are BRAC closings and some of the bases have had to close. But when that happens, the EDA does have the function, and the EDA in this case can provide grants if local communities apply for these grants. If they do not want to apply for them, they do not have to do it. The fund seeks to promote development of future fuels, coal to liquids, cellulosic biomass, not just oil.

This is not the same amendment, I might add, as we tried to pass unsuccessfully by a one-vote margin in the Environment and Public Works Committee.

Second, this idea that there is a rollback in environmental laws—the association representing the environmental

concerns of every State, the Environmental Council of States, clearly states this will not do any such thing. Here is the Environmental Council of the States. Every State belongs to this, including California. It says in here:

This bill does not weaken the standards and allows each State to choose its best course on most of the matters detailed in the bill.

So there you have it. On this matter, the organization that represents all the environmental groups is strongly supporting this.

Will do nothing to increase energy independence? The reason the United States is vulnerable, in a vulnerable position, is because we don't have an adequate supply to meet the demand. Supply—that is what I have been talking about since we started talking here. Reducing demand is only one part of the equation. We want to reduce demand. We also want to increase supply.

I would say probably the most damaging thing that has been stated by the junior Senator—here is a quote by the senior Senator from California. When she talks about streamlining permitting, yes, that is one of the big problems. So I used a quote by Senator FEINSTEIN in a letter to Governor Schwarzenegger. I will read it again because I think maybe the junior Senator wasn't in the Chamber when I talked about this. This is a quote out of the letter:

I can see where a cumbersome permitting process, with uncertain outcomes, would make it difficult to plan and implement projects . . . I encourage you to improve the speed and predictability of the permitting process, and believe that this will allow business and government to focus their limited resources on actions that most benefit the environment.

That is exactly what we want to do. That is a very acute observation by the senior Senator from California.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I was not aware that Senator FEINSTEIN was supporting your amendment. Is that what you are suggesting?

Mr. INHOFE. This is a quote. Would you like me to read it again?

Mrs. BOXER. I would like you to read it again.

Mr. INHOFE. I will read it again.

Mrs. BOXER. I would really like that because you are implying that she supports your amendment.

Mr. INHOFE. No, no; I am saying she is concerned about the permitting process.

Mrs. BOXER. We all are. That doesn't mean we support your amendment. Go ahead, read it again.

Mr. INHOFE. ''I can see where a cumbersome permitting process, with uncertain outcomes, would make it difficult to plan and implement projects . . . I encourage you to improve the speed and predictability of the permitting process, and believe that this will allow business and government to focus their limited resources on actions that most benefit the environment.''

This is exactly what this bill does. We have a section in here that allows States, if they want to do it—and there is nothing wrong with allowing States to do what they see is in their best interests. I agree with Senator FEINSTEIN that this would allow States to overcome this cumbersome permitting process, as she states in her statement.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, if I might say, I appreciate hearing that. It has nothing to do with this particular amendment, which, basically, is a giveaway to the energy companies at a time when they are making a fortune.

We have a Federal Clean Air Act. We have it for a reason: Air goes from one State to another, one region to another. That is what we have. It is a Federal Clean Air Act. This was passed under Republican and Democratic administrations, over and over again. This is what the people want.

Do they want streamlining of permits? Yes. We all do. I was a county supervisor. I did a lot of my work streamlining permits. That doesn't mean backing off on protecting the people you represent and making sure you have an adequate timeframe to ascertain what are the pollutants that are going to come out of the smokestacks here. What are the diseases that could follow if these pollutants get into the lungs of the people?

This is an amendment which hides behind the word ''streamlining.'' But what it really does, it waives environmental laws.

Yes, I know a lot about this particular amendment. I have to say, the Senator from Oklahoma talks about these local redevelopment authorities—you could have 10 people from oil companies on those redevelopment authorities. You could. So you cannot stand here and tell me this is protective of the public interest.

We have an amendment which has been offered as some kind of a fix to the lack of refineries. You take a look at our refineries. I think the Senator from Washington is aware of this. They remind us a lot of the problems we had with Enron. They keep taking power offline, shutting down the refineries for so-called maintenance, at higher and higher levels. And when Shell Oil had a chance to expand a refinery or keep it going, they chose to shut it down.

My friend doesn't think the refinery companies, I guess, are making enough money. They are making record profits. He wants to give them land for nothing. He says it goes to a redevelopment agency. Yet there is no protection for the public there. At the end of the day, these companies are getting it for free, whether they are getting it from the Federal Government directly to them or the Federal Government through a redevelopment agency. Environmental laws are waived. People in this country will not be protected. It is a backdoor way to repeal part of the Clean Air Act at a time when people are dying of particulate matter.

Now, if you are on Indian land, you get that land, and you get reimbursed 100 percent for the plant. So my friend can get up and say: I didn't read it. And he could read me a quote from my friend, Senator FEINSTEIN, who, as far as I know, is not supporting his amendment. I mean, it is a very tricky thing. I can hold up a statement from Senator DOMENICI and say: Look at this statement.

I can hold up a statement from every Republican from a speech they made saying how important it is that the people be protected from lung cancer. That has nothing to do with this amendment. It is a good debating tactic, but at the end of the day this amendment failed in the Environment Committee when the Senator from Oklahoma had the gavel, and this amendment would clearly have failed in the committee when I was holding the gavel.

So the fact is, what we are trying to do in this particular legislation is gather around amendments that have been voted out of committee in a bipartisan fashion, that were not contentious, like this one; that are not argumentative, like this one; and that are very unclear and are going in uncharted waters, like this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me respond again. The distinguished junior Senator from California can say over and over and over again as many times as she wants that it is giving money to oil companies. It is not.

Specifically, the EDA portion provides grants to local communities if they want them. If the local community doesn't want them, they don't have to have them.

At this point in the RECORD I want to have printed a letter from the EDA that says:

No for-profit entity is eligible to receive EDA assistance.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington. DC, October 21, 2005.

Hon. JAMES M. INHOFE,
Chair, Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN INHOFE: This letter responds to the Committee on Environment and Public Works' request on October 19, 2005 for clarification on the Economic Development Administration's (''EDA'') mission and entities that are eligible to receive EDA assistance, as well as additional information on EDA's past involvement in base realignment and closure (''BRAC'') rounds.

EDA's mission is to lead the federal economic development agenda by promoting innovation and competitiveness, preparing American regions for growth and success in the worldwide economy. To implement this mission, EDA is directed by its authorizing statute, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended (''PWEDA''), to foster economic growth by ''empowering local and regional communities experiencing chronic high unemployment and low per capita income to develop

private sector business and attract increased private capital investment'' (Section 2(a)(3)(C) of PWEDA).

EDA is authorized to provide assistance only to an ''eligible recipient,'' as that term is defined in PWEDA. An ''eligible recipient'' means a(n) (1) economic development district; (2) Indian tribe; (3) State, including a special purpose unit of a State or local government engaged in economic or infrastructure development activities; (4) city or other political subdivision of a State; (5) institution of higher education; or (6) public or private non-profit organization or association acting in cooperation with officials of a political subdivision of a State (Section 3(4)(A) of PWEDA). No for-profit entity is eligible to receive EDA assistance with one exception: EDA may provide a grant to a for-profit entity under its Training, Research and Technical Assistance program (Section 3(4)(B) of PWEDA). However, this relatively small program is not applicable to the provision of EDA assistance for the reuse of former military installations.

For the most recent BRAC round, beginning in FY 1994, Congress (Commerce-Justice-State appropriators) began adding a Defense Economic Adjustment line item to EDA's annual appropriations. In FY 1994, EDA received $80 million in defense economic adjustment funding. The high-water mark of this round came in FY 1995, with BRAC '95 underway, in which EDA received an appropriation of $125 million in defense economic adjustment funding that was subsequently slightly reduced due to an across-the-board rescission that year. Defense economic adjustment appropriations then slowly declined through FY 2001. The table below depicts actual EDA Defense Economic Adjustment appropriations (after any rescissions or adjustments) for the most recent BRAC round.

[Dollars in millions, after rescissions, if any]

Fiscal year	Defense Economic Adjustment appropriation
1994	$80
1995	120
1996	90
1997	90
1998	89
1999	84.8
2000	77.3
2001	31.4

Defense Economic Adjustment appropriations have been allocated among EDA's six (6) regional offices based on a variety of factors, including the number of major installation closures located within the regional office's designated region, the number of military and civilian personnel dislocations resulting from base realignments, the number of affected defense installation contractors (not relevant to the current round), and the relative economic distress level of the affected area.

Each fiscal year, EDA's regional offices have awarded assistance to BRAC-affected communities based on the policies and procedures in place at the time of each award. These policies and procedures are published in the Federal Register each year in EDA's Federal Funding Opportunity (''FFO'') notice. The FFO also specifies EDA's Funding Priorities for the funding available during that fiscal year. Funding Priorities include such items as investing in transportation, communications, or other sector-specific infrastructure enhancements. In no instance has any one funding priority utilized all of a regional office's defense economic adjustment allocation. Rather, investments are made across different priority areas based on the needs of the local and regional economy.

EDA Defense Economic Adjustment investments made during the most recent BRAC round, covering the period from FY 1994 through FY 2001, are depicted in the enclosed tables. As requested, the tables include the investment recipient, location, EDA grant dollars, and jobs and private investment realized when available.

Thank you for this opportunity to explain EDA's mission and its policies and procedures related to BRAC, and to provide additional information on EDA's past BRAC-related investments.

If you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact David T. Murray, EDA's Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, at (202) 482–2900.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN ERULKAR,
Chief Counsel.

Mr. INHOFE. Then, also, the permitting process is a small part of this amendment, but it is a very important part. It is a part that we have, subtitle A, about 4 pages, talking about trying to make the permitting process more streamlined. And that is where I used the statement from Senator FEINSTEIN, who certainly agrees when she says: I can see where a cumbersome permitting process with uncertain outcomes would make it difficult to plan and implement projects.

Well, that is just one of the many things that we are trying to correct with this bill. Again, I have responded to all of the other statements that were made. I would repeat in terms of the environment, I am going to go ahead and submit for the RECORD at this point, along with the letter on the EDAs, a letter from the Environmental Council of the States, when they state very specifically: The bill does not weaken the standards and allows each State to choose its best course for most matters.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL
OF THE STATES,
Washington, DC, October 25, 2005.

Re S. 1772 Gas PRICE Act.

Hon. JAMES M. INHOFE,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES M. JEFFORDS,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN INHOFE AND SENATOR JEFFORDS: I am writing to provide comments on behalf of the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS) on the above bill. ECOS is the national, non-partisan association of the States' environmental agency leadership.

We appreciate the Senate's desire to address the shortcomings of the nation's refinery processes exposed by the recent hurricanes and hope our comments assist you.

States implement most of the federal environmental statutes on behalf of the federal government, including most programs that regulate the nation's refmeries. These include the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. States issue most of the environmental permits pursuant to these Acts, as well as conducting the inspections, monitoring and enforcement.

While each State's opinions may vary over the details of the bill, we can agree that the bill takes an approach that we would like to see in more legislation. I speak here of the ''opt-in'' feature.

In this approach, the Governor of each State decides whether the benefits the bill provides are appropriate for the State. This includes the streamlined permits approach, the judicial review of such arrangements (Title II), and the fuels waiver (Title IV). Some concern remains about the special fuels provisions. We appreciate that within Title IV a state would be held harmless under section 110 to account for the emissions from a waiver granted by the Administrator at the request of that State. We would not expect such emissions to significantly contribute to another state's air quality issues, but would note that the protection afforded should be limited to that extent.

ECOS has long emphasized the need for the flexibility that allows each State to tailor its environmental programs according to its needs. This bill does not weaken the standards and allows each State to choose its best course on most of the matters detailed in the bill.

Our primary reservation is that the bill, if passed, not be conferenced with the recent Gasoline Security Act of 2005, passed by the House.

Sincerely,

STEPHANIE HALLOCK,
President.

Mr. INHOFE. I think there is a basic, as I said before, problem in disagreement on the floor of this body when there are a lot of people who do not think that decisions, good decisions, are made unless they are made in Washington, DC.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I just have one last response. I don't know how many of my colleagues ever sat on a redevelopment agency. I happen to have done so when I was on county board of supervisors. And it is disingenuous to say it is the redevelopment agency that gets the benefit. The redevelopment agency is the conduit to the private sector, and that is where the benefit goes.

Now, in many cases it is totally fine. When I sat on the redevelopment entity, it was because we had a very rundown part of our county that needed support. And so whatever it was we could give to them, any benefit in the Tax Code, et cetera, that is what we did.

But how about this? The benefit goes to the particular businesses now that are making record profits. I would tell you, the American people looking at this debate are going to say: Why aren't you protecting us from price gouging like Senator CANTWELL suggests? That is the bill that is in the package, not this bill which essentially says we are taking away clean air protection, we are going to have 50 different standards here, 50 different permit processes. What a nightmare. We are giving away the money of the taxpayers to the biggest corporations in America that are making the most money ever—not only giving them the land but paying them back for all of their costs.

To me, to put this in this package will doom this package. I just hope if and when this does come up for a vote, there will be a resounding no. It was voted down in the committee, and it ought to be voted down on the floor of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I would observe that the junior Senator from California is not going to support my amendment. However, I would also observe that you can't keep saying the same thing over and over and over again and make it true.

We have quoted the Environmental Council of the States. They all say there is nothing in here that is going to be damaging to the environment. Anyway, it is my understanding that I am going to be willing to set this aside for other amendments, so we can perhaps get in the queue and have several votes tomorrow, whenever the appropriate time is.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I wanted to follow my colleague, Senator BOXER, to talk just a bit about the automobile efficiency standards that are in this bill. I played a role in the Commerce Committee in helping to write a portion of that.

Before I do that, let me say it is often the case that a piece of legislation brought to the floor of the Senate dealing with an important issue is described as something that is very significant, earthshaking. And in most cases it does not turn out to be quite that significant.

My dad once told me: Never buy something from someone who is out of breath. There is always kind of a breathless quality to reform packages that are brought to the floor of the Senate. I must say, however, that I think what we have on the floor of the Senate, perhaps with some amendments, is a significant change with respect to an issue that we should address; that is, energy.

Let me talk about the automobile efficiency issues and the issues of renewable fuels and renewable energy. Now, I noted that the OPEC countries have weighed in the last few days. This is dated June 7. It says: OPEC—that is the cartel—those are the countries that have formed a cartel. They produce a substantial portion of our country's energy, the world's energy. About 40 percent of global oil production comes from the eight OPEC countries.

Here is what OPEC says. OPEC, on Tuesday, warned Western countries that their effort to develop biofuels as an alternative energy source to combat climate change risks driving the price of oil, ''through the roof.''

The Secretary General of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries said: The powerful cartel was considering cutting its investment in new oil production in response to moves by the developed world to use more biofuels.

So let me say again what this is. This is the OPEC cartel, which, of course, would be illegal in our country, getting together and saying to the United States: If you begin to produce more biofuels, ethanol and so on, we may well cut our production of oil, which would have the capability of then putting upward pressure on oil and gas prices; almost certainly it would do that. An interesting and I think also disturbing message from the OPEC countries.

But this underscores why we need an Energy bill. I mean we are held hostage by a group of people sitting in a room, called OPEC ministers, deciding how much they are going to produce, at what price they want to produce it. They close the door, make judgments in secret in a secret cartel that would be illegal in this country. They say to us: Oh, by the way, if you want to get out of this box that you are in, by producing more of the energy yourself in the form of renewable fuels, good luck. By the way, tough luck, because we may well decrease our own production.

Well, if I might just point out that this bill itself, it has some titles. Let me read the titles of the bill. I am sure my colleagues have done that: Title 1, Biofuels for Energy Security, it is a very important title; title 2, Energy Efficiency, there is substantial energy to be gained in the efficiency standards; title 3, Carbon Capture, Storage, Research and Development; title 4, Cost-Effective, Environmentally Sustainable Public Buildings. All of this is important.

With respect to the biofuels, I was thinking as I was sitting here, about a young guy who came up to me one night. He was about 21 years old. He came up to me at a community meeting in North Dakota and said: I just came in from the west coast. I drove a pickup truck from the west coast on vegetable oil. He was fueling his pickup truck using vegetable oil.

Here is a kid that is working for alternative fuels groups out on the west coast someplace with stars in their eyes and dreams about finding alternative fuels that work.

I said: Well, how does it work when you use vegetable oil?

He had modified his engine in his pickup truck and drove across the Northern Tier using vegetable oil. He said: It worked great until they got to Montana, by the way, no offense to the Montanans here. He said it worked great until we got to Montana when it got kind of cold. Then the viscosity of that vegetable oil thickened up and they could not quite use it for a while.

But the point is, there are a lot of people doing inventive, interesting, fascinating things fueling their vehicles, creating modifications to vehicles. We are talking about creating a very substantial and aggressive standard for what are called biofuels, particularly ethanol and cellulosic ethanol, and so on.

Now, my colleague from California talked about automobile efficiency, and the automobile efficiency standards that we have created. Let me make the point first that there has been no change in 25 years to these standards. None. I have actually been persuaded in years past by those who say: Well, let's have NHTSA, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration within the Department of Transportation, develop these new standards.

The fact is, that is an excuse for doing nothing. It is pretty evident to me now that nothing will happen if that is what we continue to do. So we, as a Congress, on a bipartisan basis, have said: We need more efficiency with respect to our vehicles.

We use about 145 billion gallons of fuel a year in this country, 145 billion gallons of fuel. If we blended every gallon with ethanol, that would be a market of 14½ billion gallons of ethanol. We have created a renewable fuel standard of 7½ billion gallons of ethanol by 2012. I was one of the authors of that just a couple of years ago. We are going to exceed that very quickly. We are probably at that level now, and going to be at 10 billion gallons in 2 or 3 years.

So now we are going to go to 36 billion gallons of renewable fuels. The OPEC countries say: Oh, this is awful. The roof is going to come in. We may decrease production of oil if you decide you are going to move in another direction.

Even as we do that, believing that with 70 percent of the oil that we import into this country being used in vehicles. And, understanding then we must make the vehicles more efficient if we are going to become less dependent on the OPEC countries and less dependent on foreign sources of oil from whom we now get over 60 percent of our oil, then we have a CAFE standard in this bill.

Now here is the result of the CAFE or the automobile efficiency standard in my State's newspapers, and I assume others by the auto industry. This is the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers. They are putting full-page ads in the newspapers, and they are also doing direct mail to constituents: Say no to extreme fuel economy increases. Make sure you don't pass these increased automobile efficiency standards.

Well, that is what they have been saying for 25 years, and nothing has changed. I have told this story repeatedly, and I will again because I think it is important. The first car I purchased as a young boy in high school was a 1924 Model T Ford for $25. It had been sitting in a grainery for decades. A guy sold it to me for $25. I spent 2 years trying to get it to run.

I restored that old Model T Ford. What I discovered was you put gasoline in a 1924 Model T Ford exactly the

same way you put gasoline in a 2007 Ford. Everything else about the vehicle has changed. Everything. There is more computing power in a 2007 brand new car than there was on the lunar lander that put the astronauts on the moon. Everything about these vehicles has changed except you still have to stick a gas hose in the tank and start pumping.

We did that in the 1924 model car, and you do it today in a 2007 model car. I would like to see us move and pole-vault to a new future. I happen to believe we ought to move to a hydrogen fuel cell future, where you have twice the efficiency of power to the wheel and put water out the tailpipe.

What a wonderful thing that would be. And hydrogen, of course, is ubiquitous. It is everywhere. You can take wind energy, produce electricity from the wind, use the electricity through the process of electrolysis, separate hydrogen from water, store hydrogen for vehicle transportation.

There are so many things we can do, but let's start, let's at least start, with the current vehicle fleet, saying to the automakers that we intend and expect you to produce more efficient automobiles.

The CAFE standards we have created that are in this legislation are called ten-in-ten. It is not unreasonable to believe that we should expect greater efficiency in these vehicles. Yes, we know the improvements that have been made in vehicles: better cupholders, more adept sound systems, all of the wonderful things that come with all of these new cars. But what about more efficiency? Nothing has changed.

A friend of mine looked at an identical vehicle they purchased 10 years prior. They loved the vehicle. So 10 years later they are ready for a new vehicle. They looked at the sticker on the window and discovered that in 10 years, the efficiency of that vehicle had not changed by 1 mile per gallon, not 1.

That describes the failure. We ought to certainly expect better than that.

Let me say also, in addition to supporting the automobile efficiency standards we will be voting on—standards that are bipartisan, standards that are reasonable, standards that have an off ramp so if they are not achievable, the industry will not have to meet them—they will have to demonstrate they are not capable scientifically of doing so.

In addition to that issue, which is so important, I wish to mention the issue of fossil fuels. We are, in fact, going to use fossil fuels in our future—coal, oil, and natural gas. I am a big supporter of renewable energy sources and renewable fuels. I believe that strongly. Whether it is wind, biomass, geothermal, renewable fuels, all of those are critically important. We will continue to use fossil fuels. It is important to me that we find ways to unlock opportunities to continue to use coal in a way that doesn't degrade the environment.

We have now finally come to an intersection. That intersection includes energy policy and climate change. We need to find a way, through clean coal technology and other issues—I will be working on that in the appropriations subcommittee which I chair—to continue to use those resources, particularly coal.

My colleagues have included, with my support, the efficiency titles of this legislation which are very important. Everything we do every day, from turning on a light switch to using appliances, everything we do every day and in every way uses energy. There are dramatic advances in lighting and dramatic savings to be had with respect to lighting standards in this bill. We fought for a long while about an obscure term called SEER 13 standards for air conditioners. We fought tooth and nail. The requirement for SEER 13 standards on air conditioners is very important and will require us to build fewer new energy plants because of the savings and the conservation that comes from that efficiency standard.

There is a lot to commend in this legislation. The next important step will be an amendment offered by Senator BINGAMAN that I will cosponsor with others called the renewable energy standard which will require 15 percent of our electric energy to come from renewable energy. That is an important standard and one I hope the Congress will embrace and support.

I am going to be speaking on other amendments as well. I again commend Senator BINGAMAN and Senator DOMENICI. We have a good start. I come from not only the Energy Committee but Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUYE on the Commerce Committee on which I serve, Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE and others who have worked on this legislation. We are off to a start that can be a very important policy change and a new direction for the country in energy policy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut

AMENDMENT NO. 1508 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1502

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, before the Senator from North Dakota leaves the floor, I would like to clarify something he said. He indicated his first car was a 1924 model car. I wanted to clarify that he did not purchase it in 1924.

Having done so, I now call up amendment No. 1508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], for Mr. BAYH, for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Mr. KOHL, Mr. REED, and Ms. COLLINS, proposes an amendment numbered 1508 to amendment No. 1502.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the publication and implementation of an action plan to reduce the quantity of oil used annually in the United States)

Strike section 251 and insert the following:

SEC. 251. OIL SAVINGS PLAN AND REQUIREMENTS.

(a) OIL SAVINGS TARGET AND ACTION PLAN.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as the ''Director'') shall publish in the Federal Register an action plan consisting of—

(1) a list of requirements proposed or to be proposed pursuant to subsection (b) that are authorized to be issued under law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and this Act, that will be sufficient, when taken together, to save from the baseline determined under subsection (e)—

(A) 2,500,000 barrels of oil per day on average during calendar year 2016;

(B) 7,000,000 barrels of oil per day on average during calendar year 2026; and

(C) 10,000,000 barrels per day on average during calendar year 2031; and

(2) a Federal Government-wide analysis demonstrating—

(A) the expected oil savings from the baseline to be accomplished by each requirement; and

(B) that all such requirements, taken together, will achieve the oil savings specified in this subsection.

(b) STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On or before the date of publication of the action plan under subsection (a), the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the head of any other agency the President determines appropriate shall each propose, or issue a notice of intent to propose, regulations establishing each standard or other requirement listed in the action plan that is under the jurisdiction of the respective agency using authorities described in paragraph (2).

(2) AUTHORITIES.—The head of each agency described in paragraph (1) shall use to carry out this subsection—

(A) any authority in existence on the date of enactment of this Act (including regulations); and

(B) any new authority provided under this Act (including an amendment made by this Act).

(3) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency described in paragraph (1) shall promulgate final versions of the regulations required under this subsection.

(4) CONTENT OF REGULATIONS.—Each proposed and final regulation promulgated under this subsection shall—

(A) be sufficient to achieve at least the oil savings resulting from the regulation under the action plan published under subsection (a); and

(B) be accompanied by an analysis by the applicable agency demonstrating that the regulation will achieve the oil savings from the baseline determined under subsection (e).

(c) INITIAL EVALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall—

(A) publish in the Federal Register a Federal Government-wide analysis of—

(i) the oil savings achieved from the baseline established under subsection (e); and

(ii) the expected oil savings under the standards and requirements of this Act (and amendments made by this Act); and

(B) determine whether oil savings will meet the targets established under subsection (a).

(2) INSUFFICIENT OIL SAVINGS.—If the oil savings are less than the targets established under subsection (a), simultaneously with the analysis required under paragraph (1)—

(A) the Director shall publish a revised action plan that is sufficient to achieve the targets; and

(B) the head of each agency referred to in subsection (b)(1) shall propose new or revised regulations that are sufficient to achieve the targets under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively, of subsection (b).

(3) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which regulations are proposed under paragraph (2)(B), the head of each agency referred to in subsection (b)(1) shall promulgate final versions of those regulations that comply with subsection (b)(1).

(d) REVIEW AND UPDATE OF ACTION PLAN.—

(1) REVIEW.—Not later than January 1, 2011, and every 3 years thereafter, the Director shall submit to Congress, and publish, a report that—

(A) evaluates the progress achieved in implementing the oil savings targets established under subsection (a);

(B) analyzes the expected oil savings under the standards and requirements established under this Act and the amendments made by this Act; and

(C)(i) analyzes the potential to achieve oil savings that are in addition to the savings required by subsection (a); and

(ii) if the President determines that it is in the national interest, establishes a higher oil savings target for calendar year 2017 or any subsequent calendar year.

(2) INSUFFICIENT OIL SAVINGS.—If the oil savings are less than the targets established under subsection (a), simultaneously with the report required under paragraph (1)—

(A) the Director shall publish a revised action plan that is sufficient to achieve the targets; and

(B) the head of each agency referred to in subsection (b)(1) shall propose new or revised regulations that are sufficient to achieve the targets under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively, of subsection (b).

(3) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which regulations are proposed under paragraph (2)(B), the head of each agency referred to in subsection (b)(1) shall promulgate final versions of those regulations that comply with subsection (b)(1).

(e) BASELINE AND ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS.—In performing the analyses and promulgating proposed or final regulations to establish standards and other requirements necessary to achieve the oil savings required by this section, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the head of any other agency the President determines to be appropriate shall—

(1) determine oil savings as the projected reduction in oil consumption from the baseline established by the reference case contained in the report of the Energy Information Administration entitled ''Annual Energy Outlook 2005'';

(2) determine the oil savings projections required on an annual basis for each of calendar years 2009 through 2026; and

(3) account for any overlap among the standards and other requirements to ensure that the projected oil savings from all the promulgated standards and requirements, taken together, are as accurate as practicable.

(f) NONREGULATORY MEASURES.—The action plan required under subsection (a) and the revised action plans required under subsections (c) and (d) shall include—

(1) a projection of the barrels of oil displaced by efficiency and sources of energy other than oil, including biofuels, electricity, and hydrogen; and

(2) a projection of the barrels of oil saved through enactment of this Act and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.).

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for not more than 7 minutes on this amendment and then Senator SALAZAR be allowed to speak for up to 7 minutes also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, this is the amendment I spoke about during morning business. I am proud to cosponsor it with Senator SALAZAR, as well as Senators BAYH, BROWNBACK, COLEMAN, FEINSTEIN, LINCOLN, CANTWELL, KERRY, DODD, COLLINS, KOHL, and REED of Rhode Island. It is a broadly bipartisan group.

This amendment would replace section 251 in the underlying bill which is the topic of our interest today. Section 251 in the bill sets forth gasoline savings targets as part of our move to help make America energy independent. We instead would put in title I of the DRIVE Act, which many of us introduced earlier this year, which sets oil savings plan requirements that are more ambitious and appropriately so.

We all know America is a nation addicted to oil and that addiction is hurting us and our people in many ways. It is saddling consumers with high gas and oil and other fuel prices. It is compromising our foreign policy. It is diminishing the quality of our environment. It is leaving our economy and our very national security subject to political instability in faraway places and to the malicious whims of foreign leaders of oil-producing nations, such as Ahmadinejad of Iran and Chavez of Venezuela. The only real and permanent solution to this problem is to substantially reduce the amount of oil consumed by our transportation sector, which consumes virtually all the oil, certainly the greater part of it, we consume as a nation.

The underlying bill before the Senate, managed by the chairman and ranking member of the Energy Committee but containing parts that came out of the Commerce Committee, the Environment and Public Works Committee I am honored to serve on, under the leadership of Senator BOXER, is a very admirable and responsive piece of legislation, a real act of leadership by this Congress, a bipartisan act of leadership. This is an institution, after the problems we had last week with the immigration bill, that desperately needs to show the American people and ourselves we can work across party lines to get things done, to solve problems that are real and present every day in the lives of our citizens. There are few one could say that would be more true of that than the energy crisis and challenge.

The savings targets in section 251 of the underlying bill are expressed in terms of American gasoline consumption and reduction of it, not oil consumption. The problem is gasoline usage can be reduced by increasing the use of diesel, but diesel is also made from oil, and oil is the substance to which we are addicted, with all the negative consequences I have described. So reducing oil consumption, in the opinion of those of us who are sponsoring this amendment, should be the express goal of the Senate bill's transportation provisions because oil dependence is what hurts us, is what drains the budgets of America's families and businesses. It hurts our national economy. It compromises our environment and undermines the independence of our foreign policy. This amendment would make that crucial correction from goals reducing gasoline consumption in the underlying bill to goals reducing oil consumption.

The gasoline savings goal in H.R. 6 amounts to a 20-percent reduction in projected oil consumption by 2030, if we try to transfer it to oil. The oil savings requirement in this amendment would amount to a 35-percent reduction in projected oil consumption by 2030. That is significant and would go a long way toward solving the problems we have talked about. I believe there is broad bipartisan support in the Senate for these stronger targets. Indeed, the fuel economy and renewable fuels provisions already found elsewhere in H.R. 6 will themselves go a long way toward achieving the stronger targets.

The DRIVE Act, which is the earlier legislation 26 of us introduced, its title I comprises our amendment to H.R. 6. It would direct the executive branch to identify, within 9 months and then within 18 months, and to publish Federal requirements that will achieve the following real and significant goals: A consistent reduction in U.S. oil consumption by 2016, a 7-million-barrel-per-day reduction by 2026, and a 10 million barrel per-day reduction by 2031. Today we consume somewhat over 20 million barrels of oil per day. That would be significant to cut 10 million barrels off our oil consumption by 2031. The measure would also direct the Office of Management and Budget to publish an analysis identifying the oil savings projected to be achieved by each requirement to be created and demonstrating that the listed measures will, in the aggregate, achieve the overall specified oil savings. So we are setting goals, and we are asking the executive branch to come up with programs to show how existing statutory authority and regulatory authority they have can be used to achieve these goals which will make America much more energy independent or, in fact, to come back and say to us: We need more authority, some new statute to achieve these goals we have set.

The cosponsors of this amendment believe we need targets that will keep the pressure on our Government and on all of us to use the authorities Congress has provided to achieve the robust oil savings America and its people need. The DRIVE Act, which is the act from which this title I amendment is taken, has 26 cosponsors in the Senate, a broadly bipartisan group reflective of every section of the country and every ideology represented in the Congress. It shows there is a consensus of demand for change in savings in oil consumption. That is exactly what this amendment would do.

I urge my colleagues to adopt it overwhelmingly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam President, I first acknowledge my good friend from Connecticut for his good work on the DRIVE Act over the last several years. It is no coincidence that he and a number of bipartisan Senators have been leading the effort to make sure we set America free. In fact, the coalition that helped in writing the legislation Senator LIEBERMAN spoke about calls itself the Set America Free Coalition. It includes conservatives such as C. Boyden Gray and progressives such as former Senator Tim Wirth, who have come together and recognized that setting America free from our addiction to foreign oil is an imperative for the United States in the 21st century.

Similar to the good work that gets done in this Chamber, this is bipartisan legislation. This amendment also has the cosponsorship of Senators BROWNBACK, COLEMAN, LINCOLN, CANTWELL, KERRY, DODD, COLLINS, KOHL, and REED of Rhode Island, and others. It is a good amendment that reflects the bipartisan composition of this body.

Let me say why I believe this ambitious set of goals for the United States is important. It is irrefutable that today about 66 percent of the oil being used in America comes from abroad. Of the oil we are importing from those foreign countries, 41 percent of it comes from underneath the sands or lands of hostile regimes. So that national security implication is we need to get off the pipeline to those hostile regimes that today essentially allows them to fund the war on terror against the United States and the free world.

The legislation we have before us with this amendment reflects the American dream of a more energy-secure future, with fewer oil imports and a strong renewable energy economy here at home.

We need to set high goals for oil savings because we know we can, in fact, meet them if we set them high—in the same way we set high standards in the 1960s, when President Kennedy said we would be launching an initiative that would get a man to the moon within 10 years, and we were able to do that; in the same way President Roosevelt said we would be able to move forward and develop the Manhattan Project, and we were able to do so within 4 years.

That is the same kind of vision and the same kind of boldness we need to have with respect to oil savings in America today. The amendment we have brought before this body today—which is the embodiment of the oil savings provision of the DRIVE Act—in fact, has that kind of boldness, that kind of courage within it. I, therefore, strongly encourage my colleagues in the Senate to support the amendment we have brought before you.

Let me, once again, say this amendment is broadly supported by both Republicans and Democrats in the Senate. I hope it is one of those amendments that can be adopted by our Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 1515 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1502

(Purpose: To establish an energy efficiency and renewable energy worker training program)

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment which is at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I would like to talk to the Senator. We are still on the amendment. What are you asking? That we set it aside for what purpose?

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I wish to offer an amendment to create a workforce for sustainable energy and energy efficiency. We are building on what was in the bill originally. We have boilerplate language.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry: We have set aside only one amendment to proceed with another thus far; that is, the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma was set aside; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, now he is asking that be done again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is also correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask the Senator, how long do you think you would be before we could return to the regular order?

Mr. SANDERS. Fifteen minutes or so.

Mr. DOMENICI. One-five?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not wish to restrict you. You talk long similar to myself. Would you rather have 20 or 25 minutes?

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, 15 or 20. I think I can do it in 15.

Mr. DOMENICI. Twenty minutes is all right by me.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

There being no objection, the pending amendment will be set aside and the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. BIDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 1515 to amendment No. 1502.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. SANDERS. Let me thank my friend from New Mexico for the opportunity to go forward.

Madam President, I rise to offer an amendment on behalf of myself, Senator CLINTON, Senator KERRY, and Senator BIDEN.

Our amendment would strike section 277 of the Senate substitute, which is very broad language directing the Secretary of Labor to work with the Secretary of Energy to develop workforce training for the energy efficiency and renewable energy sectors, and replace it with a clearer directive regarding workforce development in those same areas.

Before I get too far along in the description of the amendment, I would like to thank Senators Bingaman and Domenici for including section 277 in the underlying bill. I think we all recognize the need to provide more workforce training in the areas of energy efficiency and renewable energy if we are to truly meet the challenge in front of us.

The amendment I offer today simply builds upon the language already included in the legislation we are considering, and so I hope it will receive the resounding support of this body. In other words, we had boilerplate language already in it, and we have built upon that. Up to this point, we have had strong bipartisan support.

This amendment would create a sustainable, comprehensive public program to provide quality training for jobs created through renewable energy and energy efficiency initiatives—an area of our economy that is in tremendous need of expansion to meet the demand for a skilled workforce in these sectors.

Fundamentally, the amendment would do two basic things: One, expand our Nation's capacity to identify and track the new jobs and skills associated with the growing clean energy technology sector; secondly, develop national and State training programs to address skill shortages that have already begun to impair the expansion of clean energy and efficiency technologies.

More specifically, the amendment would authorize funding for national and State research on labor market trends in the energy efficiency and renewable energy sectors. Additionally, the amendment would provide competitive grants for national and State

training programs in the renewable energy and energy efficiency areas.

Entities eligible for grants are nonprofit partnerships that include equal participation of industry and labor groups, and there is explicit encouragement for the development of partnerships with other organizations such as community-based organizations, educational institutions, small businesses, cooperatives, State and local veterans agencies, and veterans service organizations.

Some of the target populations for the training programs include those who are veterans of the Armed Forces, those affected by national energy or environmental policies, those displaced by economic globalization, and those seeking pathways out of poverty and into economic self-sufficiency. The eligible industries include the energy-efficient building, construction, and retrofits industry; the renewable electric power industry; the energy-efficient and advanced drive train vehicle industry; the biofuels industry; and the deconstruction and materials use industries.

Some may ask whether we even have reason to believe we need training to increase the number of workers skilled in the areas targeted by this amendment. The answer is a resounding yes. We know the lack of trained workers is a significant barrier to the growth of the renewable and energy efficiency industries.

A 2006 study from the National Renewable Energy Lab identified the shortage of skills and training as a leading nontechnical barrier to renewable energy and energy efficiency growth. This same study identified a number of critical unmet training needs, including lack of reliable installation, maintenance, and inspection services, the shortage of key technical and manufacturing skills, and failure of the educational system to provide adequate training in new technologies.

All of those issues are addressed in this amendment. I can tell you from talking to the people on the ground, there is a real shortage of trained workers in these areas. In Vermont, if a family wants to retrofit and weatherize their home, it could take a very long time to make it happen because there are simply not enough workers out there trained to do the work. The same thing goes for installation of solar panels or wind turbines.

The widespread adoption of these technologies is being stopped in its tracks because we simply do not have enough people to do the jobs. But instead of talking about a study or listening to my experience from Vermont, let me actually offer testimonials from some of those who are most familiar with the need for the workforce development concepts I am proposing.

Let me quote Tim Michels, from Energy Solutions, Incorporated, from St. Louis, MO:

> We have been saving energy for institutions for over 30 years. We typically find that we can reduce energy use 25+ percent with less than a 4 year payback, so it is very economical and we have lots of case studies to prove it. The limiting factor to our growth as an industry is lack of qualified professionals to perform the analyses.

That is what we are trying to do: find the workers to do those types of efforts.

Lisa Mortensen, the CEO of Community Fuels, of Encinitas, CA, states:

> Currently, we are constructing a 7.5 million gallon per year biodiesel plant at Port of Stockton, California. As a renewable energy start-up we have an intimate understanding of the need for a high quality workforce. Skills in mechanical operations, industrial hygiene and safety, quality control and a wider understanding of energy production are essential to a quality workforce. These skills are not easily learned. With funding opportunities like the one proposed, our company could work with local training institutions to help develop a workforce prepared for the changing U.S. landscape.

Christopher O'Brien, vice president for strategy & government relations, Sharp Electronics Corporation, of Mayway, NJ, writes:

> Sharp Corporation is the world's leading producer of solar photovoltaic equipment and has been the No. 1 producer since 2000. Sharp's solar manufacturing plant in Memphis is the largest solar panel manufacturing facility in the U.S., with annual production capacity of 64 Megawatts, comprised of almost 400,000 solar panels. The 200 solar production workers in Memphis are represented by IBEW Local 474. Sharp supports the proposal for increased Federal funding for worker training in solar and other renewable energy and energy efficiency industries. . . . We have since 2003 trained and certified over 1,681 workers. Additional Federal funding support would help to accelerate the pace of this training and would assure Sharp and other solar manufacturers that there will be a reliable and professionally trained pool of workers to deliver and install solar energy systems on customers' homes and commercial buildings. . . .

Those are a few—just a few—of the testimonials that have come across my desk as I have worked on this amendment, but I do think they do a good job of making this issue real for those of us in the Senate.

Now, my colleagues may wonder why we need a specific program for training in energy efficiency and renewables. The answer is simple: While the renewable energy and energy efficiency industries use many skills that can be transferred from other industries, specific, additional skills are often needed to take maximum advantage of the newer energy technologies.

For instance, investments in training of building maintenance workers and building superintendents and engineers can improve the operation of today's heating and cooling systems by as much as 10 percent in large public and commercial buildings, according to the National Association of Energy Services Companies. Such training could save millions of dollars per year in energy costs in larger public or commercial buildings, not to mention reduce the emission of pollutants that add to global warming. Let me quote from two business leaders about the need for specific training in these areas.

Erik Larson, from Indie Energy, of Evanston, IL:

> We are the first company in the Chicago area to develop geothermal systems for commercial and residential developments using in-house vertical drilling. . . . We recognized right away that the skill sets required for a geothermal operation were not available in current labor markets.

Robert de Grasse, senior vice president of technical standards, AIMCO—America's largest owner of apartment complexes—of Denver, CO, writes:

> I personally support the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Worker Training Program. AIMCO is expecting that properly trained maintenance technicians will have significant and measurable benefits; in particular with HVAC systems and electric motors. Energy User News described the energy and financial savings on HVAC for community colleges in California was estimated from 6 percent to 19 percent of a typical community college's energy bill; a direct result of technical training.

There is no doubt in my mind this amendment could make a tremendous difference in our ability to implement concrete, on-the-ground strategies that help to address our energy challenges. Ensuring we have a workforce trained in the skills needed to implement bold energy efficiency and renewable energy policies will go a long way.

Before I yield the floor, I would like to read the long list of some of the organizations that support the Sanders-Clinton-Kerry-Biden amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that letters from the following groups be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAESCO,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2007.

Re business leaders urge vote for Sanders-Clinton amendment to promote workforce training for a new energy economy.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: As a business association representing leading companies working to build a new clean energy economy, we strongly urge you to vote ''yes'' on an amendment to the Energy Savings Act of 2007 (SB 1321) that will be vital to our nation's energy security and to the fight against global warming. Offered by Senators Sanders and Clinton, the Amendment would establish an Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Workforce Training Program at the Department of Labor to ensure our country trains the workforce needed to ensure continued robust growth of a new, clean energy industry.

NAESCO's current membership of about 85 organizations includes firms involved in the design, manufacture, financing and installation of energy efficiency and renewable energy equipment and the provision of energy efficiency and renewable energy services in the private and public sectors. NAESCO members deliver about $4 billion of energy efficiency projects each year. NAESCO numbers among its members some of the most prominent companies in the world in the HVAC and energy control equipment business, including Honeywell, Johnson Controls, Siemens, Trane and TAC/Tour Andover. Our members also include many of the nation's largest utilities: Pacific Gas & Electric, Southern California Edison, New York Power

Authority, and TU Electric & Gas. In addition, ESCO members include affiliates of ConEdison, Pepco Energy Services, Constellation, PP&L, DMJM Harris and Direct Energy. Prominent national and regional independent members include Custom Energy, NORESCO, Onsite Energy, EnergySolve, Ameresco, UCONS, Chevron Energy Solutions, Synergy Companies, Wendel Energy Services, WESCO and Energy Systems Group. NAESCO member companies have been delivering energy efficiency projects to residential, commercial, institutional and industrial customers across the country for the past twenty years.

The companies we represent are developing and deploying a wide range of innovative clean energy technologies, utilizing domestic biomass, wind, solar energy, geothermal power, fuel cells, energy efficient technologies and services, and much, much more. By 2025, these technologies could provide electric power equal to half of all the electricity that our country uses today. By 2030, our industries could replace 30% to 40% of the petroleum our country now imports. By doing so, our industries could make a significant contribution to curbing global warming pollution, enhancing our nation's energy security, and creating up to 5 million new jobs by 2025.

However, to achieve these goals, we must find enough qualified, trained people to design, manufacture, install, operate, and maintain a host of innovative renewable energy and energy efficient technologies. Across the country, our companies experience workforce shortages as one of the key barriers to growth. Indeed, a recent literature review from the National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) identified the shortage of skills and training as a leading non-technical barrier to renewable energy and energy efficiency growth.

We believe that the $100 million dollars authorized by the Sanders-Clinton Amendment is urgently needed to develop national and state skill training programs that will prepare workers technically for our emerging industries, as well as to analyze market trends and demonstrate best practices. While the renewable energy and energy efficiency industries use many skills that can be transferred from other sectors, in many other cases, our companies require specific, new skills to take maximum advantage of the newer energy technologies. By establishing a pilot program specifically geared toward the renewable energy and efficiency industries, the Sanders-Clinton Amendment would enable us to build the workforce our industries need to achieve their maximum potential.

Our companies stand ready to help our country with new energy technologies that will make us all more secure, curb the threat of global warming, and create economic opportunity for millions of working Americans. We urge you to vote ''yes'' on the Clinton-Sanders Amendment as a crucial step toward achieving these vital objectives.

Sincerely,

DONALD D. GILLIGAN,
President.

CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS ACTION FUND,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2007.

Senator BERNARD SANDERS,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC.

Senator HILLARY CLINTON,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS SANDERS AND CLINTON: I write to express my strong support for the proposed Sanders-Clinton Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Worker Training Program that will be offered as an amendment to the upcoming energy bill, and to encourage other Senators to join in support of this provision as co-sponsors. This is a critically important energy and jobs measure that will help to ensure both America's future energy and economic security.

As our nation confronts the twin challenges of our escalating energy dependence and a mounting climate crisis, we are presented by a remarkable opportunity to meet these pressing demands with new more efficient and ever cleaner sources of energy. This ''energy opportunity'' represents a chance to rebuild our communities, to better train our workers, and to reinvest in the basic infrastructure of the nation. This amendment takes a significant step forward in meeting the practical need to ensure that American firms and workers have the cutting edge skills to participate in the growing market for clean and efficient energy, and to capture the jobs of the future.

Even as wind and solar energy experience explosive annual growth rates, the utility industry is facing retirement of half its workers within the decade, while the National Renewable Energy Lab has identified a shortage of skilled workers as a major barrier to deployment of renewable and efficient energy. This amendment strategically invests $100,000,000 dollars into a more robust labor market and skills training that will prepare up to 30,000 workers to jump start these booming industries that America invented. This is a smart investment in a safer, more prosperous, and more competitive U.S. economy.

By enhancing the workforce investment system, and working with state governments, non-profit community groups, and both labor and management, this amendment offers an efficient path forward for the American economy. Targeting workers displaced by shifting energy policies, enhanced skills for returning veterans, pathways out of poverty for those most in need of work, and a reliable labor market for both small business and heavy industry represents a sound investment in the future. This amendment will help build a state of the art economy and expand markets for renewable energy, good jobs in construction and building trades, and job security for the U.S. auto industry. Thank you for your leadership on this issue. The Center for American Progress Action Fund salutes your vision, and offers its full support for this important measure.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. PODESTA,
President and CEO.

JUNE 11, 2007.

Re support the Sanders-Clinton amendment on worker training for the clean energy economy.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: As representatives of the environmental, energy efficiency, and clean energy advocacy communities, we urge you to vote for an amendment to the Renewable Fuels, Consumer Protection, and Energy Efficiency Act of 2007 (S. 1419) that will train working Americans for high-skilled jobs in the emerging, clean energy economy. Sponsored by Senators Sanders and Clinton, the amendment would create an Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Workforce Training Program at the Department of Labor to train workers in the skills our country needs to make the most of new investments in clean, renewable energy and energy-saving technologies.

As Congress advances programs to enhance our energy security and address global warming, workforce shortages have emerged as one of the top barriers to the new energy economy. Indeed, a 2006 study from the National Renewable Energy Lab identified a shortage of skills and training as a leading barrier to renewable energy and energy efficiency growth.

The program established by the Sanders-Clinton Amendment would help ensure that our nation develops the best models for training workers in the new skills required to properly manufacture, install, maintain, and operate clean energy technologies. Grant funding under the program could, for instance, train wind-industry workers in such new skills as turbine siting, airfoil repair, and weather patterns that affect turbine performance. Investments in training of building maintenance workers, superintendents, and engineers could improve the operations of sophisticated heating and cooling systems by as much as 10 percent, saving millions in energy costs each year in large public, industrial, or commercial buildings.

Of crucial importance, the Sanders-Clinton amendment provides working Americans with a clear pathway to earn a family-supporting livelihood in the emerging, new energy economy. We enthusiastically embrace this amendment for signaling that America is, at last, ready to replace the old debate of ''jobs vs. the environment'' by investing in ''jobs for the environment.''

Thank you for considering our request to co-sponsor this vital amendment. If you have any questions about this legislation, please feel free to contact Jessica Maher in Sen. Sanders' office.

Sincerely,

KATERI CALLAHAN,
President, Alliance to Save Energy.

BILL PRINDLE,
Acting Executive Director, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy.

DAVID ZWICK,
President, Clean Water Action.

VAWTER PARKER,
Executive Director, Earthjustice.

FRANCES BEINECKE,
President, Natural Resources Defense Council.

JOAN CLAYBROOK,
President, Public Citizen.

CARL POPE,
Executive Director, Sierra Club

KEVIN KNOBLOCH,
President, Union of Concerned Scientists.

JUNE 11, 2007.

Re business leaders urge vote for Sanders-Clinton amendment to promote workforce training for a new energy economy.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: As business associations representing hundreds of leading companies working to build a new clean energy economy, we strongly urge you to vote ''yes'' on an amendment to the Energy Savings Act of 2007 (SB 1321) that will be vital to our nation's energy security and to the fight against global warming. Offered by Senators Sanders and Clinton, the Amendment would establish an Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Workforce Training Program at the Department of Labor to ensure our country trains the workforce needed to ensure continued robust growth of a new, clean energy industry.

The companies we represent are developing and deploying a wide range of innovative clean energy technologies, utilizing domestic biomass, wind, solar energy, geothermal power, fuel cells, energy efficient technologies and services, and much, much more. By 2025, these technologies could provide electric power equal to half of all the electricity that our country uses today. By 2030, our industries could replace 30% to 40% of the petroleum our country now imports. By doing so, our industries could make a significant contribution to curbing global warming pollution, enhancing our nation's energy security, and creating up to 5 million new jobs by 2025.

However, to achieve these goals, we must find enough qualified, trained people to design, manufacture, install, operate, and maintain a host of innovative renewable energy and energy efficient technologies. Across the country, our companies experience workforce shortages as one of the key barriers to growth. Indeed, a recent literature review from the National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) identified the shortage of skills and training as a leading non-technical barrier to renewable energy and energy efficiency growth.

We believe that the $100 million dollars authorized by the Sanders-Clinton Amendment is urgently needed to develop national and state skill training programs that will prepare workers for our emerging industries, analyze market trends, and demonstrate best practices. While the renewable energy and energy efficiency industries use many skills that can be transferred from other sectors, in many other cases, our companies require specific, new skills to take maximum advantage of the newer energy technologies. By establishing a pilot program specifically geared toward the renewable energy and efficiency industries, the Sanders-Clinton Amendment would enable us to build the workforce our industries need to achieve their maximum potential.

Our companies stand ready to help our country with new energy technologies that will make us all more secure, curb the threat of global warming, and create economic opportunity for millions of working Americans. We urge you to vote ''yes'' on the Clinton-Sanders Amendment as a crucial step toward achieving these vital objectives.

Sincerely,

BRADLEY D. COLLINS,
Executive Director, American Solar Energy Society.

RANDALL SWISHER,
President, American Wind Energy Association.

DONALD GILLIGAN,
President, National Association of Energy Service Companies.

ROBERT DINNEEN,
President Renewable Fuels Association.

RHONE RESCH,
President, Solar Energy Industries Association.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2007.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to request your support for an amendment to be offered by Sen. Sanders to S. 1419 the ''Energy Savings Act of 2007.''

The Sanders amendment would establish the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Worker Training Program to train workers for good-paying jobs in clean energy design, manufacturing, installation, construction, operation, and maintenance. This program would help U.S. workers get good jobs in an industry expected to experience rapid growth as our nation refits and rebuilds its energy infrastructure, and would help the U.S. economy take advantage of emerging environmental technologies.

To ensure that the benefits from new investments in our national energy infrastructure are distributed equitably, the Sanders amendment would give priority to partnerships that train veterans, workers displaced by globalization or environmental policies, and disadvantaged workers and communities. In addition, to allow for the delivery of training unique to specialized geographic and industry needs, the Sanders amendment balances grants between national, regional, and state workforce development programs.

As Congress considers legislation designed to reduce our country's reliance on foreign sources of fossil fuels, we believe it should also invest in the domestic workforce. American workers should have every opportunity to acquire the skills necessary for job opportunities that will be created by new investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy industries.

The AFL–CIO strongly urges you to support and cosponsor the Sanders amendment. To become a cosponsor, please call Jessica Maher in Sen. Sanders' office. If you have any other questions or need any further information, please contact David Mallino in the AFL–CIO's Department of Legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Department of Legislation.

JUNE 5, 2007.

Re co-sponsor the Sanders-Clinton amendment on workforce development for the new energy economy

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I write to urge you to cosponsor an amendment that Senators Sanders and Clinton will offer during the upcoming debate on S. 1419, the Renewable Fuels, Consumer Protection, and Energy Efficiency Act of 2007, that would help America develop the specialized workforce skills needed to ensure robust growth of the renewable energy and energy efficiency industries. The Sanders-Clinton Amendment would establish an Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Workforce Training Program to be administered by the Department of Labor (DOL) in coordination with the Department of Energy.

The purpose of this initiative is twofold—to expand our nation's capacity to identify and track the new jobs and skills associated with the growing energy technology sector and to develop national and state skill training programs that will demonstrate best practices in addressing skill shortages that have already begun to impair the expansion of energy technologies that are crucial to national security, economic competitiveness, and curbing global warming.

Industries eligible for training services under the program would include: energy-efficient building, construction, and retrofits; renewable electric power; advanced automotive drive trains; advanced bio-fuels; and the deconstruction and materials use industries.

As Congress advances programs to enhance our energy security and address global warming, workforce shortages are emerging in the utilities sector that could stymie growth of the renewable energy and efficiency industries. According to the American Public Power Association, half of current utility workers will retire within the next decade. However, our nation is not training enough new workers to fill their places. For instance, the number of high school graduates with technical training has declined by 35 percent over the last decade.

Already, the renewable and energy efficiency industries are feeling the pinch. A 2006 study from the National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) identified the shortage of skills and training as a leading non-technical barrier to renewable energy and energy efficiency growth. In particular, the NREL study identified a number of critical unmet training needs, including lack of reliable installation, maintenance, and inspection services, the shortage of key technical and manufacturing skills, and failure of the educational system to provide adequate training in new technologies.

Leading companies in the renewable energy and efficiency sector experience lack of skilled workers as a key business constraint. According to Steve Cowell, CEO and Chairman, of Conservation Services Group (CSG), a leading provider of building efficiency and renewable energy services, ''the growth of the industry is constrained by the challenges of finding experienced, trained people. . . . CSG has identified this issue as our . . . industry's most significant constraint on growth.''

The program established by the Sanders-Clinton Amendment would help ensure that our nation has the best models for training workers in the many new skills required to properly manufacture, install, maintain, and operate clean energy technologies. For instance, grant funding provided under the amendment could train workers in such substantial new skills as wind turbine siting, airfoils and composite repair, and weather patterns that affect turbine performance.

While the renewable energy and energy efficiency industries use many skills that can be transferred from other industries, specific, targeted skill enhancements are often needed to take maximum advantage of the newer energy technologies. For instance, investments in training of building maintenance workers and building superintendents and engineers can improve the operations of today's sophisticated heating and cooling systems by as much as 10 percent in large public and commercial buildings, according to the National Association of Energy Services Companies. Such training could save millions of dollars per year in energy costs in larger public or commercial buildings.

The Sanders-Clinton amendment is unique among many of the new energy polices that Congress will consider for providing a pathway for working Americans to earn a family-supporting livelihood in our new energy economy. This Amendment honors the sacrifice of our veterans by including them among groups targeted for training. In addition, the Amendment helps to tap the full range of our nation's human capital by offering training opportunities to those displaced by national energy and environmental policy, economic globalization, individuals seeking pathways out of poverty, formerly incarcerated, adjudicated and non-violent offenders who seek to play a constructive role in society, and incumbent workers in the energy field needing to update their skills.

The $100 million authorized by the Sanders-Clinton Amendment is needed to implement programs of sufficient size and scale to achieve the dual goals described previously—enhanced labor market information as well as national and state demonstration training programs. The Amendment would authorize up to $40 million in grants on a competitive basis under a National Training Partnerships program and up to $40 million in grants to states to implement labor exchange and

training programs. Preference would be given to states that show leadership in promoting renewable energy, energy efficiency, and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Eligible entities would include nonprofit organizations that are composed of partnerships between industry and labor, taking advantage of established programs in order to ensure the highest-quality training possible. The Sanders-Clinton amendment also provides funding for national and State industry-wide research, labor market information, and labor exchange programs.

Using the average costs of attending a community college, we estimate that funding would be sufficient to train between 20,000 and 30,000 workers per year. These numbers represent just a small fraction of the 3 million workers that would be needed, according to our own estimates, if the country launched an ambitious ten-year Apollo-like effort to build a new energy future. However, we believe it is prudent to begin with a pilot program on the scale proposed by Senator Sanders to ensure we fully understand the kinds of training needed and future workforce trends before investing in a larger effort.

Worker training, we believe, will be crucial to the wider market penetration of innovative renewable energy and energy efficient technologies. With passage of the Sanders-Clinton Amendment, businesses can, for instance, have greater confidence that an expensive solar array or geothermal heat pump will be properly installed, reducing the perceived risks of investing in relatively unfamiliar technologies. As skills improve, costs will come down. That will, in turn, pave the way toward making renewables and efficiency a core component of our country's energy mix.

Thank you for considering our request to co-sponsor this vital amendment. If you have any questions about this legislation, please feel free to contact Jessica Maher in Senator Sanders' office or Dan Seligman, Apollo's National Campaign Director.

Sincerely,

JEROME RINGO,
President, Apollo Alliance.

Mr. SANDERS. Some of those groups are the Apollo Alliance; the Renewable Fuels Association; Wider Opportunities for Women; the Union of Concerned Scientists; the AFL–CIO; the National Association of Energy Service Companies, which includes many businesses and utilities that we all have heard of—Honeywell, Johnson Controls, Trane, and Pacific Gas & Electric, to name a few—the Sierra Club; the Alliance to Save Energy; the Solar Energy Industries Association; Clean Water Action; the American Wind Energy Association; Earthjustice; the American Solar Energy Society; the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy; Public Citizen; the Center for American Progress Action Fund; and the Natural Resources Defense Council.

To conclude, this amendment has widespread support from the business community and from organized labor. It has support from the environmental community. What it says is if we are going to go forward in a bold way, breaking our dependence on fossil fuels, moving to energy efficiency, moving to sustainable energy, we are going to need a skilled workforce to help us move in that direction. I have always believed as we move to sustainable energy and energy efficiency, we have the capability of creating millions of new, good-paying jobs. This amendment is terribly important if, in fact, we are going to be able to do that.

I yield the floor and ask for support of this amendment.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I have conferred with my colleague and we are willing to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, the one he presented to the Members, the one that is currently pending. Perhaps my colleague wants to speak to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, we have reviewed the amendment, and actually we have similar activity already prescribed for in the bill. This modifies some, changes some, adds in other places, but all of it is authorizing to the extent that it expands—it is pretty much the kind of thing the bill contemplated. So we have no objection on our side.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I appreciate those comments, and the Senator from California who chairs the Environment and Public Works Committee indicates it is acceptable to her committee as well. So at this point, I think the Senate is ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1515) was agreed to.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President and fellow Senators, I need now to bother you with a few minutes of time, because some very good Senators have come to the floor to speak in favor of a proposal that was brought to the floor by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, and he was joined by the Senator from Colorado, Mr. SALAZAR. Between the two, they mentioned and enumerated a number of Senators who favored this—good Senators here who favor this proposal that was brought to the Senate's attention, as it was a free-standing amendment that has been floating around the Senate for quite some time as something that maybe we should consider. Now, it sounds good. Senators who spoke about it spoke eloquently about it, but I would suggest that maybe, just maybe, these goals in this amendment were necessary yesterday—maybe yesterday, Senator BINGAMAN—I am not sure, but maybe.

But I encourage my colleagues to look to the underlying bill and compare it to the goals that are set forth in that amendment. We don't need the goals, because we have already—the amendment they offer sets goals and then directs the administration to figure out how to get where they are supposed to go. I think that is sort of like outsourcing. That is outsourcing of the legislature duties and responsibilities to the executive, and then praising the bill because it tells the executive they have to reach these goals and save all of this oil. Well, if it were that easy, ever since we found out we were greatly dependent upon foreign oil, it would have been a cinch. There would have been nothing to it. We could have come to the floor and said we have an answer.

We want a dream. We want a dream, and the dream is a two-sentence bill that says the executive branch of Government shall have OMB proceed to direct goals that will get us to the point where we are no longer dependent. What a dream they could say that is. I am kind of paraphrasing my wonderful friend from Colorado who talked about the dream, that this was a dream to achieve big things. But you see, this is merely saying to the executive branch: You do what we ought to do, and when you do it, or if you do it, we are going to take credit today, because we told you to get OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, or somebody in your branch of the Government, to set the goals and then tell us how to do it, and then do it.

Let me get back to why we don't need it, if we ever needed it. I would have made this same argument in any event, but I want to say yesterday it was a little more relevant. My colleagues understand we have a bill before us, and we the Congress set goals on gasoline savings and then we set the policies that will attain the goals. They are tough, hard goals. They are not saying to the President: You reach these goals. We reach the goals. In fact, we will vote on this bill and when we do, if we do, and if we have enough courage, we will be voting on changing the automobile standards in a big way. For the first time in decades, we will have changed the standards for automobiles, for new automobiles, and made the automobile manufacturers make cars every year less dependent, more efficient so they use less gasoline.

But we don't say: Executive branch, You do it. Set the goals. And aren't we happy we dreamed big and we said to you, you set the goals for CAFE standards. We didn't say that. We said: Here, we changed them. And if anybody wants to vote to change the CAFE standards, they are already changed in this bill. If you want to change the CAFE standards and save a huge number of barrels, since they are talking

about barrels, a huge number of barrels of crude oil, because all the gasoline for the most part comes from that, you will achieve those savings by voting for this bill. You don't have to vote for an amendment that says to the President: You set the goals, Mr. President, and then you achieve them. And, boy, when that gets done, we will have made a real dream come true.

Now, I figure we should stop dreaming. We dreamed so much on energy and we have been working so hard that today, for the first time in the transportation section, the section of our law that is transportation oriented, we took one big bite out of the use of transportation fuel, and we did not need the amendment I am opposing that was brought here today and that the distinguished Senators from Colorado and Connecticut and others spoke in favor of. We don't need it anymore, because we don't need anybody else setting the goals. We achieved the goals ourselves right in the bill.

In 1972, President Nixon set the goal of being energy independent by 1980. We were about 30 percent dependent on foreign oil at that time. Today, unfortunately, we are 60 percent reliant upon foreign oil. That tells me goals are not enough. We need action. Interestingly enough, this bill that they offer an amendment to is the action. It is the action per se. We have not had any action that makes us less reliant, substantially less reliant, as does this bill. By adoption of the changes in the laws that apply to new cars, we have dramatically reduced what Americans are going to spend on gasoline and diesel fuel in the forthcoming years because we have changed the law and have caused that to happen in a very good way. But we haven't asked anybody to do it for us. We haven't said: Mr. President, would you find in your administration somebody who could set these goals and achieve them? Boy, we have told you how to do it. We have set them very high so we can go home and tell the American people how high we have set the goals and how much we achieved. But we did nothing in the amendment. We did nothing; we just asked the White House to do it.

I know a lot of people have endorsed a bill that does this, that has these goals that asks the President to ask the OMB to achieve the goals, and we have everybody on it. We have people in ordinary life who are great citizens. We have former Senators, former members of White House staff. They all joined this bill. But the bill was nothing more than a set of goals, and it said the White House should go out and achieve them. It was sort of saying: We would like to be President, but we are not. Since we are not, we are going to adopt this amendment and it is going to tell the President that is what he ought to do. But I say that once again, the amendment, which I am going to call the Salazar amendment for a moment, would require the administration to develop a plan to reduce oil consumption by 2.5 million barrels of oil per day during the calendar year 2016, ramping up to 10 million barrels per day during calendar year 2031. But the bill we are considering already includes an ambitious gasoline savings goal. It goes on to achieve the goal. The bill itself achieves the goal by changing the law. Senators are going to be voting—not the President—to get it done. The bill we are considering already includes ambitious savings. The bill sets gasoline savings at 20 percent by calendar year 2017, 35 percent by calendar year 2025, and 45 percent by calendar year 2030.

Now, we did not ask the President to ask staff to come up with a goal and then today brag on the goal because the President is going to do it. What we did in this bill is we adopted these goals and then changed the law to achieve them.

As you know, we changed the law to achieve the savings, by changing the law on new automobiles and other things in this bill. These goals are consistent with what the President articulated in the State of the Union Address. But we didn't wait around to see how he was going to do it and let him call the shots and then brag that he set the goals. We did it ourselves. The President's Twenty in Ten Initiative calls for a reduction in gasoline usage by 20 percent in 10 years, or by 2017.

This bill not only includes these gasoline savings goals but establishes the programs that will put us on track to meet them. In particular, the bill includes an ambitious renewable fuel standard that will displace foreign oil with homegrown renewable fuel.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment. Then we set the policies that attain the goals we are trying to achieve. Outsourcing our authority—we outsource it to the White House in the amendment that was put before us—Senator LIEBERMAN first brought it up. I don't know who takes credit as its author. Perhaps it is the distinguished Senator from Colorado, Mr. SALAZAR, but we all know which three or four Senators first came up with it.

I wish to talk for a moment about this. On the biofuels part of the bill, we save 2.5 million barrels per day by 2017—I have converted some of this to barrels so they won't wonder what we are doing—4.5 million barrels per day by 2025, and 6.5 million barrels per day by 2030. This is just the renewable fuels section. If we add the CAFE standards from the bill, we probably will exceed these goals in practice by passing this bill.

This amendment is unnecessary. The amendment offered by Senator SALAZAR and others here today is unnecessary because we, as a matter of fact, already adopted law changes. We will be the ones who were courageous and did the work. We are not going to just set goals and put numbers there and say, now we have done our job, and say to the President, you go do it, and then come to the Senate and say, won't it be great. We set these goals, and the President will do it.

I don't believe that is the way we are going to do that. If that was the way we were going to do it—I told you about Richard Nixon and how far we were already substantially indebted to the world, 20 percent dependent. We were all trying to get a balanced budget in terms of the energy consumption. He wanted to have a zero difference. He wanted to make everything work, where we didn't have any excess use of oil, and he announced that. But, you see, he was President. He could have done whatever he wanted that was legal. He must have found that the President cannot do it. He didn't achieve it. The Congress tried but could not achieve it with him, and nobody could do it very easily.

We have been doing very well when you consider what we did in the bill we passed 2 years ago, the Energy bill, plus the two things which are in this bill which are gigantic, the likes of which we have never done—the CAFE change, which is giant. You heard the effects from Senator FEINSTEIN. That is not set in stone. That is adopting the changes in CAFE standards, big changes. And then we did the dramatic thing the President recommended in terms of moving ahead with ethanol and beyond ethanol to the kind of cellulosic ethanol, which is going to be truly a magnificent substitute for the oil we are using. But we are not setting a goal; we are going to do it. The bill will do it. By the time we are finished, the bill will achieve almost as much as the Salazar amendment requested in goals.

With that, 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. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I want to get it clear in the RECORD who this amendment belongs to. It was introduced by Senator BAYH some time ago. It had as sponsors Senators BROWNBACK, LIEBERMAN, COLEMAN, SALAZAR, CANTWELL, KERRY, DODD, and KOHL. The amendment was also proposed by Senator REID. I now have it straight that these were the Senators on this amendment.

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. COLEMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COLEMAN. Madam President, I rise today to speak in favor of the Bayh amendment No. 1508 that is rooted in one of the most basic responsibilities we have as Members of this body,

and that is to preserve the security of the American people. For over a year, I have been working with a bipartisan group of Senators, including Senator BAYH, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator BROWNBACK, and Senator SALAZAR, on a plan that will create oil savings for this Nation.

By the way, the bill before us does that. Senator DOMENICI is right. Congress needs to do the hard work, there is no question about that. This bill has already been strengthened, and there have been provisions with CAFE that will add to the strength of this bill.

The approach we are offering is a more aggressive approach than the savings target in the bill. It is a more aggressive approach than CAFE or other oil savings that we see.

We offer this amendment today to replace the gasoline savings goal in H.R. 6, the underlying legislation we are now considering, with title I of what we call the DRIVE Act, which we have offered as an amendment. It would direct the executive branch of our Government to identify within 9 months and to publish within 18 months Federal requirements that will achieve a 2.5-million-barrel-per-day reduction of U.S. oil consumption by 2016, which is the amount of oil that we currently import from the Middle East. The amendment goes on to achieve a 7-million-barrel-per-day reduction by 2026, and a 10-million-barrel-per-day reduction by 2031. That is about 50 percent of the per-day oil consumption in the United States today.

The amendment would also direct the Office of Management and Budget to publish an analysis to ensure the Government's action plan will achieve the oil savings targets, and the amendment will hold the Government accountable by including specific requirements to the executive branch to evaluate, review, and update the plan.

The question that is probably on the minds of most Americans is, Can we do this? Is America up to the challenge? Can we summon the leadership and resources for a task of this magnitude? The simple answer for us as Americans is: We can because we must.

The handwriting is on the wall. Failure to address our energy dependence will mean a future for our kids which is less prosperous, less safe, and less free.

We should be motivated not by fear, however. We need to dream of the better America we can build.

This bill before us does that. It moves us in that direction. This amendment moves us more aggressively in that direction. It makes sure the Federal Government has all the tools at its disposal, the tools that the underlying text provides.

The American people will make it possible. For every voice of concern I hear about foreign oil dependence, I hear about another instance of Americans' innovative spirit. All I have to do is look at my home State of Minnesota where entrepreneurs are inventing new renewable fuel processes, hydraulic-powered vehicles, new revolutionary energy-saving technologies, the list goes on and on.

The DRIVE Act, upon which this amendment is based, includes a blueprint of a plan for oil independence that centers on three principles: energy conservation, vehicle technology, and renewable fuels. H.R. 6, the underlying text, has included many components of our plan, and, again, I give great credit to both the chairman of the committee, Senator BINGAMAN, and the ranking member, my friend, Senator DOMENICI, for the work they have done and all that they have pulled together to help America lessen its dependence on foreign oil. We need an oil savings target that is bold. We need one that will hold Government accountable to achieving cuts to our foreign oil dependence.

We have the tools, but now we need the leadership. We need to give the leadership direction, and that is what this amendment does. This amendment would express that leadership in terms of what we think is a more relevant standard, one that focuses on our problem—oil consumption. The underlying bill will reduce gasoline use, but it is possible it could result in an increase in diesel which is, of course, made from oil. So our amendment, which is based on oil reduction, is, in our opinion, the more appropriate goal for this law, and that is why we are offering this amendment to H.R. 6.

The gasoline savings goal currently in H.R. 6 amounts to about a 20-percent reduction projected oil consumption by 2030, 23 years from now. But the oil savings in our amendment amounts to a 35-percent reduction in projected oil consumption in 2030. That is a significantly greater reduction, and I believe it is one we can achieve if we set the goal as high as it should be—high enough to cut our dependence on foreign oil and free America from dependence on the oil of tyrants. We put petrodollars—oil is a malleable product. We may not buy directly from Iran, but the fact is, the addiction we have to foreign oil puts petrodollars in the pockets of thugs and tyrants such as Chavez in Venezuela and Ahmadinejad in Iran.

The reality is that 97 percent of transportation in the United States is fueled by oil we buy from a unified global oil market. Saudi Arabia holds 20 percent of the world's oil reserves, Iran 10 percent, and Venezuela holds 6 percent of the world's oil reserves. It is time to stop funding Hugo Chavez and start sending that money to America's entrepreneurs.

Madam President, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan oil savings amendment. Again, I applaud the chair and the ranking member, the Senators from New Mexico. They have strengthened this bill. There will be a CAFE piece that we know will achieve greater savings. But, clearly, what we are doing is about oil consumption not just about gasoline. I think we should set the higher standards. If we tell Americans this is the goal we have to reach, they will get it done, and we will benefit from it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, we probably are going to enter into an agreement to have a vote this evening, but I didn't want the good Senator to leave the floor without me making three points.

I do not seek now to have an argument about his approach. I will do that before the vote when we set that up. But when the Senator from Minnesota talks about a goal of saving oil and the bill before us has savings of gasoline, I just wonder if he knows that most of the crude oil goes to gasoline in the United States. That is a fact, isn't it? Most of the crude oil we import, that we bring into our country to go to refineries, is turned into gasoline and used by automobiles.

Mr. COLEMAN. Madam President, most of the fuel we consume, I think over 60 percent, is gasoline. But the issue is dependence. Our concern is not just about gas. It is about oil, oil dependence. So we push a little further on the large issue.

I certainly agree with my distinguished colleague from Mexico that gasoline is a major part of what we are consuming.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I am going to yield the floor in a moment. I just want to say, if my colleague thinks carefully, the amendment that was offered that was spoken to by my good friend sets goals to be achieved by the White House, by the executive department. We have a bill before us that I am so proud of because for the first time, we did it right. We put in the bill the kinds of law changes that will save gasoline and oil because we change the law. We don't have to ask the President to find ways; we did it. When Senators vote for it, they will not be voting for a goal that asks the President to do something. They will be voting for a change in the law that makes cars more efficient in the future if produced and used in the American market.

That same bill will save tremendous amounts of electricity and whatever is used with electricity because we are going to become so much more efficient on appliances and the like.

And, third, there will be some enormous savings because we are going to make gasoline from something other than crude oil and other than by making it out of corn. We are going to make it out of switchgrass and other products that are part of the biomass approach.

I am proud that just those three will do more than we have ever done, and we won't be asking a President to set goals to achieve, which a President has never been able to do. If they could, they would do it without us asking them. We are doing it in this bill.

I yield the floor and will return when we have a vote on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, first, I thank my friend from Minnesota, Senator COLEMAN, who has been very active in the construction of the so-called DRIVE Act. I thank him for his cosponsorship of this amendment. I appreciate very much this is a bipartisan measure.

I say to Senator DOMENICI, if I may, I wish to respond to his statement. The aim of this amendment is to build on—and I mentioned this earlier in my statement—all the extraordinary steps forward that are in the bill that has come out of the Energy Committee and the Commerce Committee.

In other words, we are trying to do basically a couple of things with this amendment. One, it is true we are moving from the goal in the bill that just says gasoline to oil so that it includes all oil usage in the country.

Second, basically, we are saying to the executive branch that over the time ahead, here are some national goals we are setting. You have authority in law, and if this bill passes—thanks to the work that Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN have done, and our friends on the Commerce Committee—the Government will have more authority. Put all those authorities together in a package and tell us how you are going to use those authorities to achieve the real goals in this bill.

So this is not in any way intended to undermine the very progressive steps in the committee's proposal, H.R. 6. It is intended to put a requirement on this administration and following administrations to make sure that all the authorities they have in the law are used to achieve these goals. If they don't feel they can do it with the authorities they have, they can come back to us and ask for more.

I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. COLEMAN. Madam President, I second what my colleague has said. I applaud the underlying work on this bill. It is progressive. It is going to make a difference.

What we are doing is simply building on that foundation and understanding that the issue of oil dependence is about oil dependence, and if we can move the ball forward, if we can give some specific tools to the administration—Congress is going to do the hard work. The Senator from New Mexico has done the heavy lifting. This is a very broad-based bill. There is a lot in this bill. I believe this amendment certainly has some responsibilities, and the executive branch needs to be part of the solution. I believe it is appropriate for Congress to give them this kind of direction. We will all benefit. But it certainly builds on a very steady foundation that the Senator from New Mexico has put forth, and I applaud him for doing that.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I will add, unless Senator DOMENICI wishes to speak, I will suggest the absence of a quorum but not quite yet.

Senator COLEMAN has a good point. We are supporting the bill. It is a very significant step forward coming out of the committees. Again, I thank Senator BINGAMAN and Senator DOMENICI for their bipartisan leadership on this bill. This amendment sets good, significant goals for savings of oil consumption by America over the next 23 years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 5:45 today be for debate with respect to amendment No. 1508 and the time be equally divided and controlled in the usual form and no second-degree amendment be in order prior to the vote and that at 5:45 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendment, without further intervening action or debate.

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object, what were the last two lines?

Mr. DURBIN. The Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendment, without further intervening action or debate, at 5:45.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have half the time?

Mr. DURBIN. Yes, you do.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, if there is no one here to speak directly to the amendment at this point, I would like to speak to the bill under this unanimous consent request. I will yield if someone comes to the floor to speak directly to the amendment, No. 1508.

This week in the Senate we are considering an energy bill, the Renewable Fuels Consumer Protection and Energy Efficiency Act of 2007. This legislation is built upon a goal we believe in, the goal to move America in a new energy direction which will enhance our national security and strengthen our economy while protecting the Earth on which we live.

This new energy direction calls upon the strength of America: innovation, ingenuity, creativity. We are calling for improvements in energy efficiency, development of cleaner alternative fuels, investment in research and development for new technology, improvements to fuel economy, and stronger consumer protection.

If we do not take steps to use our energy resources more wisely and instead continue on the path we have followed, we threaten our Nation's future, we risk our economic security, and we fail to protect our country and our children from the growing threats of global warming. If we continue on the path from where we have been, we will be left behind as others around the world who recognize the growing demand for energy make their own advancements in harnessing renewable resources and improving energy efficiency. We will fall behind as a nation and, instead of being leaders of innovation, we will be followers, reliant on others.

Business as usual will not improve our economy or make our Nation more secure. A new energy direction for our country will create jobs and grow our economy. Here are some facts, for a moment, to put it in perspective.

Every day, we consume 20.8 million barrels of oil, 14,000 barrels per minute, over 10,000 gallons per second—25 percent of all the oil produced in the world consumed here in the United States. Over 60 percent of the oil we use is imported. This figure may grow to 70 percent over the next two decades, with about half of the increase coming from members of the OPEC oil cartel, many with whom we have relationships that are shaky at best. The thirst for oil costs us $291 billion annually on oil imports, with 38 percent of this money going to OPEC.

In 2006, the top five integrated oil companies made $119 billion in profits. Making money is not a bad thing, but that is a recordbreaker. Since 2005, when the Senate last considered energy policy, gasoline prices have gone up 45 percent. Since the election of this President, gasoline prices in America have doubled. In my State, 2 years ago, we paid $2.19 a gallon. Today, the average is $3.35; in Chicago, $3.50. The cheapest gasoline I could find 10 days ago in Chicago, $3.75 a gallon. In the past 5 years, we have witnessed a 136-percent increase in gas prices and an 83-percent increase in diesel fuel prices. Think about the added shipping costs, manufacturing costs, and agricultural costs associated with this.

Three factors are at work here: the industry's failure to reinvest enough of their profits to expand refinery capacity, the increasing global demand for world oil resources, and our failure to reduce consumption. In order to help reduce our dependence on imported oil and break us from these ever-increasing costs, this bill calls for strengthening renewable fuel standards.

A century ago, Henry Ford's Model T was the first flex-fuel vehicle. It could run on both gasoline and ethanol. Ford knew that fuel could be found in many places, even fermented.

Here we are today, a century later, encouraging the production of bio-based renewable fuels in order to displace a portion of our petroleum thirst. This Energy bill calls for an increase in the domestic production of clean, renewable fuels to 8.5 billion gallons in 2012 and 36 billion in 2022. It specifically calls for an increase in advanced biofuels, those not derived solely from corn. This provision would save 1.4 million barrels of oil a day and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Another provision in this bill will save us 1.5 million barrels of oil a day and also reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

For the first time in 30 years, this bill raises fuel economy standards for cars and trucks to 35 miles a gallon by

the year 2020. I offered an amendment 2 years ago that would have called for these higher fuel economy standards. The Senate was not ready for that amendment. I think America was. My amendment did not pass, but it was a starting point for the legislation we have today.

Title V of this bill reflects a true bipartisan compromise and addresses many concerns about CAFE standards. It authorizes NHTSA to establish tailored fuel economy standards based on vehicle size and weight, which removes the disparity between large-car manufacturers and those that produce smaller vehicles.

I would like to say a word about this. I still hear that many of the American automobile companies oppose these CAFE standards. It is truly unfortunate. The time for debate has come and gone. Unfortunately, some of the leaders of these companies have failed to make the right decisions about the products they sell in America. They have failed to invest in the kind of technology that would have brought us better miles per gallon with safe cars, cars that serve our families and the needs of our economy. They failed to do this. Sadly, other automobile companies have not failed. They have stepped in with more fuel-efficient cars that are now extremely popular. There are long waiting lines for hybrid vehicles and other cars that have real fuel economy. It is a sad day for Detroit, and I feel bad for an industry which once used to lead the world, and I feel even worse for the workers who were not part of these management decisions which unfortunately brought them to this moment today, decisions which resulted in cars and trucks that are being sold that do not serve the needs of America and its future as they should.

Now we have to change. We really have to move beyond this. We have to urge Detroit to move beyond their current thinking. Instead of just selling us more of last year's model, bring us fuel efficiency, bring us fuel economy so we can save money at the gas pumps and stop pumping all of these greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere, destroying the climate on our planet.

Two years ago, BusinessWeek published a story that said:

> As Congress puts the final touches on a massive new energy bill, lawmakers are about to blow it. That's because the bill . . . almost certainly won't include . . . a government-mandated increase in average fuel economy.

That was 2 years ago. That is when I offered my amendment. That is when it failed. We cannot fail again. If we fail again, shame on this Congress, shame on the Members who will not look to the reality of our future, which is with more fuel economy and fewer emissions from vehicles.

We also need to move for energy efficiency in so many different areas—in the appliances we use and the machinery we build, certainly in the cars and trucks we drive. We have to realize our reliance on foreign oil does not make us safer but, in fact, weaker in a world of real danger. We need to reduce our demand for foreign oil and increase domestic sources so we do not find ourselves drawn into countries around the world primarily because we depend so much on the energy from that country or that region. We have seen it happen over and over again.

A New York Times article from April 20 cited a report issued by 11 retired admirals and generals. This report argued that climate change could be a ''threat multiplier'' in already fragile parts of the world. Rising sea levels could threaten the livelihoods of a billion people living within 45 miles of Asia's coastlines; in Africa, recurring heat waves, causing widespread shortages of food and water. So our dependence on foreign oil and the energy we consume not only sends more American dollars abroad, sometimes to countries that do not share our values, but it tends to change the world we live in, change it in ways that destabilize us and make the world less safe.

We want innovation to be the driver of our future, not oil. We want more American jobs, a stronger economy, and a cleaner environment. We want a secure future for America.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. 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. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, since I last had the opportunity to speak, a unanimous consent was entered to vote on the amendment, No. 1508, which has been introduced by the occupant of the chair, Senator SALAZAR, by Senator BAYH, Senator COLEMAN, Senator BROWNBACK—who is, unfortunately, not here today but is a cosponsor—myself, and others.

I do wish to say that this bill sets strong targets for a reduction of oil consumption by America and the American people and American businesses. It does so by way of breaking what we all agree is a harmful dependence we have.

I wish to make clear that the underlying bill as proposed by the committee includes targets. So we are not doing something different by having a target; we are just saying the target ought to be to reduce oil consumption, not just gasoline consumption, as the underlying bill indicates.

That is because we all know the problem we have in America is an addiction to oil. It is oil dependence, not just gasoline dependence. It is all of the various uses of oil we have. To get a bit technical, if we only talk about reducing gasoline consumption, that might be accomplished by greater use of diesel, but diesel comes from oil. So we would not, even if we went to diesel, decrease our dependence on foreign oil. So we think this is building on not just the targets in the bill but building on all of the good work for energy conservation and energy efficiency in the bill. It would strengthen the bill.

The targets are a bit more ambitious and would, by our calculations, reduce American consumption of oil by 35 percent from what it would otherwise be in the year 2030. That is substantial.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides during any ensuing quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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. DOMENICI. Mr. President, fellow Senators, let me say, we are getting close to the end of a good day on the bill. This is a three-part bill that came to us from the Energy, Natural Resources Committee, the Commerce Committee, and the Environment and Public Works Committee. Then the majority leader put them together, and I was very proud to be able to come to the floor and tell the Senators and the American people what an outstanding bill this was. We had not heard much from anybody, and people were not quite sure what happened. But people kept saying: We had an energy bill. Well, we can, at the end of the first day, say we still have it. It has not been changed any. We accepted one amendment. It was an authorizing amendment, and it enlarged upon some pieces of the bill. But essentially it is intact.

And, lo and behold, without this amendment that is before us, which I urge the Senate not pass, that they not vote for it—it is harmless, but I do not think we ought to pass it. I wish to tell you all why. To do that I have to talk a little bit about the bill, because the bill changes the law. If all of the things in this bill get adopted, we will save huge amounts of crude oil and gasoline.

The other side keeps mentioning that the bill saves more gasoline and not enough crude oil. But I guarantee you that if we could get the kind of savings that could be forthcoming from transportation fuels, America would be safe, America would be happy, and we would not be dependent, because we would be using much less crude oil also.

So there is no difference. They are almost the same. Nonetheless, the truth of the matter is that never in the history of the Congress have we saved so

much gasoline—that is the thing that moves transportation in America: diesel fuel, transportation, and related products. Never have we changed America so much in terms of how much of that fuel we would use. What fuel? The fuel everybody says makes us more and more dependent, the transportation fuel. Right.

Now, what happened is we did not adopt a bill in the Energy Committee or the Commerce Committee, headed by the Senator from Hawaii and Senator STEVENS from Alaska. Those bills that produced that came from these committees and are actually changes in the law.

Let's talk right off and say the biggest change is the CAFE standards. The Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction, had the courage and the guts to adopt a long-standing amendment sponsored by the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and it had been regularly known as the bill that changes the CAFE standards. We adopted it. It is in here. The changes we have been yearning for are here. We adopted them, and they are now before us. We don't have to ask anybody to make the changes that will cause the biggest single savings in transportation fuels that we ever did.

Then right on top of that, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee adopted a huge multiyear program to use more ethanol but ethanol that would not be produced by corn but, rather, by switchgrass and come out of that whole area we are now researching and just almost over the hurdle in terms of a new kind of production of ethanol. When you add the two together, it is the biggest reduction in transportation fuel we will ever get.

I wanted to make the point that we did not set any goals; we did not adopt any targets; we did not ask the President to find any savings. We asked the President to sign a bill that will make the savings because we change the law.

When oil savings amendments were offered in the past, people would say this was a hidden CAFE standard. They were correct. When you direct the executive branch to save oil in such a dramatic way, one of the only ways you can do it and reach that goal is to change the CAFE standards. So whenever you were telling the President to make these savings, everybody would say: In transportation, the only way you can do it is to change the CAFE standards. Isn't that interesting? But we didn't do that here today. We changed the CAFE standards and saved oil and gasoline over the next 30 years, calculated as it is in the bill, because we got that done.

We don't need a hidden CAFE in this bill, which essentially is the only way you could get to your targets in oil is to do something to transportation consumption, and that means you would have to do something with the so-called hidden CAFE standards that would be incorporated in your suggested targets. In the bill we have, there are real increases in the CAFE standards that are adopted and they were articulated by Senator FEINSTEIN and talked about at length. Perhaps when we pass this amendment asking the President to save oil, perhaps when we do that—and I know my good friend, the occupant of the Chair, thinks that amendment I am talking about is a great thing because it sets targets and let's us dream, as he says, but I think all the President would have to do, if we adopt and sent to him the Bayh amendment—that is properly the name of it because he was the first name on this many months ago—I would venture to say, without fear or trepidation, if we had the bill we have before us today, Senator BAYH wouldn't be introducing this amendment with these kinds of targets, because he would look down and say: The biggest target for crude oil that is used in gasoline is already done because they have changed the CAFE standards. They don't need another target.

If we continue this way and we adopt the Bayh amendment, then when the President signs our bill, he can send it back to us and say: This is my plan, to do what you asked me to do, because in this bill we have already accomplished the things you were talking about.

Let me say, there isn't any rancor. I am not trying to belittle anybody. The truth is, when you have to set targets and tell the President to achieve the targets, you have accomplished nothing. Because if that is the way you could have saved crude oil in the past, every President would have done it himself, would have taken us out of this crisis by doing just what your targets say, go out and find them and do them. But you can't do them. You have to have Congress. You have to change laws.

I want to sit down for a moment and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, if I could ask a question of my friend and colleague from New Mexico, I am informed that the time on our side of the aisle has expired. Is it possible I could prevail upon him to request 2 minutes, perhaps?

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 7 minutes 57 seconds. The Senator from Indiana has 1 minute 33 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. What do you want, five total?

Mr. BAYH. If I go beyond three, it will have been an imposition.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will say five.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the, Senator. I appreciate that very much.

I want to begin by complimenting you for the excellent work you and Senator BINGAMAN have demonstrated on this bill. I know it is a matter of great concern to you and, frankly, I am pleased to see your cooperation from your State can cross party aisles just as mine with Senator LUGAR crosses the party aisle in my own State.

I thank all of our colleagues, starting with Senator LIEBERMAN for his hard work and leadership. I thank Senator SALAZAR, who occupies the Presiding Officer's chair today; Senator BROWNBACK, who could not be with us. He is in the process of returning to the floor but is supportive and helpful. I thank Senator COLLINS, Senator NORM COLEMAN, and all others who have been instrumental. Our leadership group on this bill extends from Senator BROWNBACK to Senator KERRY. It includes Democrats, Republicans, and even independent Democrats, suggesting the breadth of our support and, more importantly, the justice of our cause.

I don't speak often on the floor. Frankly, I don't find utility in it that often. But the magnitude of this issue is important to our Nation. Its importance to our Nation compelled me to come here today to speak on behalf of this amendment. It is a friendly amendment designed to improve what is a good work product in the underlying bill. We offer this amendment for several reasons.

First, because the issue of oil dependency is one of the defining challenges of our time. Our ability to grapple with this issue will affect our Nation in profound ways. It will affect finances, our economy, our environment and, most importantly, the quality of the world that one day we will leave to our children.

Unfortunately, today we are not doing nearly enough to meet this challenge. We can and must do better. This is brought into stark reality when you realize that since the attack on 9/11, we import more oil to this country today than we did on that day. Clearly we must do better. The expected consumption of petroleum is projected to increase from 20 million barrels per day this year to 26.8 million barrels per day in 2030. This is unacceptable. We have gathered here today to do something about it, to move us as far and as fast as we can to reduce this dependency on imported petroleum.

This is affecting the quality of Americans' daily lives. I was looking at some statistics before coming to the floor. American consumers in the first 6 months of 2006 spent $38 billion more on gasoline than they did in 2005, and $57 billion more than they did in 2004. This is an alarming trend that we don't need to bring to the attention of anyone who is filling up at the pump. Clearly we have to do something about this. Our amendment is designed to be robust and aggressive in doing so.

We have worked with a coalition of 26 of our colleagues to form the DRIVE Act. It spans the ideological spectrum. Our goal is to reduce oil imports by 2.5 million barrels per day over the next 10 years, an equivalent of everything we currently import from the Middle East. Along with the authors of this bill, we propose that we move America in a

better direction to find a better future for our children and create a legacy of which we can be proud. I believe we can do that in material ways, getting there further and faster than the underlying bill envisions.

Our approach targets oil, petroleum, not just gasoline. Gasoline is an important subset of the challenge. But dependency on oil and particularly imported oil gets to the heart of the challenge facing our country. That is what our amendment does. We propose an additional reduction of 3.8 million barrels per day, a further reduction in our dependency of 15 percent, a material step in improving our situation. Finally, we hold the administration accountable, requiring the Office of Management and Budget to work with the Departments of Energy and Transportation to come up with a specific plan, not just a goal but a specific plan with concrete steps to achieve that goal and to revisit that plan, to evaluate its effectiveness every 3 years, to make sure we do more than pass this amendment or pass this legislation but, in fact, we translate this legislation into concrete results for the American people.

Let me conclude by saying this is a good bill. It begins to take us in the right direction. But now is the time to do something more than just good steps. Now is the time to take bold, transforming steps to meet the challenges, particularly one of the defining challenges of our time. Now is the time to invest in American ingenuity, to build an American future that is more prosperous, more healthy, and more secure. Now is the time to forge a legacy that will enable our grandchildren one distant day to say that we were both good stewards of our Nation and, most importantly, good stewards of their future.

That is what this bill will accomplish. That is what this amendment will accomplish. That is why I urge colleagues to vote in support of the amendment.

I yield the floor and thank the Senator from New Mexico for his indulgence. He has been very kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, that was an eloquent statement and I want to acknowledge it. But I want to make sure those who are worried about America's energy crisis know a mere statement, whether it be verbal or written down on a piece of paper, that says we ought to achieve this doesn't achieve anything. Or we in the Senate think our goal should to be save 3.5 million barrels of oil and then say how proud we are that we are going to achieve this great goal; that doesn't do anything. All you have is, if you have a bunch of targets and goals and they are high and they are big, you can say: We are a better dreamer than the other side, because we have these great dreams about how much we should save and what our target should be. But think for a minute, what do they accomplish?

The truth is, the underlying bill, for a change, saves on crude oil consumption and gasoline, because we have changed the CAFE standards permanently. As anybody in here remembers, every time we were talking about saving large quantities of gasoline, if we could just change the CAFE standards. Remember? Well, we changed them. The biggest way to save on gasoline is to change them. We changed them. We don't need a target in the bill that says we should save on gasoline. Maybe you should say by changing the CAFE standards, but the President can't change the CAFE standards. Only we can, and we did.

They have some auspicious goals, some magnificent targets. They can speak eloquently about what will be required to do them. But the point is, they don't save one single penny's worth of gasoline. They don't achieve 10 cents' worth of savings. They are merely goals, things we wish to do. I guarantee you that the bill they are attaching this amendment to for a change will truly save by changing the CAFE standards permanently. By changing the standard for ethanol and the second generation of ethanol, we will save more on gasoline and then on crude oil, which it comes from, than we have ever done before. So we don't need an amendment to a terrific bill. The bill is something we can be very proud of. Three committees participated. They did it bipartisanly.

Now we have bold and high words about what the President should do because it says the President shall find ways to achieve these goals. That is essentially the plan: Mr. President, we have these goals. Mr. President, you go talk to OMB and you achieve them.

That is it. I do not believe anybody thinks that will work. But I would say, if it passes, I do not know what it does, and I do not know what we would do with it because I do not know how you get any savings from that kind of proposal.

But I kind of know where we are. A lot of Senators and non-Senators got together before we were here with this bill and decided they would introduce a bill that sounded good, that set high goals, and they did. Then we come along with a bill that actually does it, and they want to amend it to get in on the action, which I do not believe would accomplish much.

I compliment the Senators for the way they have worked, and in particular Senator BAYH, whom we do not see very much, but I see him a lot, and I am pleased always to see him. I say to the Senator, I thank you for the way you have responded.

I wish to say again, I don't believe with the bill we need your bill. With the bill that is underlying, we do not need another bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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. 1508.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that 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), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MENENDEZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Akaka	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Alexander	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Grassley	Pryor
Bayh	Gregg	Reed
Biden	Harkin	Reid
Bingaman	Inouye	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kennedy	Salazar
Brown	Kerry	Sanders
Byrd	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Kohl	Sessions
Cardin	Landrieu	Smith
Carper	Lautenberg	Snowe
Casey	Leahy	Specter
Clinton	Levin	Stabenow
Coleman	Lieberman	Sununu
Collins	Lincoln	Tester
Conrad	Lugar	Thune
Dorgan	McCaskill	Voinovich
Durbin	Menendez	Webb
Ensign	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feingold	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—30

Allard	Crapo	Kyl
Bennett	DeMint	Lott
Bond	Dole	Martinez
Bunning	Domenici	McConnell
Burr	Enzi	Murkowski
Chambliss	Hagel	Roberts
Cochran	Hatch	Shelby
Corker	Hutchison	Stevens
Cornyn	Inhofe	Vitter
Craig	Isakson	Warner

NOT VOTING—6

Brownback	Dodd	McCain
Coburn	Johnson	Obama

The amendment (No. 1508) was agreed to.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me propound a unanimous consent agreement with regard to tomorrow morning.

I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, June 13, when the Senate resumes consideration of H.R. 6, the time between the end of morning business and 11:45 a.m. be for debate with respect to the Inhofe amendment No.

1505, with no amendment in order to the amendment prior to the vote, and that the time be equally divided and controlled between the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE, and the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, or their designees; and that at 11:45, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendment without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, last Wednesday I came to the floor and introduced legislation that would place the country in a new direction, a path toward a better energy future, by requiring that 25 percent of electricity be provided by renewable sources in this country. For me, this is not that radical an idea, since my State, the State of Minnesota, just enacted this plan this past year. It was brought into law by an overwhelming majority, a bipartisan majority in a Democratic-controlled legislature, and signed into law by a Republican Governor. In fact, it is even higher for Xcel Energy, which is our largest electricity company. They are bound to a 30-percent standard. In fact, the CEO of that company came and sat in my office and told me that he felt they could meet that standard without increasing rates.

Part of this is that Minnesota has been on the front end of renewables. We have done it with fuel, with biodiesel, and with ethanol—in fact, we have about a third of this country's ethanol that comes right in our State. And we have done it with wind. We have so many wind turbines right now down in southeastern Minnesota, in the Pipestone area, that they have actually opened a bed and breakfast. If you are looking for an interesting weekend, you can go to the bed and breakfast in Pipestone, MN, and wake up in the morning and look at a wind turbine.

But this is serious stuff. I was proud to introduce that 25-by-25 standard, but I also want to say that I support the standard the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, is introducing in the next few days, and that is a 15 percent by 2020 standard.

Our current path has led us to record-high electricity and natural gas prices. These prices are not only hurting ordinary families, but they are also hurting businesses that see their own costs going up dramatically. The growth of energy-intensive industries, such as manufacturing, is actually being stunted due to skyrocketing energy costs. We already know the negative impact this situation is having on the environment. It is clear that we need a new direction, that we cannot continue down the energy path we are on anymore. A strong renewable energy policy is good for this country.

Currently, I will say, we do not have a diversified electricity portfolio. Mr. President, 52 percent of our electricity comes from coal, 20 percent is generated using nuclear power, 15 percent natural gas, 7 percent hydro, and only 2.5 percent from renewable energy. A strong renewable electricity standard can actually diversify our energy sources so we are not so reliant on one energy source, such as natural gas, that could be vulnerable to periodic shortages or other supply interruptions.

A strong renewable energy standard can also save the American consumer money. According to several studies, a 15-percent renewable electricity standard will save consumers a total of $16.4 billion on their energy bills by the year 2030. An aggressive national standard will also open the door to a new electricity industry that will bring in thousands of jobs and pump billions of dollars into our economy.

Over the last 20 years, America's renewable energy industries, and the wind industry in particular, have achieved significant technological advancements. The industries for solar, wind, and biomass energy systems are expanding at rates exceeding 30 percent annually, and the clean energy revolution is still in its infancy. So the question is, Does the United States want to be a leader in creating new green technologies and the new green industries in the future? Are we going to sit back and watch the opportunities pass us by?

We are no longer the world leader in two important energy fields. We rank third now in wind production between Denmark and Spain. We are also third in solar power installed, behind Germany and Japan. Ironically, these countries surpassed us by using technology that was actually developed in our own country. We came up with the right ideas, but we didn't have a plan or the standards in place to adequately fund the deployment of these technologies. That is because the Federal Government has been complacent and let the States take the lead. That is good in some ways. The States, as Justice Brandeis noted, are the laboratories of democracy. He always talked about, in that one opinion, how an individual State can have the courage to experiment and bring us new ideas on a national basis. But I don't think he ever meant this should mean inaction by the Federal Government. Sadly, that is what has been happening.

Twenty-two States now throughout the country have already demonstrated the value of establishing renewable electricity standards. As I mentioned, Minnesota has been one of the most aggressive with its 25-by-25 standard.

The way that bipartisan standard was set, with a Democratic legislature and a Republican Governor, should be a model for national action. The courage that we have seen in the States must be matched by courage in Washington. We have an opportunity in the next 2 weeks for the Federal Government to act. It is time for the Federal Government to begin moving toward an aggressive national standard on power with State standards.

We have everything we need, we just need to act. I have talked to many investors and businesspeople, and part of the issue is we never think in the long term in government. We don't set these standards out because when you set those standards out, the money is going to follow in terms of investment. But they think the standard is going to change or maybe we just set it for the next 2 years instead of setting it out as Senator BINGAMAN has suggested in his amendment for the year 2020, when we get stronger investment confidence in what we are going to be doing in this country and the new direction in which we are going to be headed in this country.

We have the fields to grow the energy that will keep our Nation moving, and we have the wind energy to propel our economy forward right here in the United States. We have the science, we have the universities, we have the technological know-how. We always believe in science.

In my State, we brought the world the Post-it note and the pacemaker. We have always been on the front end in science. That is why the people who are committed to a strong, renewable standard in our State are not just limited to the people who might be investing in it. It is students at the university who see the potential. It is kids who wear little buttons about ''save our penguins.'' It is the city council down in Lanesboro, MN, that recently changed out all of their lightbulbs because they are concerned about climate change. It is farmers who are putting up wind turbines in their backyard because they know it is going to save them money. It is school districts that say: Maybe I will get a wind turbine. It is governments across this land, with mayors and city councils that are installing solar energy, that see the future and see this new direction.

It is our job in the next 2 weeks to lead the new direction. And that is why I support a strong renewable standard. That is why I urge my fellow Senators to support the amendment, which I am already cosponsoring, for a 15-percent renewable standard for electricity in this country. We have to start now.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, there is a term that is often used here in the Senate when members refer to one another. That term is ''gentleman.'' No one fit that term better than Senator Craig Thomas. I join with all my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in mourning the loss of Senator Thomas, and in extending our condolences to his wonderful wife Susan and the entire Thomas family.

In the 10 years I was privileged to serve with Senator Thomas in this Chamber, I never once heard him raise his voice, and I never once saw him lose his temper. But that doesn't mean that Senator Thomas was not a fighter for his beloved Wyoming. In fact, he was a very effective advocate for the people of Wyoming and all of rural America. His accomplishments were not the result of shouting. They were the result of perseverance, integrity, and a whole lot of hard work.

I was privileged to serve with Senator Thomas on a number of committees, where I saw firsthand the scope of his interests and his effectiveness. On the Finance Committee, I saw how he was a champion for better health care for rural Americans, and I saw how he worked to open markets for the cattlemen, farmers, and soda ash producers of Wyoming.

On the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, he brought Wyoming's unique perspective to the forefront on the energy debate, and, as chairman and ranking member of the National Parks Subcommittee, he brought the first reform overhaul to the National Parks Service in 20 years—a vital step in a State that is home to the Yellowstone National Park, one of the crown jewels of our park system.

And I served with Craig on the Indian Affairs committee, where the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho tribes of Wyoming's Wild River Reservation and Native Americans across the country could always count on his commitment to improving their lives.

Although Craig Thomas spent the last 18 years of his life working in the corridors of the U.S. Capitol, he never forgot where he came from. He was a true westerner, a straight-talker, and he was always just ''Craig'' to his constituents. Always at Craig's side was his wife and partner Susan, who is always a remarkable, eloquent advocate for Wyoming. The last several months have been difficult and challenging ones for Craig, and Susan was always there for him.

Mr. President, my wife Sharon joins with me in extending our condolences to Susan, the Thomas family, and the people of Wyoming. I can say without hesitation that the ''gentleman from Wyoming'' will always be remembered by those of us who were fortunate to serve with him, and by all those he served with such diligence and distinction.

IRAQ

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I wish to join the majority leader in marking a solemn milestone in the war in Iraq. Three thousand five hundred members of the armed services have died fighting in Iraq. Like those before them who died serving their country, those 3,500 men and women have served honorably. We are all indebted to them for their courage and patriotism, as we are indebted to the 25,950 troops who have been wounded.

It has been just under a year since the 2,500th U.S. servicemember died in Iraq. With the toll of this war continuing to mount, particularly since the President decided to escalate our involvement, we must redouble our efforts to change course in Iraq. We owe it to the troops serving in Iraq. These brave men and women signed up to defend their country, not to police an Iraqi civil war. Many of these individuals chose to join the Armed Forces as a result of the horrific attacks of September 11. Yet they have found themselves fighting in a country that had nothing to do with those attacks. As they endure untold hardship in Iraq, al-Qaida and its extremist network are rebuilding in Afghanistan, northern Africa and around the globe.

As I am sure my colleagues have done, I have been to the memorial services honoring the dead, I have handed the wounded their Purple Hearts, I have spoken to the parents whose children have returned from war with brain injuries they will live with for the rest of their lives. These experiences are a constant reminder of the responsibility we have to the brave individuals who have volunteered to defend their country. We have a duty to ensure that when they are asked to fight on our behalf, it is not on the basis of false premises and shifting rationales. We have a duty not to put them in harm's way when there is no exit strategy. Most importantly, we have a duty to bring them home because we know there is no military solution to the war they are fighting.

We must help the Iraqi people rebuild their country and we must work to build the broad international coalition that is needed to help bring peace and stability to Iraq. But our servicemembers in Iraq have been asked to do the impossible—they have been asked to resolve political and other differences by military force. The Congress has the power to change this misguided policy by forcing the President to redeploy U.S. troops. Measures that express the need for a policy shift, and concern for the well-being of the troops, may be well-intended but they do not go far enough and they will not help the troops. Only binding legislation requiring redeployment will prevent further brave servicemembers from losing their lives for this administration's failed and self-defeating policies.

Many soldiers serving in Iraq have written to me to express their support for my efforts to end this war. It is with them in mind that I will continue working to end this tragic mistake.

COLLAPSE OF THE BERLIN WALL

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I would like to note that exactly 20 years ago, on June 12, 1987, President Ronald Reagan stood at the Berlin wall, at the Brandenburg Gate, and issued his—issued liberty's—famous challenge to Soviet tyranny:

> General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization: Come here to this gate! Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate! Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!

Although that speech was deeply rooted in the Cold War, and is indeed seen as a significant milestone in that war, it also spoke larger truths. President Reagan also said:

> Freedom leads to prosperity. Freedom replaces the ancient hatreds among the nations with comity and peace. Freedom is the victor.

President Reagan was not just addressing West Berlin, and the Soviet General Secretary, he was addressing the world, and posterity. He was expounding on the American ideal of liberty and justice for all. He was not addressing a regional problem, but mankind's aspirations. It was a triumphant moment for Americans and our ideals.

Accordingly, I have previously submitted a resolution, S. Con. Res. 1, calling for an artistic rendering of that moment in time to be painted into the Capitol, along with the other significant scenes of our Nation's past. As we walk through the building today, we can see scenes from the Nation's founding, from the Civil War, our westward expansion, even the Moon landing and *Challenger* astronauts. I would like to also see Reagan at the Brandenburg Gate. I think it would be entirely appropriate to have this image added. It would be an important reminder of the struggle this Nation undertook. It would stand for the millions of Americans who did their part for nearly half a century in that struggle, both military and civilian. And it would testify to the greatness of our Nation, and the greatness of our 40th President.

Today I am adding cosponsors to that resolution. I urge my remaining colleagues to join me as well. This is worth doing.

POLLINATOR HABITAT PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President I rise today to speak about S. 1496, the Pollinator Habitat Protection Act, which I introduced on May 24. Pulitzer Prize-winning insect biologist E.O. Wilson said the honeybee is nature's ''workhorse—and we took it for granted.'' That statement sums up the state of the Nation's honey bee.

Our Nation's honeybees are being affected by a phenomenon named colony collapse disorder, and the symptoms are baffling. Since October 2006, 35 percent or more of the United States' population of the Western honeybee—billions of individual bees—simply flew from their hives and disappeared.

We don't know what is causing their disappearance. The honeybee is an active pollinator for both agriculture and native plants. It is used commercially to pollinate crops across the country, and some crops, like apples and almonds, will not produce fruit without the assistance of the honeybee. My home State of Montana is the country's fifth largest honey-producing State. Without bees, Montana would not produce our famous huckleberries.

During busy years, a hive might make up to five cross-country trips, following the crop blooming cycles. Scientists are speculating that the bees are stressed from making cross-country journeys and are being attacked by viruses and parasites. Either way, this is an emergency situation, and we have to do something now.

That is why I am introducing the Pollinator Habitat Protection Act. This bill is simple and it makes sense. It is the right thing to do.

Through the use of the existing conservation programs in the farm bill, agricultural producers would receive incentives to rebuild natural habitat with flowering plants to benefit pollinators such as honey bees. For example, instead of planting straight grass, a producer could plant clover, alfalfa, or other native flowering plants on land enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program.

Perhaps this bill's most attractive feature is that it does not cost additional money or create a new program. It simply requires existing conservation programs to acknowledge pollinator habitat as a conservation resource and rewards producers whose conservation practices are beneficial for pollinators.

When the budget is tight, it is better to improve existing programs rather than create new ones. This is a dramatic important improvement for our conservation programs.

It is not often we can protect our environment and increase producer's income at the same time. But that is exactly what this bill will do. This is one simple way to help out our honeybee population and give farmers another option to make money on their land.

As a honorary cochair of the Pollinator Partnership, I am honored to introduce this legislation. I thank organizations like the Coevolution Institute which are doing the right thing, by bringing a diverse group of people together from across the country to address this challenging issue.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 1496 the Pollinator Habitat Protection Act.

WORLD DAY AGAINST CHILD LABOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today, June 12, is the annual observance of the International Labor Organization's World Day Against Child Labor. This is the day we set aside each year to speak out against the fact that millions of children around the globe continue to be trapped in forced and abusive labor, often in extremely hazardous conditions.

For many years, I have been active in efforts to stop exploitative child labor as well as trafficking in child and female slaves around the world. In my travels, I have seen this scourge firsthand. I have come to the floor of the Senate many times to speak about this issue. I have spoken about how shocked I was to see the deplorable conditions under which these kids are forced to work. Many are physically, emotionally, and sexually abused. All of them, every child engaged in abusive child labor, is deprived of a childhood solely for someone else's gain.

Why should we as a nation tolerate children being used in such a manner? We should not. It is a moral outrage and an affront to human dignity. When a child is exploited for the economic gains of others, not only does the child lose, but the family loses, and I think the whole world loses. It is bad economics, and it is bad development strategy. A nation cannot achieve prosperity on the backs of its children, and there must be no place in the global economy for child labor.

This year, the World Day Against Child Labor specifically shines a spotlight on child laborers in agriculture. This has been a special concern for me going back many years. I have been especially concerned about forced child labor in the cocoa industry.

In 2001, the Knight-Ridder syndicate ran a series of articles on forced child labor on cocoa farms in West Africa. According to one of those articles, child laborers in Ivory Coast ''are whipped, beaten, and broken like horses to harvest the almond-sized beans that are made into chocolate treats for more fortunate children in Europe and the United States.''

When I read these articles, I resolved to do everything I could to end this tragic exploitation of children. Together with Congressman ELIOT ENGEL of New York, we engaged the major chocolate companies in lengthy, intense negotiations. The result was what is now called the Harkin-Engel protocol, an agreement that aims to ensure that cocoa beans are grown and processed in a manner that complies with the International Labor Organization Convention 182 concerning the prohibition and immediate action for the elimination of the worst forms of child labor.

The Harkin-Engel protocol, signed in September 2001, applies everywhere that cocoa is grown and processed. It laid out a series of date-specific actions, including the development of credible, mutually acceptable, voluntary industry-wide standards of public certification by July 1, 2005 in order to give a public accounting of labor practices in cocoa farming. Although I was disappointed that the July 2005 deadline was not fully met by the industry, we have continued to work together and the rollout of the certification system—including monitoring, data analysis reporting, and activities to reduce the worst forms of child labor—will proceed as aggressively as possible in Ivory Coast and Ghana with the goal of covering 50 percent of the two countries' cocoa producing areas by July of 2008. This is, indeed, a milestone on the path toward the ultimate goal of 100 percent coverage in cocoa-producing countries around the world.

The clock is ticking. The corporations and national governments that were party to the Harkin-Engel protocol are moving forward. For example, the Government of Ghana has conducted a pilot project and the results were released. However, the results still need to be independently verified, and I am hopeful that the industry will work with the Ghanaian government to have these preliminary reports independently verified in accordance with the protocol. Additionally, the Ivorian government has only recently begun to conduct a pilot certification process. It is a good start, but that pilot needs to be scaled up in order to give more realistic results for the main harvest season.

The Harkin-Engel protocol marks an important first—an entire industry, including companies from the United States, Europe, and the United Kingdom taking responsibility for addressing the worst forms of child labor and forced labor in its supply chain.

Today the protocol stands as a framework for progress in West Africa, bringing together industry, West African governments, organized labor, nongovernmental organizations, farmers groups, and experts in a concerted effort to eliminate the worst forms of child labor and forced labor from the growing and processing of cocoa.

To further assist in the effort to eradicate child labor, in my capacity as chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, this past April I convened a hearing to facilitate collaborative efforts by advocacy groups in the child labor field. In light of the International Labor Organization's report last year, the discussion focused on how best to continue the cooperative international effort to eradicate child labor.

The ILO global report, ''The End of Child Labor: Within Reach,'' states that for the first time child labor, especially in its worst forms, is in decline across the globe. Between the years 2000 and 2004, the number of child laborers worldwide fell by 11 percent, from 246 million to 218 million. Even better, the number of children and youth aged 5–17 trapped in hazardous work decreased by 26 percent, declining from 171 million in 2000 to 126 million in 2004. Among younger child laborers, the drop was even sharper at 33 percent.

This is remarkable progress in just 4 years' time. And looking to the future, the report cautiously predicts that, if the current pace of decline is maintained, and if global efforts to stop child labor continue, we have a real shot at eliminating child labor in its worst forms within 10 years' time.

Today, 218 million child laborers—many of whom are trapped in the worst forms of child labor, such as prostitution, armed conflicts, and slavery—are still suffering. While the U.S. Government and international organizations such as the World Bank and UNICEF have programs designed to reduce abusive and exploitative child labor, it will require all of these entities and others working together if we are to reach the goal of ending the worst forms of child labor by the year 2016.

Likewise, in the broader fight against child labor, the ILO report verifies that we are on the right track to eliminate abusive and exploitative child labor. The great work of the ILO's International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor, IPEC, affirms the confidence I placed in this program early on. I secured the first Federal appropriation for the IPEC program back in 1996, and over the last decade, I have secured a total of more than $323 million for the program. Clearly, that money has made a real difference in the lives of children. It has given millions of children an opportunity to get an education and to break the cycle of poverty.

Although there has been a tremendous amount of progress in ending child labor, now is not the time to become complacent. Economic development alone is not enough. We must also focus on human rights and educational opportunities for those in poverty. Social change must go hand in hand with economic development, which requires workers' and employers' organizations. Our keys to success will be mainstreaming child labor efforts with other human rights and development goals, as well as getting national governments, NGOs, and international organizations working cooperatively to end child poverty.

We should not think about these children only on June 12 each year. We should think about this last vestige of slavery 365 days a year. I have remained steadfast in my commitment to eliminating abusive and exploitative child labor. It was in 1992 that I first introduced a bill to ban all products made by abusive and exploitative child labor from entering the United States. And I am committed to working with the representatives of the cocoa industry and the national governments to implement the Harkin-Engel Protocol by July 1, 2008 deadline.

In my view, we can make significant progress to eliminate this scourge if we all do our part and redouble our efforts. This means that governments must not merely pass laws but enforce them, while also striving to provide quality free education. Businesses must take responsibility, as well, by not hiring children, and by paying adults livable wages so they can provide for their families. Multilateral institutions must also play a robust role. Together, we can eliminate the worst forms of child labor by 2016.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF JACOB'S PILLOW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this month marks the 75th anniversary season of Jacob's Pillow. Based in Becket, MA, it is the longest running dance festival in the United States. Jacob's Pillow is renowned in the dance world for its commitment to excellence and beloved by audiences throughout the world for the quality and diversity of its programming.

This prestigious organization is one of the most significant cultural groups in Western Massachusetts and it attracts tens of thousands of visitors to the beautiful Berkshire Mountains each summer. Cultural tourism is the second largest industry in Massachusetts, and cultural jewels such as Jacob's Pillow are the anchors of the industry. Year after year, surveys demonstrate that arts, culture, and heritage are among the top reasons for visiting Massachusetts.

With its proud heritage, Jacob's Pillow continues to be one of the most dynamic centers of dance in our State and across the country. As Mikhail Baryshnikov has said, ''Jacob's Pillow is one of America's most precious cultural assets—a haven for choreographers and dancers and an environment that nurtures the creation of new work.''

The site was originally a family farm settled with extraordinary pioneering spirit in the 1700s, and it became a station on the Underground Railroad in the 19th century for slaves escaping to freedom.

In 1933, Jacob's Pillow was established as a dance festival and school. Its mission continues today to support dance creation, presentation, education, and preservation. Through this work, it broadens appreciation and understanding for classical and modern dance—and it provides an important opportunity for dancers and choreographers to develop their own work and skills.

In addition to its regular programming, Jacob's Pillow also offers over 200 free events each season, including performances, workshops, lectures, and discussions with artists. It maintains a preservation program with rare archives open to the public, a training program for arts administrators, year-round community programs, and a creative development residency program.

Jacob's Pillow also encompasses a professional school training and mentoring program for emerging dancers and is recognized throughout the globe as a center for arts leadership in the world of dance.

It is the first and only dance institution in the United States to be declared a National Historic Landmark for its important part in our country's cultural heritage. It embodies the very best in cultural achievement and has enhanced the causes of the many talented artists who have performed on its stages and enhanced the lives of countless audiences who have enjoyed their exceptional performances.

As President Kennedy said, ''I am certain that after the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we, too, will be remembered not for victories or defeats in battle or in politics, but for our contribution to the human spirit.''

I commend the many dedicated persons who have made Jacob's Pillow such a remarkable success over the past 75 years. May this treasure of Berkshire County continue to enrich us all in the years ahead.

EXTRAORDINARY CONFERENCE OF CFE STATES PARTIES

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, on May 28, 2007, Russia requested an Extraordinary Conference of States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe—the CFE Treaty—to discuss what Russia identified as ''exceptional circumstances'' that may lead them to suspend implementation of the treaty. Russia complains that most of their former Warsaw Pact allies have now joined NATO, significantly altering, in Russia's view, the ''balance'' of forces in Europe. This Extraordinary Conference is now under way in Vienna, Austria. What happens there will have tremendous implications for the security of Europe and for U.S.-Russian relations. Both sides must avoid actions that could lead to the potential unraveling of a treaty that has served as a cornerstone of European security since the end of the Cold War.

In 1990, the CFE was conceived as a mechanism to reduce post-Cold-War arsenals of conventional weapons in Europe and has evolved into a stabilizing influence through its wide range of agreed verification measures. This treaty should not be relegated to the dustbin of history. That is not in the interest of all European States, including Russia, nor of the United States.

The CFE Treaty was originally designed to limit the possibility of a surprise attack on Europe, when the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact still existed. It imposes numerical limits on

major conventional military weapons—battle tanks, armored combat vehicles, artillery, combat aircraft, and attack helicopters—that can be deployed within Europe. These limits are verifiable through an extensive regime of inspections, transparency measures, and data exchanges. To be sure, since the Cold War ended, most countries, especially in central Europe, have reduced their levels of conventional weapons well below the limits specified by the treaty. Nonetheless, the verification measures that continue in place to the present day provide a level of openness and predictability important to the continued stability of Europe.

The ''exceptional circumstances'' referred to in Russia's request for an Extraordinary Conference of the CFE States Parties are of Russia's own making, and Russia holds the key to their resolution. At the end of the last decade, the CFE Treaty was updated to reflect post-Cold-War realities in Europe. The Adapted CFE Treaty was signed in 1999 at Istanbul, Turkey; however, it has not entered into force. Ratification of the treaty by the United States and its NATO allies will not occur until Russia implements two political commitments it made at the time of the treaty's signing.

In 1999, Russia pledged that it would fully withdraw its forces from the territories of Georgia and Moldova, which were part of the former Soviet Union. One of the CFE Treaty's fundamental tenets is that a nation must give its consent for the stationing or deployment of foreign military forces on its territory. NATO nations have insisted that Russia live up to this fundamental principle and abide by its commitments. In the Senate, we have made clear to administration officials that we would give advice and consent to ratification of the Adapted CFE Treaty's provisions only when and if Russia satisfied these commitments.

Russia has protested that its commitments regarding Georgia and Moldova were not related to the CFE Treaty. However, both the Georgian and Moldovan Governments have said repeatedly that they want Russian forces withdrawn from their territories. This has become a central issue in the CFE Treaty debate. Russia possesses the ability and the means to fulfill these commitments, needing only to close a single, largely abandoned Russian base in Georgia, and to withdraw a few hundred troops and an ammunition storage depot in Moldova. Russia has made progress in Georgia, but very little in Moldova since 2004.

The United States is prepared to find ways to work through its differences with Russia on important security issues in ways that recognize shared interests. Russia's threatened suspension of the CFE does not demonstrate a reciprocal view and could lead to the unraveling of the CFE Treaty itself. Nevertheless, the Extraordinary Conference can serve as an opportunity to modernize the Cold-War-era CFE Treaty in a direction that reflects the current security environment in Europe and one in which all parties can completely fulfill their commitments.

The administration's proposal to multilateralize the current Russian peacekeeping forces in Moldova, perhaps under the auspices of the NATO-Russia Council, merits serious consideration. In Georgia, Russia has already taken significant steps to reduce its troop presence the remaining steps are far less demanding but just as important. The Extraordinary Conference should offer a new beginning, rather than the beginning of the end.

The United States and its NATO Allies believe that the Adapted CFE Treaty offers the best path toward ensuring a Europe united and at peace, one in which Russia honors its commitments. If this were to occur, then, and only then, would the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the United States Senate be likely to begin a careful, expeditious review leading to U.S. ratification of the Adapted CFE Treaty.

HONORING SENATE CHAPLAIN BARRY C. BLACK

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, Maryland is proud to honor its sons and daughters whose accomplishments touch the lives of others. We are particularly elated when an individual's talents and achievements are recognized throughout the Nation and beyond.

Chaplain Barry C. Black is one such Marylander, born and raised with five sisters and two brothers in Baltimore by a prudent and faithful mother, Pearline Black. He has penned his life story in a recent book titled, ''From the Hood to the Hill, '' stating that, ''in spite of unpromising beginnings, my siblings and I bucked the statistics and turned out fine (O)ne of the boys even became a two-star Navy admiral and the first African-American Navy chief of chaplains. Later, he was selected as the sixty-second chaplain of the United States Senate. I am that child.'' These are but a few of the stellar accomplishments in a life that serves as inspiration for us all.

Even though I have only been a Senator for 5 months, I have spent several mornings opening the Senate's sessions, and I am always inspired by Chaplain Black's serene manner, the conviction in his voice, the faith present in his life, and the ministry he has accepted. In addition to leading daily prayer before each session of the Senate, Chaplain Black and his dedicated staff conduct Bible studies and attend to the spiritual needs of our Nation's leaders and the thousands of staff members who work in the Senate. His invaluable leadership and service to our country are worthy of both recognition and celebration.

Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate Black Legislative Staff Caucus will honor the Reverend Barry C. Black, the Chaplain of the Senate, with a resolution and the presentation of a plaque honoring him for a distinguished career of leadership and service to the Senate and the larger community. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

SENATE BLACK LEGISLATIVE STAFF CAUCUS RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF CHAPLAIN BARRY C. BLACK, THE FIRST AFRICAN-AMERICAN CHAPLAIN OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Whereas Chaplain Black is a spiritual leader who, through his faith in GOD, overcame many obstacles that profoundly impacted him, taking his humble beginnings and used them to set his feet on higher ground;

Whereas Barry Black was born the fourth of eight children on All Saints Day, November 1, 1948 to parents Pearline Bull Black and Lester Clayton Black in Baltimore, Maryland;

Whereas Barry Black attended Pine Forge Academy and furthered his education, becoming an alumnus of Oakwood College, Andrews University, North Carolina Central University, Eastern Baptist Seminary, Salve Regina University, and United States International University (now Alliant International University);

Whereas Barry Black received Master's Degrees in Divinity, Counseling, and Management, a Doctorate degree in Ministry, and a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Psychology;

Whereas Barry Black married Brenda Pearsall on June 17, 1973, whom he met during his junior year at Oakwood College. They would later have three children: Barry II, Brendan, and Bradford;

Whereas Barry Black was commissioned in 1976 as chaplain in the United States Navy, eventually to become the Navy Chaplain Corps' first African-American Admiral, Deputy Chief of chaplains in 1997, and Chief of Navy Chaplains in 2000;

Whereas Barry Black was responsible for the spiritual care of servicemen from 190 religious traditions, advised and provided ministry to the Chief of Naval Operations, the Secretaries of the Navy and Defense, and the Commandants of the Marine Corps and Coast Guard;

Whereas Barry Black served in the U.S. Navy for 27 years, retiring on August 15, 2003;

Whereas Barry Black's personal decorations include the Legion of Merit Medal, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medals (two awards), Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals (two awards), and numerous unit awards, campaign and service medals. He was also selected from one hundred twenty-seven nominees for the 1995 NAACP Renowned Service Award for his contribution to equal opportunity and civil rights;

Whereas on July 7, 2003, Barry Black was appointed as the 62nd Chaplain of the United States Senate by Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist (R-Tenn.), becoming the first African-American and the first Seventh-day Adventist to serve in this position: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate Black Legislative Staff Caucus recognizes Chaplain Barry C. Black's exemplary achievements; his leadership and personal integrity in service to the United States Senate and the larger community; and his altruism and commitment to public service, touching the lives of many who bear witness to his spiritual leadership.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

UGA WOMENS GYMNASTICS 2007 CHAMPIONS

• Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate the women's gymnastics team from my alma mater, the University of Georgia, for winning the 2007 NCAA championship for the third straight year.

The Gym Dogs celebrated their threepeat championship and eighth national title as they earned the highest score of the finals in Salt Lake City, UT, on April 27, 2007, and completed their season with a final record of 31–2–1.

As an alumnus of this distinguished university, I am extremely proud of these talented women for all of their hard work and dedication that contributed to the championship scores that sealed their victory. I congratulate all of the team members and the women of the senior class, Adrienne Dishman, Kelsey Ericksen and Ashley Kupets, who gave 4 years of excellence to the Gym Dogs. Their leadership and talents will surely be missed. In addition, sophomore Courtney Kupets won her second straight National Individual All-Around title, and Courtney Kupets, Megan Dowlen, Marcia Newby, Tiffany Tolnay, Katie Heenan, Grace Taylor were all named first team All Americans. This is a remarkable program that will carry on its winning tradition with the outstanding strength of the remaining juniors, sophomores, and freshman members. Furthermore, I would like to extend my appreciation to all the families and fans for their continual support of the Gym Dogs throughout the season.

The success of the team could not have been achieved without the exceptional coaching staff, led by legendary head coach Suzanne Yoculan, the 2006 NCAA Coach of the Year. Coach Yoculan has been the head coach of the Gym Dogs since 1983 and has won 8 national championships, 15 conference championships, as well as being named National Coach of the Year four times.

Congratulations again to all of these young women for their great accomplishments and hard work.•

RETIREMENT OF DR. JAMES A. LAKE

• Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge a special milestone in the career of one of the truly great nuclear energy luminaries of our time. I am speaking of the retirement of Dr. James A. Lake of Idaho National Laboratory.

During his nearly quarter-century of service to Idaho National Laboratory—and by extension, to all of America—Dr. Lake has applied his exceptional technical and managerial expertise to some of this Nation's highest priority research and development initiatives in the nuclear energy arena. From leading the design team that developed an innovative ultra-high-flux research reactor concept early in his Idaho career, to guiding the establishment of the U.S./Russian International Centers for Environmental Safety later on, Dr. Lake's contributions have had an extraordinary impact.

As the elected president of the American Nuclear Society at the start of the 21st century, Dr. Lake did much to usher in the nuclear renaissance now sweeping the globe. In a single year, he personally visited 11 countries, a dozen universities, and more than 20 nuclear powerplants and nuclear facilities around the world. He also gave countless interviews with major television, newspaper, and magazine journalists—representing CNBC, the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post, BusinessWeek and others—to help them better understand nuclear power's unique abilities to dependably generate massive amounts of electricity—around the clock, rain or shine—without generating any of the greenhouse gases that are now of such global concern.

Beyond his contributions to INL and the American Nuclear Society, Dr. Lake has also left his indelible mark of excellence on countless other organizations and activities ranging from the American Association of Engineering Societies to the International Nuclear Societies Council. He holds patents on ''An Inherently Safe Fast Breeder Reactor'' and other key nuclear technologies and has more than 35 publications in refereed journals and conference proceedings.

Dr. James A. Lake—scientist, research leader, nuclear energy visionary, and gentleman—leaves a legacy of growth, safety, and success in the nuclear programs at INL, for which the laboratory, the great State of Idaho, and the Nation will be forever grateful. I extend my best wishes to Dr. Lake as he retires from INL and moves on to the next chapter of his remarkable life.•

HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, today I would like to commemorate the 65th anniversary of the founding of Holloman Air Force Base near Alamogordo, NM, on June 10, 1942.

Established 6 months after the entry of the United States into the Second World War, Holloman served as a training center for B–17, B–24, and B–29 bomber crews for the duration of that conflict. Over the course of the war, 20 bomber groups trained at Holloman before serving in the European and Pacific theaters of the war.

After the war, Holloman became the primary Air Force base for the testing and development of guided missiles and unmanned aircraft. Holloman was also the site of several notable events, including a 1954 rocket-propelled sled test that reached speeds of 632 miles per hour and earned Dr. John P. Stapp the title of ''Fastest Man Alive.'' Additionally, Holloman was the location of CPT Joseph W. Kittinger, Jr's, 102,800 feet skydive in 1960 that broke four world records and it was there that ENOS, the chimpanzee who made the first American animal orbital flight, received his training.

In 1968, a new era at Holloman began with the arrival of the 49th Tactical Fighter Wing. For the last 39 years, the 49th has called Holloman home and has flown F–4 Phantom IIs, F–15 Eagles and in 1992 became the only Air Force unit equipped with the F–117 Nighthawk, also known as the stealth fighter. Holloman also serves as the home to the German Air Force Tactical Training Center.

Today, Holloman is preparing for another major transition. As the F–117 is retired, the 49th will begin to receive new F–22 Raptors. Since its founding, Holloman has played an important role in the development of new technologies and has been home to the world's most advanced aircraft. Most importantly though, I believe it is the men and women who serve at Holloman who make it one of this country's premier military installations. I would like to thank all those who served and continue to serve at Holloman for their hard work and dedication. I have no doubt the work done at Holloman will continue to contribute to the national security of the United States for another 65 years.•

HONORING ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I honor the extraordinary life of Robert M. La Follette, Sr. This week, on June 14, people around my home State of Wisconsin will mark the 152nd anniversary of La Follette's birth. Throughout his life, La Follette was revered for his tireless service to the people of Wisconsin and to the people of the United States. His dogged, full-steam-ahead approach to his life's work earned him the nickname ''Fighting Bob.''

Robert Marion La Follette, Sr., was born on June 14, 1855, in Primrose, a small town southwest of Madison in Dane County. He graduated from the University of Wisconsin Law School in 1879 and, after being admitted to the State bar, began his long career in public service as Dane County district attorney.

La Follette was elected to the House of Representatives in 1884, and he served three terms as a Member of that body, where he was a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

After losing his campaign for reelection in 1890, La Follette returned to Wisconsin and continued to serve the people of my State as a judge. Upon his exit from Washington, DC, a reporter wrote, La Follette ''is popular at home, popular with his colleagues, and popular in the House. He is so good a fellow that even his enemies like him.''

He was elected the 20th Governor of Wisconsin in 1900. He served in that office until 1906, when he stepped down in order to serve the people of Wisconsin in the Senate, where he remained until his death in 1925.

As a founder of the national progressive movement, La Follette championed progressive causes as Governor of Wisconsin and in the Congress. As Governor, he advanced an agenda that included the country's first workers' compensation system, direct election of Senators, and railroad rate and tax reforms. Collectively, these reforms would become known as the ''Wisconsin Idea.'' As Governor, La Follette also supported cooperation between the State and the University of Wisconsin.

His terms in the House of Representatives and the Senate were spent fighting for women's rights, working to limit the power of monopolies, and opposing pork-barrel legislation. La Follette also advocated electoral reforms, and he brought his support of the direct election of Senators to this body. His efforts were brought to fruition with the ratification of the 17th amendment in 1913. Fighting Bob also worked tirelessly to hold the Government accountable and was a key figure in exposing the Teapot Dome scandal.

La Follette earned the respect of such notable Americans as Frederick Douglass, Booker T. Washington and Harriet Tubman Upton for making civil rights one of his trademark issues. At a speech before the 1886 graduating class of Howard University, La Follette said:

> We are one people, one by truth, one almost by blood. Our lives run side by side, our ashes rest in the same soil. [Seize] the waiting world of opportunity. Separatism is snobbish stupidity, it is supreme folly, to talk of non-contact, or exclusion!

La Follette ran for President three times, twice as a Republican and once on the Progressive ticket. In 1924, as the Progressive candidate for President, La Follette garnered more than 17 percent of the popular vote and carried the State of Wisconsin.

La Follette's years of public service were not without controversy. In 1917, he filibustered a bill to allow the arming of U.S. merchant ships in response to a series of German submarine attacks. His filibuster was successful in blocking passage of this bill in the closing hours of the 64th Congress. Soon after, La Follette was one of only six Senators who voted against U.S. entry into World War I.

Fighting Bob was outspoken in his belief that the right to free speech did not end when war began. In the fall of 1917, La Follette gave a speech about the war in Minnesota, and he was misquoted in press reports as saying that he supported the sinking of the *Lusitania*. The Wisconsin State Legislature condemned his supposed statement as treason, and some of La Follette's Senate colleagues introduced a resolution to expel him. In response to this action, he delivered his seminal floor address, ''Free Speech in Wartime,'' on October 16, 1917. If you listen closely, you can almost hear his strong voice echoing through this chamber as he said:

> Mr. President, our government, above all others, is founded on the right of the people freely to discuss all matters pertaining to their government, in war not less than in peace, for in this government, the people are the rulers in war no less than in peace.

Of the expulsion petition filed against him, La Follette said:

> I am aware, Mr. President, that in pursuance of this general campaign of vilification and attempted intimidation, requests from various individuals and certain organizations have been submitted to the Senate for my expulsion from this body, and that such requests have been referred to and considered by one of the Committees of the Senate.
>
> If I alone had been made the victim of these attacks, I should not take one moment of the Senate's time for their consideration, and I believe that other Senators who have been unjustly and unfairly assailed, as I have been, hold the same attitude upon this that I do. Neither the clamor of the mob nor the voice of power will ever turn me by the breadth of a hair from the course I mark out for myself, guided by such knowledge as I can obtain and controlled and directed by a solemn conviction of right and duty.

This powerful speech led to a Senate investigation of whether La Follette's conduct constituted treason. In 1919, following the end of World War I, the Senate dropped its investigation and reimbursed La Follette for the legal fees he incurred as a result of the expulsion petition and corresponding investigation. This incident is indicative of Fighting Bob's commitment to his ideals and of his tenacious spirit.

La Follette died on June 18, 1925, in Washington, DC, while serving Wisconsin in this body. His daughter noted, ''His passing was mysteriously peaceful for one who had stood so long on the battle line.'' Mourners visited the Wisconsin Capitol to view his body and paid respects in a crowd nearing 50,000 people. La Follette's son, Robert M. La Follette, Jr., was appointed to his father's seat and went on to be elected in his own right and to serve in this body for more than 20 years, following the progressive path blazed by his father.

La Follette has been honored a number of times for his unwavering commitment to his ideals and for his service to the people of Wisconsin and of the United States.

During the 109th Congress, I was proud to support Senate passage of a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Congresswoman TAMMY BALDWIN that named the post office at 215 Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard in Madison in La Follette's honor. I commend Congresswoman BALDWIN for her efforts to pass that bill, and I am pleased she is introducing House companion measures of the legislation I am introducing today in the Senate.

The Library of Congress recognized La Follette in 1985 by naming the Congressional Research Service reading room in the Madison Building in honor of both Fighting Bob and his son, Robert M. La Follette, Jr., for their shared commitment to the development of a legislative research service to support the Congress. In his autobiography, Fighting Bob noted that, as Governor of Wisconsin, he:

> made it a . . . policy to bring all the reserves of knowledge and inspiration of the university more fully to the service of the people. . . . Many of the university staff are now in state service, and a bureau of investigation and research established as a legislative reference library . . . has proved of the greatest assistance to the legislature in furnishing the latest and best thought of the advanced students of government in this and other countries.

He went on to call this service ''a model which the federal government and ultimately every state in the union will follow.'' Thus, the legislative reference service that La Follette created in Madison served as the basis for his work to create the Congressional Research Service at the Library of Congress.

The La Follette Reading Room was dedicated on March 5, 1985, the 100th anniversary of Fighting Bob being sworn in for his first term as a Member of Congress.

Across this magnificent Capitol in National Statuary Hall, Fighting Bob is forever immortalized in white marble, still proudly representing the State of Wisconsin. His statue resides in the Old House Chamber, now known as National Statuary Hall, among those of other notable figures who have made their marks in American history. One of the few seated statues is that of Fighting Bob. Though he is sitting, he is shown with one foot forward, and one hand on the arm of his chair, as if he is about to leap to his feet and begin a robust speech.

When then-Senator John F. Kennedy's five-member Special Committee on the Senate Reception Room chose La Follette as one of the ''Five Outstanding Senators'' whose portraits would hang outside of this chamber in the Senate reception room, he was described as being a ''ceaseless battler for the underprivileged'' and a ''courageous independent.'' Today, his painting still hangs just outside this chamber, where it bears witness to the proceedings of this body—and, perhaps, challenges his successors here to continue fighting for the social and Government reforms he championed.

Mr. President, to honor Robert M. La Follette, Sr., during the week of the anniversary of his birth, today I am introducing two pieces of legislation. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. KOHL; the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY; and the junior Senator from Ohio, Mr. BROWN.

I am introducing a bill that would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins to commemorate Fighting Bob's life and legacy. The second bill that I am introducing today would authorize the President to posthumously award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Robert M. La Follette, Sr. The

minting of a commemorative coin and the awarding of the Congressional Gold Medal would be fitting tributes to the memory of Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and to his deeply held beliefs and long record of service to his State and to his country. I hope that my colleagues will support these proposals.

Let us never forget Robert M. La Follette, Sr.'s character, his integrity, his deep commitment to progressive causes, and his unwillingness to waver from doing what he thought was right. The Senate has known no greater champion of the common man and woman, no greater enemy of corruption and cronyism, than ''Fighting Bob'' La Follette, and it is an honor to speak in the same Chamber and serve the same great State as he did.●

HONORING PHILIP M. KAISER

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor the memory of Philip Kaiser, a dear family friend who was also an outstanding public servant. In a career that spanned four decades, he served as an ambassador to four countries and as Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs. He was a man of tremendous accomplishment who was sought out by U.S. Presidents, from Truman to Carter, for his unparalleled diplomatic skills.

While he served as Ambassador to Senegal in the early 1960s, he brokered a critical agreement with the Senegalese President that prevented Soviet aircraft from refueling there during the Cuban Missile Crisis, in case the Soviets tried to use aircraft to break the blockade. Later, when he served as Ambassador to Hungary during the Carter Administration, he negotiated the return of a powerful national symbol in Hungary, the Crown of St. Stephen, to the Hungarians after it had been held for safekeeping in the United States after World War II.

Ambassador Kaiser received his undergraduate degree at the University of Wisconsin and then studied at Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar. Those experiences undoubtedly influenced his career, and, as it turns out, they influenced my career as well. It was because Philip Kaiser went to the University of Wisconsin that he met my father, Leon Feingold. They became, and always remained, good friends. As I grew up, I got to know Ambassador Kaiser, and heard so much about him from my father. As a young man with an interest in public service and foreign affairs, I looked up to Ambassador Kaiser. In fact, one of the reasons I applied for a Rhodes Scholarship was because Ambassador Kaiser had been a Rhodes Scholar himself.

I am proud to have known Ambassador Kaiser and proud of his connection to my family. I am deeply saddened by his passing, and my thoughts are with his wife, his children and grandchildren, and his many friends during this difficult time. He left a lasting mark on this country and the world, and it is an honor to pay tribute to his memory today.●

HONORING KAY AND MARY KRAMER

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I wish to honor two remarkable Iowans. Kay and Mary Kramer of Clive, IA have served their local community, our great State of Iowa, and America well. They have set an example of civic service that all people should be proud to follow.

Mary has a distinguished record of service to our country. She was the U.S. Ambassador to Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean. Additionally, she served on the White House Commission on Presidential Scholars, honoring outstanding high school seniors each year for both their academic and artistic achievements.

Mary has also served her home State of Iowa well. She has done this through her work in the Iowa Senate where she was elected and reelected for more than a decade. While serving in the senate, Mary was chosen by her fellow senators to be President of the senate. Her election to this position of leadership is a testament to the respect Mary has earned from those who know her best.

Mary and her husband Kay make a great, civically-minded team. Kay was named as a West Des Moines Citizen of the Year and is an active volunteer in his community. He served on the West Des Moines Board of Human Services and is still active as an officer with the West Des Moines Rotary Club.

I am proud to call Kay and Mary Kramer friends, and I am happy to honor both of them here today. I appreciate their tireless efforts to serve Iowa and America. I hope that their good work, and lifetime of service, does not stop any time soon.●

HONORING CLAIRA MONIER

● Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, JUDD GREGG, and I wish to recognize the considerable achievements of Claira Monier, a Goffstown resident who recently announced her retirement after leading the New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority for nearly two decades.

Claira is a gold standard public servant. A New Hampshire native, she has devoted her life to improving her community, State and Nation. Moreover, in what limited spare time she has, Claira is someone to whom Senator GREGG and I can turn for steady counsel on policy—housing tax credits, bond caps, affordable housing—and politics. She is a rare and irreplaceable friend.

Whether in the classroom or leading efforts to expand access to housing or health care, Claira has demonstrated the highest commitment to service over a 40-year period. Although her record of achievement is well-known in New Hampshire, it is worth repeating here on the floor of the Senate.

From 1967 to 1974, she held teaching and administrative positions at New Hampshire College and St. Anselm College. Claira subsequently served for 5 years as the director of the New Hampshire State Council on Aging, completing her tenure in 1981.

Having demonstrated uncommon competence and creativity in these roles, Claira was selected as Region I Director of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. In 1988, she began her legendary career as executive director of the New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority—an organization on which she has left an indelible mark.

While working by day to support affordable housing and home ownership initiatives in New Hampshire, Claira managed to simultaneously bring her leadership skills to a number of nonprofit boards.

She served as a Director of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston from 1990 to 1992 and was a member of its Affordable Housing Advisory Council. She also found time to serve for 2 years as chairman of then-Governor Gregg's Commission on Health Care Costs and Availability, leaving the panel in 1991. Claira was board president of the National Council of State Housing Agencies and served as cochair of the Fannie Mae Housing Impact Advisory Council.

The list goes on: past chair of the Manchester Red Cross; former Southern New Hampshire University trustee; 2003 chair of the Heritage United Way Campaign; former chair of the New Hampshire Main Street Center; chair of New Hampshire's chapter of the American Lung Association; chair of the West High School endowment fund; member of the Dartmouth Hitchcock Healthcare System's assembly of overseers; and so on.

It is not exactly clear when, or if, Claira had time to sleep.

But this much is known: Claira is one of those special people who looks at her community and is able to see how she can make it better. She is not prone to idle thoughts. Rather than stand on the sidelines saying how the order of the world should be, Claira enters the arena with vigor and inspires people to achieve difficult objectives.

The results of her work can be seen across New Hampshire. For first-time homeowners in our State—or those who thought they might never be able to own a place of their own—it is likely that Claira's leadership at New Hampshire Housing had something to do with their securing a piece of the American dream. It is difficult to imagine work that is more hopeful.

There is no question that Claira leaves behind a rich legacy at New Hampshire Housing. Her successors, no doubt, share her commitment to that organization's mission and will continue the important work she has started. It should be noted, though,

that Senator GREGG and I will certainly miss working with her on critical issues that impact so many New Hampshire residents.

Claira may be retiring from her day job but in no way is she retiring from her community. Her knowledge of New Hampshire, her warm demeanor, and her strong leadership will continue to benefit the organizations she supports. Additionally, candidates—notably those seeking the highest office in the land—will turn to Claira for advice and counsel that only she can provide.

Claira is a good, true and loyal friend. A great citizen of New Hampshire, Senator GREGG and I extend our warm regards to Claira on the occasion of her retirement. We look forward to seeing her in the communities she has served and will serve.●

TRIBUTE TO PEARL D. WILLIAMS

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge Councilwoman-at-large Pearl D. Williams of Slidell for being named volunteer of the year by the United Way of St. Tammany Parish. I would like to take some time to make a few remarks on her success and her contributions to Louisiana.

Councilwoman Williams has long enjoyed volunteering with various organizations in order to assist the community, especially needy children, and this award recognizes the hard work and success she has constantly rendered.

Councilwoman Williams has shown tireless dedication to the United Way. Williams has served on the St. Tammany United Way Leadership Council as a progressive, active fundraiser who helped establish various committees and celebrations in order to benefit different charities. She also served on the board of directors for the Children's Wish Endowment and as past president of the Slidell Memorial Hospital Women's Health Alliance, among many other great accolades.

Councilwoman Pearl D. Williams passed away of heart failure at the age of 64 on Thursday, May 17, 2007, at her residence. She is survived by not only proud family members but also the grateful city of Slidell who will never forget Councilwoman Williams' selfless acts of generosity and charity.

Thus, today, I rise to honor Councilwoman Pearl D. Williams so that more people can understand the kind of sacrifices she gave for others.●

RECOGNIZING LAITRAM, LLC

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge Jay Lapeyre and Laitram, LLC, of New Orleans for receiving the Recognition of Excellence in Innovation certificate from the Louisiana Technology Council. I would also like to take a few moments to expand on Laitram, LLC, and their continued success.

The Louisiana Technology Council recently hosted their third annual awards council and the first since Hurricane Katrina. This certificate awards local and regional leaders in new technology throughout the United States who have created a new industrial advance or service in the last 12 months, operated a new, original manufacturing process, or have received a patent from the U.S. Patent and Trademark office for a recent technological discovery. More than 60 nominations were submitted from public and private sectors, institutions, and individuals.

J. M. Lapeyre, the designer of the original shrimp-peeling machine in 1946, founded Laitram, LLC, and completely transformed the shrimping industry. Since its inception, his descendants have continued to carry on this tradition of improvement and modernization. Over the past 5 years, Laitram has patented more than 60 new inventions, including 16 in 2006, illustrating Laitram's commitment to innovation and the best quality for its customers and the State of Louisiana. Specifically, the Intralox Series 400 Angled Roller conveyor belt has revolutionized the industry, allowing the replacement of older technology and maintaining Louisiana's package handling applications not only in food but in other industries as well. Therefore, I congratulate Jay Lapeyre and Laitram LLC on being an inspiration to business owners everywhere, and I wish them success.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOSSIER CITY, LOUISIANA

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to honor Bossier City, LA, which is celebrating its centennial anniversary, and I would like to take a few moments to publicly recognize their great history.

In the 1830s, the area of Bossier City originally encompassed the Elysian Groves Plantation of James Crane. Due to its proximity to the river, it quickly became a hotbed for trade and activity. By 1850, hundreds of wagons crossed through the vicinity on their way to the West; many settlers also stayed, realizing the land's fertile river valley and abundant farmland. Soon, interstate railway systems boomed, and Bossier became a growing metropolis. The farmers, realizing the area's potential, quickly began to sell plots of land as transportation flourished. Finally, in 1907, with its growing textile industry and expansive transportation system, Bossier City received official status as a city in Louisiana. Throughout its history, Bossier City has endured and survived many impediments, such as the great fire which consumed over half of the downtown area. In the late 1950s, Bossier was named the fastest growing city in Louisiana.

Bossier City began its centennial celebration on April 7 with the biggest birthday party that the city has ever witnessed on the banks of the city's foundation on the Red River. The initial festivities ranged from the opportunity to meet the city's oldest resident to a reception, with a 100-square-foot birthday cake. Throughout the year, the commemoration will continue with events from the American Cancer Society's Relay for Life to Barksdale Air Force Base. Over the year, residents and business owners in the city will be able to attend and plan activities that aid in representing the city's deep southern history and culture.

The centennial memorializes Bossier City's rise to one of the great cities of the State of Louisiana. Today, I want to congratulate Bossier City on the last 100 years, and I wish the residents luck and continued success and progress.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:46 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that it has passed the act (S. 676) to provide that the Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank or the Alternative Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank may serve on the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation, without amendment.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 65. An act to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1441. An act to strengthen controls on the export of surplus parts for F–14 fighter aircraft.

H.R. 2356. An act to amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father's Day.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 12, 2007, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 5. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 65. An act to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 1441. An act to strengthen controls on the export of surplus parts for F–14 fighter aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2356. An act to amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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–2227. A communication from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Israel; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2228. A communication from the General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's plan for the future of its workforce; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2229. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Franchising, 16 CFR Part 436; Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Business Opportunities, 16 CFR Part 437'' (RIN3084–AA63) received on June 7, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2230. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Corporation's Inspector General for the period of October 1, 2006, through March 31, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2231. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, 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–2232. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Administration's Inspector General for the period of October 1, 2006, through March 31, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2233. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Administration's Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2234. A communication from the Attorney General, 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–2235. A communication from the Secretary of Education, 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.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–114. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging Congress to provide resources to address the colony collapse disorder affecting honeybees; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 76

Whereas, Michigan and the nation's agricultural industry rely on honeybees to pollinate plants and enable the production of our nation's fruits, vegetables, seeds, and nuts. Honeybees pollinate at least 90 commercial crops and account for 80 percent of the nation's pollination services, providing $5 billion to $10 billion of direct benefits to United States agriculture; and

Whereas, honeybees in Michigan and 25 other states have succumbed to a mysterious ailment referred to as Colony Collapse Disorder, where honeybees abandon their hives. In affected states, beekeepers lost up to 50 percent of their colonies last winter, threatening Michigan's $383 million fruit industry and billions of dollars of agricultural production nationwide; and

Whereas, immediate research is needed to determine the cause of Colony Collapse Disorder and assistance to Support our nation's 135,000 beekeepers and the agriculture industry from this potentially crippling threat: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide resources to address the Colony Collapse Disorder affecting honeybees; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation,

Adopted by the House of Representatives, May 22, 2007.

POM–115. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan expressing opposition to Norfolk Southern Corporation's proposed sale of its rail line between Lansing and Jackson; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 96

Whereas, The Norfolk Southern Corporation is considering the sale of several Michigan lines, including the line that runs between Lansing and Jackson. Traffic on Michigan's rail lines has increased over the past two years. Expanding both freight and passenger rail service is being promoted as a solution to rising oil prices, pollution, and increased highway congestion. The sale or closure of rail lines could be counterproductive to efforts to improve Michigan's economy; and

Whereas, The Norfolk Southern lines are vital links between Michigan cities and between Michigan and neighboring states. Expanding rail capacity on the Lansing/Jackson line is essential to the future development of this area. New industry, including production plants for coal energy, biodiesel, and ethanol fuel, is proposed for Michigan and the railroad will play an integral role in moving products and supplies. Continued operation of this line by Norfolk Southern is essential to expansion of new industry in Michigan; and

Whereas, Norfolk Southern is a Class One railroad operator, earning revenue in excess of $250 million annually. As a Class One operator, Norfolk Southern has the capacity to maintain and promote the use of these lines. The proposed sale of the Lansing to Jackson line will almost certainly place the line under the management of a Class Three operator, a rail company earning revenue of $20 million or less annually. A Class Three operator may be far less likely to have the means to maintain the line, thus increasing the chance of accidents. Class Three operators also rely on federal grants for line and equipment maintenance—grants that are not always guaranteed; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we express opposition to Norfolk Southern's proposed sale of its rail line between Lansing and Jackson; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; members of the Michigan congressional delegation; the United States Department of Transportation, Surface Transportation Board; the Norfolk Southern Corporation; AMTRAK; and the Michigan Department of Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow full expensing for the cost of qualified refinery property in the year in which the property is placed in service, and to classify petroleum refining property as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. OBAMA, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1592. A bill to reauthorize the Underground Railroad Educational and Cultural Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. SALAZAR):

S. 1593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief and protections to military personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 1594. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to improve port safety and security for especially hazardous cargos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1595. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide flexibility in the manner in which beds are counted for purposes of determining whether a hospital may be designated as a critical access hospital under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1596. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 South Getty Street in Uvalde, Texas, as the ''Dolph S. Briscoe, Jr. Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1597. 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 Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COLEMAN (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1598. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, with respect to civil penalties for child labor violations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1599. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to provide for energy-related regulatory reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1600. A bill to establish an energy technologies innovation network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1601. A bill to lower the effective tax rate on investment in necessary energy infrastructure and credits for renewable energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1602. A bill to improve the energy security of the United States by promoting diverse energy supplies and energy efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. REID, Mr. OBAMA, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWNBACK):

S. Res. 231. A resolution recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day and expressing the sense of the Senate that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR):

S. Res. 232. A resolution congratulating the University of Colorado at Boulder Men's Cross Country team for winning the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Cross Country Championship; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 22

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) were added as cosponsors of S. 22, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a program of educational assistance for members of the Armed Forces who serve in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 57

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) 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. 185

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to restore habeas corpus for those detained by the United States.

S. 225

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 225, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the number of individuals qualifying for retroactive benefits from traumatic injury protection coverage under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance.

S. 242

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 242, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the importation of prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 251

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 251, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the importation of prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 294

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) 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 Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) 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. 455

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 455, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief to active duty military personnel and employers who assist them, and for other purposes.

S. 469

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 469, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to reduce the incidence of suicide among veterans.

S. 513

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 513, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revive previous authority on the use of the Armed Forces and the militia to address interference with State or Federal law, and for other purposes.

S. 535

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to establish an Unsolved Crimes Section in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, and an Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office in the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes.

S. 648

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 648, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce the eligibility age for receipt of nonregular military service retired pay for members of the Ready Reserve in active federal status or on active duty for significant periods.

S. 696

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 696, a bill to establish an Advanced Research Projects Administration—Energy to initiate high risk, innovative energy research to improve the energy security of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 713

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 713, a bill to ensure dignity in care for members of the Armed Forces recovering from injuries.

S. 773

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 773, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal civilian and military retirees to pay health insurance premiums on a pretax basis and to allow a deduction for TRICARE supplemental premiums.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa in the effort to achieve internationally recognized goals in the treatment and prevention of HIV/AIDS and other major diseases and the reduction of maternal and child mortality by improving human health care capacity and improving retention of medical health professionals in sub-Saharan Africa, and for other purposes.

S. 819

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 819, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 836, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for sewer overflow control grants.

S. 858

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 858, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the transportation fringe benefit to bicycle commuters.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor 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. 911

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors 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. 991

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 991, a bill to establish the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation under the authorities of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

S. 1078

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1078, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for employer-provided employee housing assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the limitation on the foreign earned income exclusion, and for other purposes.

S. 1212

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit direct payment under the Medicare program for clinical social worker services provided to residents of skilled nursing facilities.

S. 1224

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1224, a bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to reauthorize the State Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1244

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1244, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to expand coverage under the Act, to increase protections for whistleblowers, to increase penalties for certain violators, and for other purposes.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1271, a bill to provide for a comprehensive national research effort on the physical and mental health and other readjustment needs of the members of the Armed Forces and veterans who served in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom and their families.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to ensure the right of employees to a secret-ballot election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 1357

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1357, a bill to amend the Law Enforcement Pay Equity Act of 2000 to permit certain annuitants of the retirement programs of the United States Park Police and United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to receive the adjustments in pension benefits to which such annuitants would otherwise be entitled as a result of the conversion of members of the United States Park Police and United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to a new salary schedule under the amendments made by such Act.

S. 1382

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1382, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Registry.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to provide for a statewide early childhood education professional development and career system, and for other purposes.

S. 1448

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) 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 Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) 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. 1459

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to strengthen the Nation's research efforts to identify the causes and cure of psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis, expand psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis data collection, study access to and quality of care for people with psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis, and for other purposes.

S. 1460

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor 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. 1492

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1492, a bill to improve the quality of federal and state data regarding the availability and quality of broadband services and to promote the deployment of affordable broadband services to all parts of the Nation.

S. 1500

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to support democracy and human rights in Zimbabwe, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, supra.

S. 1518

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1518, a bill to amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to reauthorize the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1529

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) 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. 1557

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1557, a bill to amend part B of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve 21st Century Community Learning Centers.

S. CON. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 1, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that an artistic tribute to commemorate the speech given by President Ronald Reagan at the Brandenburg Gate on June 12, 1987, should be placed within the United States Capitol.

S. CON. RES. 26

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 26, a concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the Military Order of the Purple Heart and commending recipients of the Purple Heart for their courageous demonstrations of gallantry and heroism on behalf of the United States.

S. CON. RES. 27

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 27, a concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Purple Heart Recognition Day''.

S. RES. 213

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 213, a resolution supporting National Men's Health Week.

S. RES. 224

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 224, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow full expensing for the cost of qualified refinery property in the year in which the property is placed in service, and to classify petroleum refining property as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise to reintroduce my legislation, the Refinery Investment Tax Assistance Act, aimed at increasing refining capacity in this Nation. No one doubts that U.S. consumers and businesses will face another long hot summer of too high gas prices. There is general consensus among experts that a major bottleneck in U.S. refining capacity is a big part of the reason prices are so high. My bill will help resolve that problem.

As my colleagues know, the Government does not explore for, extract, transport, or refine oil in this country. Our Nation relies wholly on private industry to feed a very large domestic energy appetite. Unfortunately, the Government often stands in the way of industry in these activities. While many refiners would like to expand their capacity to refine oil, they face extraordinary costs from bureaucratic regulations that limit the available funding for such expansion. Because of this and other unfriendly economic factors, not a single new refinery has been built in the United States since 1976. In fact, we have lost nearly 200 refineries over that time period and now we badly need that refining capacity.

I authored a key provision of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which is currently providing some incentives for new refining capacity. However, due to budgetary constraints, the tax incentives in my proposal were cut in half during the conference between the House and the Senate. I am confident that if we had known 2 years ago just how much of a bottleneck the refinery shortage would present in today's market, the full measure of my incentive would have been enacted.

The Refinery Investment Tax Assistance Act would restore those provisions I originally introduced, but which were later removed for budget reasons. First, it would increase the short-term incentive for the industry to build new refineries or to expand existing ones. As with the 2005 bill, S. 1591 would provide immediate expensing of 100 percent of the cost of new or expanded refineries in certain circumstances. As I said earlier, cost constraints forced us to limit this incentive in 2005 to 50 percent of expensing for refiners that were able to commit to installing new refining equipment before 2008. Under this bill, any added capacity would have to be placed in service by 2012 in order to qualify to write off the full cost of the expanded capacity in the first year.

The second part of S. 1591 would address the 10-year depreciation schedule for refining assets under our current tax law. This 10-year schedule is longer than the write-off period for much of the equipment used in other manufacturing industries, including the petrochemical industry. My bill would eliminate this disparity by shortening the depreciation schedule for refining assets from 10 years to 5. This unfair and unwarranted treatment of our refining industry acts as a long-term obstacle to new investment in increased capacity. I call on my colleagues to help me level the playing field on depreciation for this critically important sector of our energy industry.

I should also point out that this legislation would allow refineries to change only the timing of the depreciation of their equipment, but not the amount. Meanwhile, it would increase the size of our tax base by encouraging industry to build new refineries and increase capacity.

Testifying before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee in 2005, Mr. Bob Slaughter of the National Petrochemical & Refiners Association said that an important solution to the energy crisis would be to ''expand the refining tax incentive provision in the Energy Act [and] reduce the depreciation period for refining investments from 10 to . . . five years in order to remove a current disincentive for refining investment.''

These changes are incorporated in the legislation I am introducing today.

Mr. Slaughter gave this testimony in the aftermath of hurricane Katrina. Every American has felt the effects of the storms on our energy sector. Refineries have been pummeled and, at one point, an unprecedented 25 percent of our Nation's refining capacity was taken offline. The rising gas prices hurt families' budgets, businesses that pay high travel expenses, and even school districts that must fuel buses to transport students. Once again, forecasters are predicting a terrible storm season this summer with hurricanes comparable to those of 2005.

We have learned that when it comes to our Nation's energy security, refining is where we are the most vulnerable. This legislation will help us deal with the energy crisis and make our Nation more secure from the attacks of Mother Nature and terrorists. I hope my colleagues will join me in pursuing the secure and independent refining program that this country truly needs. 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. 1591

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 ''Refinery Investment Tax Assistance Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FULL EXPENSING FOR QUALIFIED REFINERY PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 179C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to election to expense certain refineries) is amended by striking ''50 percent of''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in section 1323 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

SEC. 3. PETROLEUM REFINING PROPERTY TREATED AS 5-YEAR PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 168(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to 5-year property) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (v), by striking the period at the end of clause (vi)(III) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(vii) any petroleum refining property.''.

(b) PETROLEUM REFINING PROPERTY.—Section 168(i) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(18) PETROLEUM REFINING PROPERTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'petroleum refining property' means any asset for petroleum refining, including assets used for the distillation, fractionation, and catalytic cracking of crude petroleum into gasoline and its other components.

''(B) ASSET MUST MEET ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—Such term shall not include any property which does not meet all applicable environmental laws in effect on the date such property was placed in service. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a waiver under the Clean Air Act shall not be taken into account in determining whether the applicable environmental laws have been met.

''(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS.—Such term shall not include any property with respect to which a deduction was taken under subsection (e)(3)(B) by any other taxpayer in any preceding year.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any property with respect to which the taxpayer has entered into a binding contract for the construction thereof on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. SALAZAR):

S. 1593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief and protections to military personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this week, we celebrate Flag Day, and in a few weeks we will celebrate the Fourth of July.

We ask a lot from our men and women in the armed services, and their sacrifices are essential to protecting our freedom here at home. One way to support them is to make the Tax Code a little friendlier to the troops.

That is why I am introducing the Defenders of Freedom Tax Relief Act of 2007. This bill would extend the tax rules favoring the military that expire in 2007 and 2008. It would also eliminate roadblocks in the current tax laws that present difficulties for veterans and servicemembers.

Our troops should fight against our Nation's enemies, not our Nation's Tax Code. Family members of fallen soldiers killed in the line of duty receive a death benefit of $100,000. But the Tax Code restricts the survivors from contributing this benefit into a tax-favored retirement account. My bill would exempt this benefit from the current restrictions on contribution amounts and income limitations. That way, the family members of fallen soldiers could take advantage of tax-favored Roth IRA accounts.

Lower ranking, lower income soldiers do most of the heavy lifting in combat situations. Under the current Tax Code, their income is not counted in computing the earned income tax credit, or EITC. The EITC is a beneficial tax provision available to working Americans. It makes no sense to deny it to our troops. My bill would count combat duty income for EITC purposes, and it would make this change to the Tax Code permanent.

My bill would also eliminate the confusion that surrounds State gifts to servicemembers. Military members should not be caught in the crossfire of competing Tax Code interpretations.

Another hazard facing our troops in the Tax Code is the statute of limitations for filing a tax refund. Most Veterans' Administration disability claims filed by veterans are quickly resolved. But thousands of disability awards are delayed due to lost paperwork or the appeals of rejected claims. Once a disabled veteran finally gets a favorable award, the good news is that the disability award is tax-free. But many of these disabled veterans get ambushed by a statute that bars them from filing a tax refund claim. My bill would give disabled veterans in this situation an extra year to claim their tax refunds.

Our men and women in uniform provide an invaluable service to our country. They, along with their families, make sacrifices and live a demanding lifestyle. The Tax Code should not add to their hardships as they move from assignment to assignment around the globe.

Protecting American interests around the world requires most of our troops to move a number of times during their career. Restricting favorable mortgage bond financing to only first-time homebuyers does not make much sense for them. Therefore, my bill would eliminate this restriction for veterans who served in the active military.

The bill would make permanent a provision that allows intelligence community employees to make use of the exclusion of gain on the sale of their home when they are assigned overseas or 50 miles away from their home.

A soldier's rucksack is heavy enough as it is without piling tax paperwork on top of it. My bill would help reduce paperwork.

My bill would treat differential pay as wages. This would make it easer for employers to contribute to a reservist's retirement plans. And it would eliminate the reservist's need to make estimated tax payments.

My bill would also make permanent certain taxpayer information reporting rules, so that the Social Security Administration and the Veterans' Administration could facilitate the administration of veteran needs-based pension and compensation programs.

A further roadblock for military service men and women is the 10-percent penalty triggered for early withdrawal from a qualified retirement plan. If reservists are called to active duty, the last thing that they should have to worry about is their 401(k) plan or IRA account. This provision would permit penalty-free early withdrawal. And it would give reservists 2 years from the time that they stop active duty to roll over their IRAs or 401(k) plans.

Small business employers are being asked to make sacrifices here at home. My bill would help.

Mobilization of Reserve personnel creates unexpected employee absences. This hits small businesses especially hard. Some employers voluntarily take on the added burden of eliminating any pay gap experienced by their reservist-employees. These employers pay the difference between the civilian salary and the military pay. In recognition of their patriotism, my bill would provide small businesses with fewer than 50 employees a tax credit of 20 percent of the differential pay, up to $20,000, for those small businesses that make differential payments to reservists called up to active duty.

This bill is fully paid for with a change in the Tax Code that makes sure that anyone relinquishing their U.S. citizenship is still on the hook to pay their fair share of U.S. taxes.

We owe the Americans fighting in our Armed Forces an enormous debt of gratitude. These important tax reforms are one small way of saluting them for all that they do. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1593

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Defenders of Freedom Tax Relief Act of 2007''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in

this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Extension of statute of limitations to file claims for refunds relating to disability determinations by Department of Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 3. Permanent extension of election to treat combat pay as earned income for purposes of earned income credit.
Sec. 4. Treatment of differential military pay as wages.
Sec. 5. Permanent extension of penalty-free withdrawals from retirement plans by individual called to active duty.
Sec. 6. State payments to service members treated as qualified military benefits.
Sec. 7. Permanent extension of disclosure authority to Department of Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 8. Three-year extension of qualified mortgage bond program rules for veterans.
Sec. 9. Permanent exclusion of gain from sale of a principal residence by certain employees of the intelligence community.
Sec. 10. Contributions of military death gratuities to Roth IRAs.
Sec. 11. Credit for employer differential wage payments to employees who are active duty members of the uniformed services.
Sec. 12. Revision of tax rules on expatriation of individuals.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS TO FILE CLAIMS FOR REFUNDS RELATING TO DISABILITY DETERMINATIONS BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 6511 (relating to special rules applicable to income taxes) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) SPECIAL RULES WHEN UNIFORMED SERVICES RETIRED PAY IS REDUCED AS A RESULT OF AWARD OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—

''(A) PERIOD OF LIMITATION ON FILING CLAIM.—If the claim for credit or refund relates to an overpayment of tax imposed by subtitle A on account of—

''(i) the reduction of uniformed services retired pay computed under section 1406 or 1407 of title 10, United States Code, or

''(ii) the waiver of such pay under section 5305 of title 38 of such Code,

as a result of an award of compensation under title 38 of such Code pursuant to a determination by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in subsection (a) shall be extended, for purposes of permitting a credit or refund based upon the amount of such reduction or waiver, until the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of such determination.

''(B) LIMITATION TO 5 TAXABLE YEARS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any taxable year which began more than 5 years before the date of such determination.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to claims for credit or refund filed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TRANSITION RULES.—In the case of a determination described in paragraph (8) of section 6511(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) which is made by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs after December 31, 2000, and on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, such paragraph—

(1) shall not apply with respect to any taxable year which began before January 1, 2001, and

(2) shall be applied by substituting ''the date of the enactment of the Defenders of Freedom Tax Relief Act of 2007'' for ''the date of such determination'' in subparagraph (A) thereof.

SEC. 3. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF ELECTION TO TREAT COMBAT PAY AS EARNED INCOME FOR PURPOSES OF EARNED INCOME CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (vi) of section 32(c)(2)(B) (defining earned income) is amended to read as follows:

''(vi) a taxpayer may elect to treat amounts excluded from gross income by reason of section 112 as earned income.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2007.

SEC. 4. TREATMENT OF DIFFERENTIAL MILITARY PAY AS WAGES.

(a) INCOME TAX WITHHOLDING ON DIFFERENTIAL WAGE PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3401 (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) DIFFERENTIAL WAGE PAYMENTS TO ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), any differential wage payment shall be treated as a payment of wages by the employer to the employee.

''(2) DIFFERENTIAL WAGE PAYMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'differential wage payment' means any payment which—

''(A) is made by an employer to an individual with respect to any period during which the individual is performing service in the uniformed services while on active duty for a period of more than 30 days, and

''(B) represents all or a portion of the wages the individual would have received from the employer if the individual were performing service for the employer.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to remuneration paid after December 31, 2007.

(b) TREATMENT OF DIFFERENTIAL WAGE PAYMENTS FOR RETIREMENT PLAN PURPOSES.—

(1) PENSION PLANS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 414(u) (relating to special rules relating to veterans' reemployment rights under USERRA) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(11) TREATMENT OF DIFFERENTIAL WAGE PAYMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this paragraph, for purposes of applying this title to a retirement plan to which this subsection applies—

''(i) an individual receiving a differential wage payment shall be treated as an employee of the employer making the payment,

''(ii) the differential wage payment shall be treated as compensation, and

''(iii) the plan shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of any provision described in paragraph (1)(C) by reason of any contribution or benefit which is based on the differential wage payment.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR DISTRIBUTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A)(i), for purposes of section 401(k)(2)(B)(i)(I), 403(b)(7)(A)(ii), 403(b)(11)(A), or 457(d)(1)(A)(ii), an individual shall be treated as having been severed from employment during any period the individual is performing service in the uniformed services described in section 3401(h)(2)(A).

''(ii) LIMITATION.—If an individual elects to receive a distribution by reason of clause (i), the plan shall provide that the individual may not make an elective deferral or employee contribution during the 6-month period beginning on the date of the distribution.

''(C) NONDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENT.—Subparagraph (A)(iii) shall apply only if all employees of an employer (as determined under subsections (b), (c), (m), and (o)) performing service in the uniformed services described in section 3401(h)(2)(A) are entitled to receive differential wage payments on reasonably equivalent terms and, if eligible to participate in a retirement plan maintained by the employer, to make contributions based on the payments on reasonably equivalent terms. For purposes of applying this subparagraph, the provisions of paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) of section 410(b) shall apply.

''(D) DIFFERENTIAL WAGE PAYMENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'differential wage payment' has the meaning given such term by section 3401(h)(2).''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for section 414(u) is amended by inserting ''AND TO DIFFERENTIAL WAGE PAYMENTS TO MEMBERS ON ACTIVE DUTY'' after ''USERRA''.

(2) DIFFERENTIAL WAGE PAYMENTS TREATED AS COMPENSATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT PLANS.—Section 219(f)(1) (defining compensation) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The term 'compensation' includes any differential wage payment (as defined in section 3401(h)(2)).''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to years beginning after December 31, 2007.

(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO PLAN AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If this subsection applies to any plan or annuity contract amendment—

(A) such plan or contract shall be treated as being operated in accordance with the terms of the plan or contract during the period described in paragraph (2)(B)(i), and

(B) except as provided by the Secretary of the Treasury, such plan shall not fail to meet the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 by reason of such amendment.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO WHICH SECTION APPLIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall apply to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract which is made—

(i) pursuant to any amendment made by this section, and

(ii) on or before the last day of the first plan year beginning on or after January 1, 2009.

(B) CONDITIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any plan or annuity contract amendment unless—

(i) during the period beginning on the date the amendment described in subparagraph (A)(i) takes effect and ending on the date described in subparagraph (A)(ii) (or, if earlier, the date the plan or contract amendment is adopted), the plan or contract is operated as if such plan or contract amendment were in effect, and

(ii) such plan or contract amendment applies retroactively for such period.

SEC. 5. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF PENALTY-FREE WITHDRAWALS FROM RETIREMENT PLANS BY INDIVIDUAL CALLED TO ACTIVE DUTY.

Clause (iv) of section 72(t)(2)(G) (relating to distributions from retirement plans to individuals called to active duty) is amended by striking all after ''September 11, 2001'' and inserting a period.

SEC. 6. STATE PAYMENTS TO SERVICE MEMBERS TREATED AS QUALIFIED MILITARY BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 134(b) (defining qualified military benefit) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) CERTAIN STATE PAYMENTS.—The term 'qualified military benefit' includes any bonus payment by a State or political subdivision thereof to any member or former member of the uniformed services of the United States or any dependent of such member only by reason of such member's service in an combat zone (as defined in section 112(c)(2), determined without regard to the parenthetical).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments made before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF DISCLOSURE AUTHORITY TO DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 6103(l)(7)(D) (relating to program to which rule applies) is amended by striking the last sentence.

SEC. 8. THREE-YEAR EXTENSION OF QUALIFIED MORTGAGE BOND PROGRAM RULES FOR VETERANS.

Section 143(d)(2)(D) (relating to exception) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2008'' and inserting ''January 1, 2011''.

SEC. 9. PERMANENT EXCLUSION OF GAIN FROM SALE OF A PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE BY CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 417(e) of division A of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 is amended by striking ''and before January 1, 2011''.

(b) DUTY STATION MAY BE OUTSIDE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 121(d)(9)(C) (defining qualified official extended duty) is amended by striking clause (vi).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to sales or exchanges after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 10. CONTRIBUTIONS OF MILITARY DEATH GRATUITIES TO ROTH IRAS.

(a) PROVISION IN EFFECT BEFORE PENSION PROTECTION ACT.—Subsection (e) of section 408A (relating to qualified rollover contribution), as in effect before the amendments made by section 824 of the Pension Protection Act of 2006, is amended to read as follows:

''(e) QUALIFIED ROLLOVER CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified rollover contribution' means a rollover contribution to a Roth IRA from another such account, or from an individual retirement plan, but only if such rollover contribution meets the requirements of section 408(d)(3). Such term includes a rollover contribution described in section 402A(c)(3)(A). For purposes of section 408(d)(3)(B), there shall be disregarded any qualified rollover contribution from an individual retirement plan (other than a Roth IRA) to a Roth IRA.

''(2) MILITARY DEATH GRATUITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified rollover contribution' includes a contribution to a Roth IRA maintained for the benefit of an individual to the extent that such contribution does not exceed the amount received by such individual under section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, or under section 1967 of title 38 of such Code, if such contribution is made not later than 1 year after the day on which such individual receives such amount.

''(B) ANNUAL LIMIT ON NUMBER OF ROLLOVERS NOT TO APPLY.—Section 408(d)(3)(B) shall not apply with respect to amounts treated as a rollover by the subparagraph (A).

''(C) APPLICATION OF SECTION 72.—For purposes of applying section 72 in the case of a distribution which is not a qualified distribution, the amount treated as a rollover by reason of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as investment in the contract.''.

(b) PROVISION IN EFFECT AFTER PENSION PROTECTION ACT.—Subsection (e) of section 408A, as in effect after the amendments made by section 824 of the Pension Protection Act of 2006, is amended to read as follows:

''(e) QUALIFIED ROLLOVER CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified rollover contribution' means a rollover contribution—

''(A) to a Roth IRA from another such account,

''(B) from an eligible retirement plan, but only if—

''(i) in the case of an individual retirement plan, such rollover contribution meets the requirements of section 408(d)(3), and

''(ii) in the case of any eligible retirement plan (as defined in section 402(c)(8)(B) other than clauses (i) and (ii) thereof), such rollover contribution meets the requirements of section 402(c), 403(b)(8), or 457(e)(16), as applicable.

For purposes of section 408(d)(3)(B), there shall be disregarded any qualified rollover contribution from an individual retirement plan (other than a Roth IRA) to a Roth IRA.

''(2) MILITARY DEATH GRATUITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified rollover contribution' includes a contribution to a Roth IRA maintained for the benefit of an individual to the extent that such contribution does not exceed the amount received by such individual under section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, or under section 1967 of title 38 of such Code, if such contribution is made not later than 1 year after the day on which such individual receives such amount.

''(B) ANNUAL LIMIT ON NUMBER OF ROLLOVERS NOT TO APPLY.—Section 408(d)(3)(B) shall not apply with respect to amounts treated as a rollover by the subparagraph (A).

''(C) APPLICATION OF SECTION 72.—For purposes of applying section 72 in the case of a distribution which is not a qualified distribution, the amount treated as a rollover by reason of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as investment in the contract.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by paragraphs (2) and (3), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to deaths from injuries occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS TO DEATHS FROM INJURIES OCCURRING ON OR AFTER OCTOBER 7, 2001, AND BEFORE ENACTMENT.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any contribution made pursuant to section 408A(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by this Act, with respect to amounts received under section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, or under section 1967 of title 38 of such Code, for deaths from injuries occurring on or after October 7, 2001, and before the date of the enactment of this Act if such contribution is made not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) PENSION PROTECTION ACT CHANGES.—Section 408A(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect after the amendments made by subsection (b)) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2007.

SEC. 11. CREDIT FOR EMPLOYER DIFFERENTIAL WAGE PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEES WHO ARE ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 (relating to business credits) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 45O. EMPLOYER WAGE CREDIT FOR EMPLOYEES WHO ARE ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of section 38, in the case of an eligible small business employer, the differential wage payment credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 20 percent of the sum of the eligible differential wage payments for each of the qualified employees of the taxpayer during such taxable year.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) ELIGIBLE DIFFERENTIAL WAGE PAYMENTS.—The term 'eligible differential wage payments' means, with respect to each qualified employee, so much of the differential wage payments (as defined in section 3401(h)(2)) paid to such employee for the taxable year as does not exceed $20,000.

''(2) QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE.—The term 'qualified employee' means a person who has been an employee of the taxpayer for the 91-day period immediately preceding the period for which any differential wage payment is made.

''(3) ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS EMPLOYER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'eligible small business employer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any employer which—

''(i) employed an average of less that 50 employees on business days during such taxable year, and

''(ii) under a written plan of the employer, provides eligible differential wage payments to every qualified employee of the employer.

''(B) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), all persons treated as a single employer under subsection (b), (c), (m), or (o) of section 414 shall be treated as a single employer.

''(c) COORDINATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The amount of credit otherwise allowable under this chapter with respect to compensation paid to any employee shall be reduced by the credit determined under this section with respect to such employee.

''(d) DISALLOWANCE FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH EMPLOYMENT OR REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS OF MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) to a taxpayer for—

''(1) any taxable year, beginning after the date of the enactment of this section, in which the taxpayer is under a final order, judgment, or other process issued or required by a district court of the United States under section 4323 of title 38 of the United States Code with respect to a violation of chapter 43 of such title, and

''(2) the 2 succeeding taxable years.

''(e) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—For purposes of this section, rules similar to the rules of subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 52 shall apply.

''(f) TERMINATION.—This section shall not apply to any payments made after December 31, 2009.''.

(b) CREDIT TREATED AS PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Section 38(b) (relating to general business credit) is amended by striking ''plus'' at the end of paragraph (30), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (31) and inserting '', plus'', and by adding at the end of following new paragraph:

''(32) the differential wage payment credit determined under section 45O(a).''.

(c) NO DEDUCTION FOR COMPENSATION TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT FOR CREDIT.—Section 280C(a) (relating to rule for employment credits) is amended by inserting ''45O(a),'' after ''45A(a),''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 45O. Employer wage credit for employees who are active duty members of the uniformed services.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12. REVISION OF TAX RULES ON EXPATRIATION OF INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part II of subchapter N of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 877 the following new section:

''SEC. 877A. TAX RESPONSIBILITIES OF EXPATRIATION.

''(a) GENERAL RULES.—For purposes of this subtitle—

''(1) MARK TO MARKET.—Except as provided in subsections (d) and (f), all property of a covered expatriate to whom this section applies shall be treated as sold on the day before the expatriation date for its fair market value.

''(2) RECOGNITION OF GAIN OR LOSS.—In the case of any sale under paragraph (1)—

''(A) notwithstanding any other provision of this title, any gain arising from such sale shall be taken into account for the taxable year of the sale, and

''(B) any loss arising from such sale shall be taken into account for the taxable year of the sale to the extent otherwise provided by this title, except that section 1091 shall not apply to any such loss.

Proper adjustment shall be made in the amount of any gain or loss subsequently realized for gain or loss taken into account under the preceding sentence.

''(3) EXCLUSION FOR CERTAIN GAIN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount which, but for this paragraph, would be includible in the gross income of any individual by reason of this section shall be reduced (but not below zero) by $600,000. For purposes of this paragraph, allocable expatriation gain taken into account under subsection (f)(2) shall be treated in the same manner as an amount required to be includible in gross income.

''(B) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an expatriation date occurring in any calendar year after 2007, the $600,000 amount under subparagraph (A) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(II) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2006' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(ii) ROUNDING RULES.—If any amount after adjustment under clause (i) is not a multiple of $1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1,000.

''(4) ELECTION TO CONTINUE TO BE TAXED AS UNITED STATES CITIZEN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a covered expatriate elects the application of this paragraph—

''(i) this section (other than this paragraph and subsection (i)) shall not apply to the expatriate, but

''(ii) in the case of property to which this section would apply but for such election, the expatriate shall be subject to tax under this title in the same manner as if the individual were a United States citizen.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an individual unless the individual—

''(i) provides security for payment of tax in such form and manner, and in such amount, as the Secretary may require,

''(ii) consents to the waiver of any right of the individual under any treaty of the United States which would preclude assessment or collection of any tax which may be imposed by reason of this paragraph, and

''(iii) complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may prescribe.

''(C) ELECTION.—An election under subparagraph (A) shall apply to all property to which this section would apply but for the election and, once made, shall be irrevocable. Such election shall also apply to property the basis of which is determined in whole or in part by reference to the property with respect to which the election was made.

''(b) ELECTION TO DEFER TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the taxpayer elects the application of this subsection with respect to any property treated as sold by reason of subsection (a), the payment of the additional tax attributable to such property shall be postponed until the due date of the return for the taxable year in which such property is disposed of (or, in the case of property disposed of in a transaction in which gain is not recognized in whole or in part, until such other date as the Secretary may prescribe).

''(2) DETERMINATION OF TAX WITH RESPECT TO PROPERTY.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the additional tax attributable to any property is an amount which bears the same ratio to the additional tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year solely by reason of subsection (a) as the gain taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to such property bears to the total gain taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to all property to which subsection (a) applies.

''(3) TERMINATION OF POSTPONEMENT.—No tax may be postponed under this subsection later than the due date for the return of tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year which includes the date of death of the expatriate (or, if earlier, the time that the security provided with respect to the property fails to meet the requirements of paragraph (4), unless the taxpayer corrects such failure within the time specified by the Secretary).

''(4) SECURITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No election may be made under paragraph (1) with respect to any property unless adequate security is provided to the Secretary with respect to such property.

''(B) ADEQUATE SECURITY.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), security with respect to any property shall be treated as adequate security if—

''(i) it is a bond in an amount equal to the deferred tax amount under paragraph (2) for the property, or

''(ii) the taxpayer otherwise establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the security is adequate.

''(5) WAIVER OF CERTAIN RIGHTS.—No election may be made under paragraph (1) unless the taxpayer consents to the waiver of any right under any treaty of the United States which would preclude assessment or collection of any tax imposed by reason of this section.

''(6) ELECTIONS.—An election under paragraph (1) shall only apply to property described in the election and, once made, is irrevocable. An election may be made under paragraph (1) with respect to an interest in a trust with respect to which gain is required to be recognized under subsection (f)(1).

''(7) INTEREST.—For purposes of section 6601—

''(A) the last date for the payment of tax shall be determined without regard to the election under this subsection, and

''(B) section 6621(a)(2) shall be applied by substituting '5 percentage points' for '3 percentage points' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(c) COVERED EXPATRIATE.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term 'covered expatriate' means an expatriate.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—An individual shall not be treated as a covered expatriate if—

''(A) the individual—

''(i) became at birth a citizen of the United States and a citizen of another country and, as of the expatriation date, continues to be a citizen of, and is taxed as a resident of, such other country, and

''(ii) has not been a resident of the United States (as defined in section 7701(b)(1)(A)(ii)) during the 5 taxable years ending with the taxable year during which the expatriation date occurs, or

''(B)(i) the individual's relinquishment of United States citizenship occurs before such individual attains age 18½, and

''(ii) the individual has been a resident of the United States (as so defined) for not more than 5 taxable years before the date of relinquishment.

''(d) EXEMPT PROPERTY; SPECIAL RULES FOR PENSION PLANS.—

''(1) EXEMPT PROPERTY.—This section shall not apply to the following:

''(A) UNITED STATES REAL PROPERTY INTERESTS.—Any United States real property interest (as defined in section 897(c)(1)), other than stock of a United States real property holding corporation which does not, on the day before the expatriation date, meet the requirements of section 897(c)(2).

''(B) SPECIFIED PROPERTY.—Any property or interest in property not described in subparagraph (A) which the Secretary specifies in regulations.

''(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN RETIREMENT PLANS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a covered expatriate holds on the day before the expatriation date any interest in a retirement plan to which this paragraph applies—

''(i) such interest shall not be treated as sold for purposes of subsection (a)(1), but

''(ii) an amount equal to the present value of the expatriate's nonforfeitable accrued benefit shall be treated as having been received by such individual on such date as a distribution under the plan.

''(B) TREATMENT OF SUBSEQUENT DISTRIBUTIONS.—In the case of any distribution on or after the expatriation date to or on behalf of the covered expatriate from a plan from which the expatriate was treated as receiving a distribution under subparagraph (A), the amount otherwise includible in gross income by reason of the subsequent distribution shall be reduced by the excess of the amount includible in gross income under subparagraph (A) over any portion of such amount to which this subparagraph previously applied.

''(C) TREATMENT OF SUBSEQUENT DISTRIBUTIONS BY PLAN.—For purposes of this title, a retirement plan to which this paragraph applies, and any person acting on the plan's behalf, shall treat any subsequent distribution described in subparagraph (B) in the same manner as such distribution would be treated without regard to this paragraph.

''(D) APPLICABLE PLANS.—This paragraph shall apply to—

''(i) any qualified retirement plan (as defined in section 4974(c)),

''(ii) an eligible deferred compensation plan (as defined in section 457(b)) of an eligible employer described in section 457(e)(1)(A), and

''(iii) to the extent provided in regulations, any foreign pension plan or similar retirement arrangements or programs.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) EXPATRIATE.—The term 'expatriate' means—

''(A) any United States citizen who relinquishes citizenship, and

''(B) any long-term resident of the United States who—

''(i) ceases to be a lawful permanent resident of the United States (within the meaning of section 7701(b)(6)), or

''(ii) commences to be treated as a resident of a foreign country under the provisions of a tax treaty between the United States and the foreign country and who does not waive the benefits of such treaty applicable to residents of the foreign country.

''(2) EXPATRIATION DATE.—The term 'expatriation date' means—

''(A) the date an individual relinquishes United States citizenship, or

''(B) in the case of a long-term resident of the United States, the date of the event described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(B).

''(3) RELINQUISHMENT OF CITIZENSHIP.—A citizen shall be treated as relinquishing United States citizenship on the earliest of—

''(A) the date the individual renounces such individual's United States nationality before a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States pursuant to paragraph (5) of section 349(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1481(a)(5)),

''(B) the date the individual furnishes to the United States Department of State a signed statement of voluntary relinquishment of United States nationality confirming the performance of an act of expatriation specified in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of section 349(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1481(a)(1)–(4)),

''(C) the date the United States Department of State issues to the individual a certificate of loss of nationality, or

''(D) the date a court of the United States cancels a naturalized citizen's certificate of naturalization.

Subparagraph (A) or (B) shall not apply to any individual unless the renunciation or voluntary relinquishment is subsequently approved by the issuance to the individual of a certificate of loss of nationality by the United States Department of State.

''(4) LONG-TERM RESIDENT.—The term 'long-term resident' has the meaning given to such term by section 877(e)(2).

''(f) SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE TO BENEFICIARIES' INTERESTS IN TRUST.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), if an individual is determined under paragraph (3) to hold an interest in a trust on the day before the expatriation date—

''(A) the individual shall not be treated as having sold such interest,

''(B) such interest shall be treated as a separate share in the trust, and

''(C)(i) such separate share shall be treated as a separate trust consisting of the assets allocable to such share,

''(ii) the separate trust shall be treated as having sold its assets on the day before the expatriation date for their fair market value and as having distributed all of its assets to the individual as of such time, and

''(iii) the individual shall be treated as having recontributed the assets to the separate trust.

Subsection (a)(2) shall apply to any income, gain, or loss of the individual arising from a distribution described in subparagraph (C)(ii). In determining the amount of such distribution, proper adjustments shall be made for liabilities of the trust allocable to an individual's share in the trust.

''(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR INTERESTS IN QUALIFIED TRUSTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the trust interest described in paragraph (1) is an interest in a qualified trust—

''(i) paragraph (1) and subsection (a) shall not apply, and

''(ii) in addition to any other tax imposed by this title, there is hereby imposed on each distribution with respect to such interest a tax in the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

''(B) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be equal to the lesser of—

''(i) the highest rate of tax imposed by section 1(e) for the taxable year which includes the day before the expatriation date, multiplied by the amount of the distribution, or

''(ii) the balance in the deferred tax account immediately before the distribution determined without regard to any increases under subparagraph (C)(ii) after the 30th day preceding the distribution.

''(C) DEFERRED TAX ACCOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(ii)—

''(i) OPENING BALANCE.—The opening balance in a deferred tax account with respect to any trust interest is an amount equal to the tax which would have been imposed on the allocable expatriation gain with respect to the trust interest if such gain had been included in gross income under subsection (a).

''(ii) INCREASE FOR INTEREST.—The balance in the deferred tax account shall be increased by the amount of interest determined (on the balance in the account at the time the interest accrues), for periods after the 90th day after the expatriation date, by using the rates and method applicable under section 6621 for underpayments of tax for such periods, except that section 6621(a)(2) shall be applied by substituting '5 percentage points' for '3 percentage points' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(iii) DECREASE FOR TAXES PREVIOUSLY PAID.—The balance in the tax deferred account shall be reduced—

''(I) by the amount of taxes imposed by subparagraph (A) on any distribution to the person holding the trust interest, and

''(II) in the case of a person holding a nonvested interest, to the extent provided in regulations, by the amount of taxes imposed by subparagraph (A) on distributions from the trust with respect to nonvested interests not held by such person.

''(D) ALLOCABLE EXPATRIATION GAIN.—For purposes of this paragraph, the allocable expatriation gain with respect to any beneficiary's interest in a trust is the amount of gain which would be allocable to such beneficiary's vested and nonvested interests in the trust if the beneficiary held directly all assets allocable to such interests.

''(E) TAX DEDUCTED AND WITHHELD.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be deducted and withheld by the trustees from the distribution to which it relates.

''(ii) EXCEPTION WHERE FAILURE TO WAIVE TREATY RIGHTS.—If an amount may not be deducted and withheld under clause (i) by reason of the distributee failing to waive any treaty right with respect to such distribution—

''(I) the tax imposed by subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be imposed on the trust and each trustee shall be personally liable for the amount of such tax, and

''(II) any other beneficiary of the trust shall be entitled to recover from the distributee the amount of such tax imposed on the other beneficiary.

''(F) DISPOSITION.—If a trust ceases to be a qualified trust at any time, a covered expatriate disposes of an interest in a qualified trust, or a covered expatriate holding an interest in a qualified trust dies, then, in lieu of the tax imposed by subparagraph (A)(ii), there is hereby imposed a tax equal to the lesser of—

''(i) the tax determined under paragraph (1) as if the day before the expatriation date were the date of such cessation, disposition, or death, whichever is applicable, or

''(ii) the balance in the tax deferred account immediately before such date.

Such tax shall be imposed on the trust and each trustee shall be personally liable for the amount of such tax and any other beneficiary of the trust shall be entitled to recover from the covered expatriate or the estate the amount of such tax imposed on the other beneficiary.

''(G) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) QUALIFIED TRUST.—The term 'qualified trust' means a trust which is described in section 7701(a)(30)(E).

''(ii) VESTED INTEREST.—The term 'vested interest' means any interest which, as of the day before the expatriation date, is vested in the beneficiary.

''(iii) NONVESTED INTEREST.—The term 'nonvested interest' means, with respect to any beneficiary, any interest in a trust which is not a vested interest. Such interest shall be determined by assuming the maximum exercise of discretion in favor of the beneficiary and the occurrence of all contingencies in favor of the beneficiary.

''(iv) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary may provide for such adjustments to the bases of assets in a trust or a deferred tax account, and the timing of such adjustments, in order to ensure that gain is taxed only once.

''(v) COORDINATION WITH RETIREMENT PLAN RULES.—This subsection shall not apply to an interest in a trust which is part of a retirement plan to which subsection (d)(2) applies.

''(3) DETERMINATION OF BENEFICIARIES' INTEREST IN TRUST.—

''(A) DETERMINATIONS UNDER PARAGRAPH (1).—For purposes of paragraph (1), a beneficiary's interest in a trust shall be based upon all relevant facts and circumstances, including the terms of the trust instrument and any letter of wishes or similar document, historical patterns of trust distributions, and the existence of and functions performed by a trust protector or any similar adviser.

''(B) OTHER DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(i) CONSTRUCTIVE OWNERSHIP.—If a beneficiary of a trust is a corporation, partnership, trust, or estate, the shareholders, partners, or beneficiaries shall be deemed to be the trust beneficiaries for purposes of this section.

''(ii) TAXPAYER RETURN POSITION.—A taxpayer shall clearly indicate on its income tax return—

''(I) the methodology used to determine that taxpayer's trust interest under this section, and

''(II) if the taxpayer knows (or has reason to know) that any other beneficiary of such trust is using a different methodology to determine such beneficiary's trust interest under this section.

''(g) TERMINATION OF DEFERRALS, ETC.—In the case of any covered expatriate, notwithstanding any other provision of this title—

''(1) any period during which recognition of income or gain is deferred shall terminate on the day before the expatriation date, and

''(2) any extension of time for payment of tax shall cease to apply on the day before the expatriation date and the unpaid portion of such tax shall be due and payable at the time and in the manner prescribed by the Secretary.

''(h) IMPOSITION OF TENTATIVE TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If an individual is required to include any amount in gross income under subsection (a) for any taxable year, there is hereby imposed, immediately before the expatriation date, a tax in an amount equal to the amount of tax which would be imposed if the taxable year were a short taxable year ending on the expatriation date.

''(2) DUE DATE.—The due date for any tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall be the 90th day after the expatriation date.

''(3) TREATMENT OF TAX.—Any tax paid under paragraph (1) shall be treated as a payment of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year to which subsection (a) applies.

''(4) DEFERRAL OF TAX.—The provisions of subsection (b) shall apply to the tax imposed by this subsection to the extent attributable to gain includible in gross income by reason of this section.

''(i) SPECIAL LIENS FOR DEFERRED TAX AMOUNTS.—

''(1) IMPOSITION OF LIEN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a covered expatriate makes an election under subsection (a)(4) or (b) which results in the deferral of any tax imposed by reason of subsection (a), the deferred amount (including any interest, additional amount, addition to tax, assessable penalty, and costs attributable to the deferred amount) shall be a lien in favor of the United States on all property of the expatriate located in the United States (without regard to whether this section applies to the property).

''(B) DEFERRED AMOUNT.—For purposes of this subsection, the deferred amount is the amount of the increase in the covered expatriate's income tax which, but for the election under subsection (a)(4) or (b), would have occurred by reason of this section for the taxable year including the expatriation date.

''(2) PERIOD OF LIEN.—The lien imposed by this subsection shall arise on the expatriation date and continue until—

''(A) the liability for tax by reason of this section is satisfied or has become unenforceable by reason of lapse of time, or

''(B) it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that no further tax liability may arise by reason of this section.

''(3) CERTAIN RULES APPLY.—The rules set forth in paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) of section 6324A(d) shall apply with respect to the lien imposed by this subsection as if it were a lien imposed by section 6324A.

''(j) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.''.

(b) INCLUSION IN INCOME OF GIFTS AND BEQUESTS RECEIVED BY UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND RESIDENTS FROM EXPATRIATES.—Section 102 (relating to gifts, etc. not included in gross income) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) GIFTS AND INHERITANCES FROM COVERED EXPATRIATES.—

''(1) TREATMENT OF GIFTS AND INHERITANCES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not exclude from gross income the value of any property acquired by gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance from a covered expatriate after the expatriation date.

''(B) DETERMINATION OF BASIS.—Notwithstanding sections 1015 or 1022, the basis of any property described in subparagraph (A) in the hands of the donee or the person acquiring such property from the decedent shall be equal to the fair market value of the property at the time of the gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS FOR TRANSFERS OTHERWISE SUBJECT TO ESTATE OR GIFT TAX.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any property if either—

''(A) the gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance is—

''(i) shown on a timely filed return of tax imposed by chapter 12 as a taxable gift by the covered expatriate, or

''(ii) included in the gross estate of the covered expatriate for purposes of chapter 11 and shown on a timely filed return of tax imposed by chapter 11 of the estate of the covered expatriate, or

''(B) no such return was timely filed but no such return would have been required to be filed even if the covered expatriate were a citizen or long-term resident of the United States.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, any term used in this subsection which is also used in section 877A shall have the same meaning as when used in section 877A.''.

(c) DEFINITION OF TERMINATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—Section 7701(a) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(50) TERMINATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual shall not cease to be treated as a United States citizen before the date on which—

''(i) the individual's citizenship is treated as relinquished under section 877A(e)(3), and

''(ii) the individual provides a statement in accordance with section 6039G (if such a statement is otherwise required).

''(B) DUAL CITIZENS.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an individual who became at birth a citizen of the United States and a citizen of another country.''.

(d) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISA OR ADMISSION TO UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(a)(10)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(10)(E)) is amended to read as follows:

''(E) FORMER CITIZENS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH EXPATRIATION REVENUE PROVISIONS.—Any alien who is a former citizen of the United States who relinquishes United States citizenship (within the meaning of section 877A(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) and who is not in compliance with section 877A of such Code (relating to expatriation) is inadmissible.''.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 6103(l) (relating to disclosure of returns and return information for purposes other than tax administration) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(21) DISCLOSURE TO DENY VISA OR ADMISSION TO CERTAIN EXPATRIATES.—Upon written request of the Attorney General or the Attorney General's delegate, the Secretary shall disclose whether an individual is in compliance with section 877A (and if not in compliance, any items of noncompliance) to officers and employees of the Federal agency responsible for administering section 212(a)(10)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act solely for the purpose of, and to the extent necessary in, administering such section 212(a)(10)(E).''.

(B) SAFEGUARDS.—Section 6103(p)(4) (relating to safeguards) is amended by striking ''or (20)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(20), or (21)''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to individuals who relinquish United States citizenship on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 877 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply to an expatriate (as defined in section 877A(e)) whose expatriation date (as so defined) occurs on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection.''.

(2) Section 2107 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply to any expatriate subject to section 877A.''.

(3) Section 2501(a)(3) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) APPLICATION.—This paragraph shall not apply to any expatriate subject to section 877A.''.

(4) Section 6039G(a) is amended by inserting ''or 877A'' after ''section 877(b)''.

(5) The second sentence of section 6039G(d) is amended by inserting ''or who relinquishes United States citizenship (within the meaning of section 877A(e)(3))'' after ''section 877(a))''.

(6) Section 7701(n) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) APPLICATION.—This subsection shall not apply to any expatriate subject to section 877A.''.

(f) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part II of subchapter N of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 877 the following new item:

''Sec. 877A. Tax responsibilities of expatriation''.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to expatriates (within the meaning of section 877A(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section) whose expatriation date (as so defined) occurs on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) GIFTS AND BEQUESTS.—Section 102(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by subsection (b)) shall apply to gifts and bequests received on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, from an individual or the estate of an individual whose expatriation date (as so defined) occurs after such date.

(3) DUE DATE FOR TENTATIVE TAX.—The due date under section 877A(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section, shall in no event occur before the 90th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today Senators BAUCUS, GRASSLEY and I, along with other Finance Committee members, are introducing the Defenders of Freedom Tax Relief Act of 2007. Earlier in the year, Senator SMITH and I introduced the Active Duty Military Tax Relief Act of 2007, which would help those who are valiantly serving their country and the families that they leave behind.

The Defenders of Freedom on Tax Relief Act of 2007 includes several provisions from the Active Duty Military Tax Relief Act of 2007. It also includes additional provisions to help military families and veterans who often struggle financially.

The best definition of patriotism is keeping faith with those who wear the uniform of our country. That means giving our troops the resources they need to keep them safe while they are protecting us. And it means supporting our troops at home as well as abroad.

Currently, there are over 149,700 military personnel serving in Iraq. There are approximately 22,100 U.S. servicemembers in Afghanistan. Many of these men and women are reservists and have been called to active duty, frequently for multiple tours.

Most large businesses have the resources to provide supplemental income to reservist employees called up and to replace them with temporary employees. I applaud the businesses that have been able to pay supplemental income to their reservists, but

it is not easy for small businesses to do the same.

In January, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship held a hearing on veterans' small business issues. A majority of our veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan are Reserve and National Guard members—35 percent of whom are either self-employed or own or are employed by a small business.

We heard some disturbing statistics about the impact and unintended consequences the call up of reservists is having on small businesses. According to a January 2007 survey conducted by Workforce Management, 54 percent of the businesses surveyed responded that they would not hire a citizen soldier if they knew that they could be called up for an indeterminate amount of time. I am concerned that long call ups and redeployments have made it hard for small businesses to be supportive of civilian soldiers.

The Active Duty Military Tax Relief Act of 2007 provides a tax credit to small businesses to assist with the cost of paying the salary of their reservist employees when they are called to active duty. A similar provision is included in the Defenders of Freedom Tax Relief Act of 2007.

In addition to helping small businesses, the Active Duty Military Tax Relief Act of 2007 addresses concerns related to differential military pay, income tax withholding, and retirement plan participation. These provisions will make it easier for employers who would like to pay their employees supplemental income, above their military pay, and make pension contributions. Our legislation would make differential military pay subject to Federal income tax withholding. In addition, with respect to the retirement plan rules, the bill provides that a person receiving differential military pay would be treated as an employee of the employer making the payment, and allows the differential military pay to be treated as compensation. These provisions are included in the Defenders of Freedom Tax Relief Act of 2007.

The Active Duty Military Tax Relief Act of 2007 would make permanent the existing provision which allows taxpayer to include combat pay as earned income for purposes of the earned-income tax credit, EITC. Without this provision some military families would no longer be eligible to receive the EITC because combat pay is currently not taxable.

Last Congress, Senator SMITH and I introduced the Fallen Heroes Family Savings Act, which we have incorporated into the Active Duty Military Tax Relief Act. This provision provides tax relief for the death gratuity payment that is given to families who have lost a loved one in combat. This payment is currently $100,000.

Our current tax laws do not allow the recipients of this payment to use it to make contributions to tax-preferred saving accounts that help with saving for retirement. The Active Duty Military Tax Relief Act of 2007 would allow military death gratuities to be contributed to certain tax-preferred accounts. These contributions would be treated as qualified rollovers. A similar provision is included in the Defenders of Freedom Tax Relief Act of 2007.

Our service men and women need to know that we are honoring their valor by taking care of those they leave behind. Helping ease the tax burden on the death gratuity will enable military families to save more for retirement. These changes to our tax laws will help our military families with some of their financial burdens. It cannot repay the sacrifices they have made for us, but it is a small way we can support our troops and their families at home as well as abroad.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 1594. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to improve safety and security for especially hazardous cargoes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Maritime Hazardous Cargo Security Act of 2007 along with my colleagues Senators INOUYE, STEVENS, and SMITH. As the bipartisan leaders of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and its Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Safety, Security, and Infrastructure, we have been working together over the course of this session to evaluate the risks posed by the transportation of especially hazardous cargo in the maritime sector. This bill is the result of exhaustive research and consultation with affected industries and the Department of Homeland Security. Ships bringing liquefied natural gas, LNG, from foreign ports as well as the facilities along America's shores that handle LNG must be better secured against terrorism.

With so much focus on hazardous cargo that is transported on our roads and railways, we must not neglect the much larger shipments of hazardous cargoes that are carried by vessel. Energy supply challenges in our country have led to the proposals for approximately 70 new shoreside facilities in the United States to receive liquefied natural gas via oceangoing tank vessel. Many of the safety and security risks of the transportation of this commodity are known and have been detailed by the Government Accountability Office. Furthermore, other chemicals and petrochemicals can present even greater security risks.

The shipping system for these commodities is international in scope, so our bill would require the administration to work with our international trading partners to develop standards of care to adequately protect those ships, facilities, employees and nearby communities and residents from attacks involving these and other hazardous cargoes. Our proposal would require significant steps to protect the safety and security of our regional and national economies, and the public health, from the potential hazards of high risk cargo transported by ship.

Specifically the Maritime Hazardous Cargo Act of 2007 would: Direct the Administration to work with international partners to develop standards and procedures for the safe and secure handling of especially hazardous cargoes, EHC, for all vessels and port facilities; require successful completion of U.S. Coast Guard Incident Command System, ICS, training for all personnel responsible for the safety and security of a vessel in port; require the Department of Homeland Security to develop regional response and recovery plans for the resumption of commerce after disruption by a security incident; authorize the U.S. Coast Guard to develop cost share plans for security costs associated with high-risk U.S. facilities; authorize assistance to foreign ports that handle and transport EHC's for the purpose of complying with or exceeding current International Ship and Port Facility Code, ISPFC, standards; authorize voluntary third party validation of international port facilities to certify they meet or exceed international safety standards; and require the U.S. Coast Guard to develop a resource allocation plan to show how its proposed budget will be used for EHC security operations and to report to Congress biannually.

In summary, the Maritime Hazardous Cargo Act of 2007 will require strengthening of Federal protections against terrorist attacks on facilities and vessels that transport, handle, and store especially hazardous cargoes, EHC's. The transportation of EHC's by ship can pose a significant risk to the public safety and the economic security of the Nation, particularly the transportation of chemicals and petrochemicals such as anhydrous ammonia, ammonium nitrate, chlorine, liquefied natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas. Currently, no international standards exist for the safe and secure handling of these chemicals/petrochemicals by ship and limited U.S. Coast Guard resources for EHC security poses a dangerous risk to our communities. Further, I intend to work with my cosponsors and other colleagues to ensure there are sufficient resources in the Federal budget to carry out the provisions of the bill.

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. 1594

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Maritime Hazardous Cargo Security Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. International committee for the safe and secure transportation of especially hazardous cargo.
Sec. 3. Validation of compliance with ISPFC standards.
Sec. 4. Safety and security assistance for foreign ports.
Sec. 5. Coast Guard port assistance program.
Sec. 6. EHC facility risk-based cost sharing.
Sec. 7. Transportation security incident mitigation plan.
Sec. 8. Coast Guard national resource allocation plan.
Sec. 9. Incident command system training.
Sec. 10. Conveyance of certain National Defense Reserve Fleet Vessels.
Sec. 11. Pre-positioning interoperable communications equipment at interagency operational centers.
Sec. 12. Definitions.

SEC. 2. INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE SAFE AND SECURE TRANSPORTATION OF ESPECIALLY HAZARDOUS CARGO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 701 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 70109 the following:

"§ 70109A. International committee for the safe and secure transportation of especially hazardous cargo

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and other appropriate entities, shall, in a manner consistent with international treaties, conventions, and agreements to which the United States is a party, establish a committee that includes representatives of United States trading partners that supply tank or break-bulk shipments of especially hazardous cargo to the United States.

''(b) SAFE AND SECURE LOADING, UNLOADING, AND TRANSPORTATION OF ESPECIALLY HAZARDOUS CARGOES.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary, in cooperation with the International Maritime Organization and in consultation with the International Standards Organization and shipping industry stakeholders, shall develop protocols, procedures, standards, and requirements for receiving, handling, loading, unloading, vessel crewing, and transportation of especially hazardous cargo to promote the safe and secure operation of ports, facilities, and vessels that transport especially hazardous cargo to the United States.

''(c) DEADLINES.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) initiate the development of the committee within 180 days after the date of enactment of the Maritime Hazardous Cargo Security Act; and

''(2) endeavor to have the protocols, procedures, standards, and requirements developed by the committee take effect within 3 years after the date of enactment of that Act.

''(d) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall report annually to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security on the development, implementation, and administration of the protocols, procedures, standards, and requirements developed by the committee established under subsection (a).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 701 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating the section 70109 the following:

''70109A. International committee for the safe and secure transportation of especially hazardous cargo''.

SEC. 3. VALIDATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH ISPFC STANDARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 701 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 70110 the following:

"70110A. Port safety and security validations

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall, in a manner consistent with international treaties, conventions, and agreements to which the United States is a party, develop and implement a voluntary program under which foreign ports and facilities can certify their compliance with applicable International Ship and Port Facility Code standards.

''(b) THIRD-PARTY VALIDATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary, in cooperation with the International Maritime Organization and the International Standards Organization, shall develop and implement a program under which independent, third-party entities are certified to validate a foreign port's or facility's compliance under the program developed under subsection (a).

''(2) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—The international program shall include—

''(A) international inspection protocols and procedures;

''(B) minimum validation standards to ensure a port or facility meets the applicable International Ship and Port Facility Code standards;

''(C) recognition for foreign ports or facilities that exceed the minimum standards;

''(D) uniform performance metrics by which inspection validations are to be conducted;

''(E) a process for notifying a port or facility, and its host nation, of areas of concern about the port's or facility's failure to comply with International Ship and Port Facility Code standards;

''(F) provisional or probationary validations;

''(G) conditions under which routine monitoring is to occur if a port or facility receives a provisional or probationary validation;

''(H) a process by which failed validations can be appealed; and

''(I) an appropriate cycle for re-inspection and validation.

''(c) CERTIFICATION OF THIRD PARTY ENTITIES.—The Secretary may not certify a third party entity to validate ports or facilities under subsection (b) unless—

''(1) the entity demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary the ability to perform validations in accordance with the standards, protocols, procedures, and requirements established by the program implemented under subsection (a); and

''(2) the entity has no beneficial interest in or any direct control over the port and facilities being inspected and validated.

''(d) MONITORING—The Secretary shall regularly monitor and audit the operations of each third party entity conducting validations under this section to ensure that it is meeting the minimum standards, operating protocols, procedures, and requirements established by international agreement.

''(e) REVOCATION.—The Secretary shall revoke the certification of any entity determined by the Secretary not to meet the minimum standards, operating protocol, procedures, and requirements established by international agreement for third party entity validations.

''(f) PROTECTION OF SECURITY AND PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall take appropriate actions to protect from disclosure information that—

''(1) is security sensitive, proprietary, or business sensitive; or

''(2) is otherwise not appropriately in the public domain.

''(g) DEADLINES.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) initiate procedures to carry out this section within 180 days after the date of enactment of the Maritime Hazardous Cargo Security Act; and

''(2) develop standards under subsection (b) for third party validation within 2 years after the date of enactment of that Act.

''(h) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall report annually to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security on activities conducted pursuant to this section.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 701 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 70110 the following:

''70110A. Port safety and security validations''.

SEC. 4. SAFETY AND SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR FOREIGN PORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 70110(e)(1) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''The Secretary shall establish a strategic plan to utilize those assistance programs to assist ports and facilities that are found by the Secretary under subsection (a) not to maintain effective antiterrorism measures in the implementation of port security antiterrorism measures.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 70110 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting ''**or facilities**'' after ''**ports**'' in the section heading;

(B) by inserting ''or facility'' after ''port'' each place it appears; and

(C) by striking ''PORTS'' in the heading for subsection (e) and inserting ''PORTS, FACILITIES,''.

(2) The chapter analysis for chapter 701 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 70110 and inserting the following:

''70110. Actions and assistance for foreign ports or facilities and United States territories''.

SEC. 5. COAST GUARD PORT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 70110 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''(f) COAST GUARD LEND-LEASE ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may lend, lease, or otherwise provide equipment, and provide technical training and support, to the owner or operator of a foreign port or facility—

''(A) to assist in bringing the port or facility into compliance with applicable International Ship and Port Facility Code standards;

''(B) to assist the port or facility in meeting standards established under section 70109A of this chapter; and

''(C) to assist the port or facility in exceeding the standards described in subparagraph (A) and (B).

''(2) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary—

''(A) shall provide such assistance based upon an assessment of the risks to the security of the United States and the inability of the owner or operator of the port or facility otherwise to bring the port or facility into compliance with those standards and to maintain compliance with them; but

''(B) may not provide such assistance unless the facility or port has been subjected to a comprehensive port security assessment by

the Coast Guard or a third party entity certified by the Secretary under section 70110A(b) to validate foreign port or facility compliance with International Ship and Port Facility Code standards.

''(3) DEADLINE.—The Secretary shall identify ports and facilities that qualify for assistance under this subsection within 180 days after the date of enactment of the Maritime Hazardous Cargo Security Act.

''(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.''.

SEC. 6. EHC FACILITY RISK-BASED COST SHARING.

The Commandant shall identify facilities sited or constructed on or adjacent to the navigable waters of the United States that receive, handle, load, or unload especially hazardous cargos that pose a risk greater than an acceptable risk threshhold, as determined by the Secretary under a uniform risk assessment methodology. The Secretary may establish a security cost-share plan to assist the Coast Guard in providing security for the transportation of especially hazardous cargo to such facilities.

SEC. 7. TRANSPORTATION SECURITY INCIDENT MITIGATION PLAN.

Section 70103(b)(2) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) through (G) as subparagraphs (F) through (H), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

''(E) establish regional response and recovery protocols to prepare for, respond to, mitigate against, and recover from a transportation security incident consistent with section 202 of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 942) and section 70103(a) of title 46, United States Code;''.

SEC. 8. COAST GUARD NATIONAL RESOURCE ALLOCATION PLAN.

The Commandant shall develop a national resource allocation plan for Coast Guard assets and resources necessary to meet safety and security requirements associated with receiving, handling, and loading especially hazardous cargo at United States ports and facilities, taking into account the Coast Guard assets and resources necessary to execute other Coast Guard missions. The Secretary shall submit the plan to the Congress at the same time as the President submits the Budget of the United States for fiscal year 2009, together with an estimate of the operational and capital costs required to assure an acceptable level of safety and security under the plan.

SEC. 9. INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM TRAINING.

The Secretary shall ensure that Federal, State, and local personnel responsible for the safety and security of vessels in port carrying especially hazardous cargo have successfully completed training in the Coast Guard's incident command system.

SEC. 10. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE FLEET VESSELS.

Section 57102 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''vessel or sell the vessel for cash.'' in subsection (a) and inserting ''vessel, sell the vessel for cash, or convey the vessel under subsection (c) to the owner or operator of a port.''; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

''(c) CONVEYANCE TO PORT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Maritime Administration, may convey a vessel described in subsection (a) to the owner or operator of a United States or foreign port—

''(1) for use in safety or security operations at that port;

''(2) with or without compensation; and

''(3) subject to such limitations on its use and further disposition as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.''.

SEC. 11. PRE-POSITIONING INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AT INTERAGENCY OPERATIONAL CENTERS.

Section 70107A of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) DEPLOYMENT OF INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AT INTERAGENCY OPERATIONAL CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that interoperable communications technology is deployed at all interagency operational centers established under subsection (a).

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider the continuing technological evolution of communications technologies and devices, with its implicit risk of obsolescence, and shall ensure, to the maximum extent feasible, that a substantial part of the technology deployed involves prenegotiated contracts and other arrangements for rapid deployment of equipment, supplies, and systems rather than the warehousing or storage of equipment and supplies currently available at the time the technology is deployed.

''(3) REQUIREMENTS AND CHARACTERISTICS.—The interoperable communications technology deployed under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) be capable of re-establishing communications when existing infrastructure is damaged or destroyed in an emergency or a major disaster;

''(B) include appropriate current, widely-used equipment, such as Land Mobile Radio Systems, cellular telephones and satellite equipment, Cells-On-Wheels, Cells-On-Light-Trucks, or other self-contained mobile cell sites that can be towed, backup batteries, generators, fuel, and computers;

''(C) include contracts (including prenegotiated contracts) for rapid delivery of the most current technology available from commercial sources;

''(D) include arrangements for training to ensure that personnel are familiar with the operation of the equipment and devices to be delivered pursuant to such contracts; and

''(E) be utilized as appropriate during live area exercises conducted by the United States Coast Guard.

''(4) ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS.—Portions of the communications technology deployed under paragraph (1) may be virtual and may include items donated on an in-kind contribution basis.

''(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed or interpreted to preclude the use of funds under this section by the Secretary for interim or long-term Internet Protocol-based interoperable solutions, notwithstanding compliance with the Project 25 standard.''.

SEC. 12. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COMMANDANT.—The term ''Commandant'' means the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

(2) ESPECIALLY HAZARDOUS CARGO.—The term ''especially hazardous cargo'' means anhydrous ammonia, ammonium nitrate, chlorine, liquefied natural gas, liquefied petroleum gas, and any other substance identified by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating as especially hazardous cargo.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1595. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide flexibility in the manner in which beds are counted for purposes of determining whether a hospital may be designated as a critical access hospital under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined today by my colleague Senator WYDEN, to introduce this important piece of legislation for America's rural hospitals. Our legislation will work to ensure that hospitals in under-served areas, including those in our home State of Oregon, have the flexibility they need to provide care to their communities.

The Critical Access Hospital program, CAH, is an important safety net that ensures that communities have access to health care services in rural areas such as my hometown of Pendleton, OR. Hundreds of hospitals across the United States operate under a CAH designation, 25 of which are in Oregon. In order to obtain this designation, certain requirements, such as being located more than 35 miles from any other hospital, or receiving certification by the state to be a ''necessary provider.'' CAH's also must provide 24-hour emergency care services 7 days a week.

One requirement, however, the 25-patient bed limit, has proven to be too constricting for facilities during times of unexpected, increased need, such as during an influenza outbreak or an influx of tourism to the community.

Leadership for Oregon hospitals have expressed to me that these rules could lead to severe patient safety issues. As hospitals reach their 25-bed capacity, they could be forced to divert those in need of care to a hospital much farther from their home and families. Alternatively, should these small hospitals take the patient in they put themselves at risk of losing their important CAH status. Loss of such status could cause the closing of the facility altogether.

Access to health care remains an issue in our Nation and this bill is one small way in which we can work to ensure that rural hospital doors remain open for millions of Americans living in communities who depend on CAH's for their medical care. This bill will provide the flexibility necessary for a CAH to choose to meet either the 25-bed-per day limit or a limit of 20-beds-per-day averaged throughout the year. Therefore, during a time of surge, they can care for more patients in need even if the hospital would exceed the use of 25 beds, which they could not do under current law. However, our bill ensures that during times of non-surge these hospitals are meeting the requirements under law that make them a CAH. This new yearly average is set lower than the daily limit to ensure that we are not expanding this program.

We believe that this simple tweak in the current law is critically important

to keeping our rural hospitals open and their communities' health care needs served. I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill, and I look forward to working with Chairman BAUCUS and other members of the Finance Committee to secure passage of this important bill.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1597. 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 Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today a bill that would go a long way toward ensuring that Federal contracting remains a process of equal opportunity and open competition. Specifically, my legislation would prohibit the practice of attaching restrictive union-only project labor agreements, or PLAs, to Federal contracts.

In short, any contractor or subcontractor who is bidding on a construction project that includes a union-only PLA must agree to recognize unions as the representatives of the employees on that job; use the union hiring hall to obtain workers and apprentices; pay union wages and benefits; and follow the union's restrictive rules, job classifications, and arbitration procedures.

These restrictions would apply at the expense of a contractor's or subcontractor's usual team of workers. They would apply in States that may have low numbers of unionized construction workers, even if it meant denying jobs to local, in-State workers and required bringing in employees from out of State. Finally, the restrictions in a union-only PLA would apply even though only 13 percent of our private construction workforce belongs to a construction labor union, and therefore effectively locking out almost nine of every 10 able, qualified workers.

In my home State of Louisiana, just 7.4 percent of private construction workers belong to a construction labor union. Yet, for example, if union-only PLAs are attached to the Federal construction projects helping rebuild Louisiana after the devastation of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, Louisianans will be locked out of this important rebuilding process, making it difficult to find work and earn a decent wage; the same jobs and wages that would enable Louisiana families to return to the hurricane-affected areas and rebuild their lives in these communities. Yet, instead of enabling local folks and businesses to come together and participate in their community's renewal, PLAs will ensure that these valuable jobs will go to just a select few, mostly out-of-State union workers. It is inexcusable that local Louisiana firms and their workers would be barred from freely bidding on construction projects in their own town or parish. And this is just one example of the harmful consequences associated with PLAs.

In sum, the Federal Government should not be in the business of taking taxpayers' money to fund projects that exclude more than four out of five workers, making these projects discriminatory, anticompetitive, and unnecessarily expensive. At the very least, taxpayers should be able to bid and work on projects that they are funding with their own hard-earned dollars. Construction workers should have the opportunity to work on projects that benefit their own communities regardless of their union affiliation. The Federal Government should maintain a neutral position and encourage full and open competition in the Federal contracting process.

Contracts should be awarded based on sound, commonsense criteria, such as quality of work, experience, and cost. Union affiliation has no place within the criteria for considering a contract bid. The best bid, by the most qualified contractor or subcontractor, should always be the winning bid.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and to oppose attempts to attach union-only project labor agreements to Federal projects.

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. 1597

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 ''Government Neutrality in Contracting Act''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

It is the purpose of this Act to—

(1) promote and ensure open competition on Federal and federally funded or assisted construction projects;

(2) maintain Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded or assisted construction projects;

(3) reduce construction costs to the Federal Government and to the taxpayers;

(4) expand job opportunities, especially for small and disadvantaged businesses; and

(5) prevent discrimination against Federal Government contractors or their employees based upon labor affiliation or the lack thereof, thereby promoting the economical, nondiscriminatory, and efficient administration and completion of Federal and federally funded or assisted construction projects.

SEC. 3. PRESERVATION OF OPEN COMPETITION AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NEUTRALITY.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—The head of each executive agency that awards any construction contract after the date of enactment of this Act, or that obligates funds pursuant to such a contract, shall ensure that the agency, and any construction manager acting on behalf of the Federal Government with respect to such contract, in its bid specifications, project agreements, or other controlling documents does not—

(A) require or prohibit a bidder, offeror, contractor, or subcontractor from entering into, or adhering to, agreements with 1 or more labor organization, with respect to that construction project or another related construction project; or

(B) otherwise discriminate against a bidder, offeror, contractor, or subcontractor because such bidder, offeror, contractor, or subcontractor—

(i) became a signatory, or otherwise adhered to, an agreement with 1 or more labor organization with respect to that construction project or another related construction project; or

(ii) refused to become a signatory, or otherwise adhere to, an agreement with 1 or more labor organization with respect to that construction project or another related construction project.

(2) APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION.—The provisions of this section shall not apply to contracts awarded prior to the date of enactment of this Act, and subcontracts awarded pursuant to such contracts regardless of the date of such subcontracts.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to prohibit a contractor or subcontractor from voluntarily entering into an agreement described in such paragraph.

(b) RECIPIENTS OF GRANTS AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.—The head of each executive agency that awards grants, provides financial assistance, or enters into cooperative agreements for construction projects after the date of enactment of this Act, shall ensure that—

(1) the bid specifications, project agreements, or other controlling documents for such construction projects of a recipient of a grant or financial assistance, or by the parties to a cooperative agreement, do not contain any of the requirements or prohibitions described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1); or

(2) the bid specifications, project agreements, or other controlling documents for such construction projects of a construction manager acting on behalf of a recipient or party described in paragraph (1), do not contain any of the requirements or prohibitions described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1).

(c) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—If an executive agency, a recipient of a grant or financial assistance from an executive agency, a party to a cooperative agreement with an executive agency, or a construction manager acting on behalf of such an agency, recipient or party, fails to comply with subsection (a) or (b), the head of the executive agency awarding the contract, grant, or assistance, or entering into the agreement, involved shall take such action, consistent with law, as the head of the agency determines to be appropriate.

(d) EXEMPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may exempt a particular project, contract, subcontract, grant, or cooperative agreement from the requirements of 1 or more of the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) if the head of such agency determines that special circumstances exist that require an exemption in order to avert an imminent threat to public health or safety or to serve the national security.

(2) SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a finding of ''special circumstances'' may not be based on the possibility or existence of a labor dispute concerning contractors or subcontractors that are nonsignatories to, or that otherwise do not adhere to, agreements with 1 or more labor organization, or labor disputes concerning employees on the project who are not members of, or affiliated with, a labor organization.

(3) ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.—The head of an executive agency, upon application of an awarding authority, a recipient of grants or financial assistance, a party to a cooperative agreement, or a construction manager acting on behalf of any of such entities, may exempt a particular project from the requirements of any or all of the provisions of subsections (a) or (c), if the agency head finds—

(A) that the awarding authority, recipient of grants or financial assistance, party to a cooperative agreement, or construction manager acting on behalf of any of such entities had issued or was a party to, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, bid specifications, project agreements, agreements with one or more labor organizations, or other controlling documents with respect to that particular project, which contained any of the requirements or prohibitions set forth in subsection (a)(1); and

(B) that one or more construction contracts subject to such requirements or prohibitions had been awarded as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATORY COUNCIL.—With respect to Federal contracts to which this section applies, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall take appropriate action to amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation to implement the provisions of this section.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT.—The term ''construction contract'' means any contract for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, extension, or repair of buildings, highways, or other improvements to real property.

(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given such term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, except that such term shall not include the Government Accountability Office.

(3) LABOR ORGANIZATION.—The term ''labor organization'' has the meaning given such term in section 701(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(d)).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 231—RECOGNIZING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT HISTORY SHOULD BE REGARDED AS A MEANS FOR UNDERSTANDING THE PAST AND SOLVING THE CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. REID, Mr. OBAMA, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWNBACK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 231

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the United States, and in particular the Southwestern States, for more than 2 years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as ''Juneteenth Independence Day'', as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas African Americans from the Southwest continue the tradition of celebrating Juneteenth Independence Day as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas, for more than 140 years, Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas, although Juneteenth Independence Day is beginning to be recognized as a national, and even global, event, the history behind the celebration should not be forgotten; and

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation;

(B) supports the continued celebration of Juneteenth Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to understand better the experiences that have shaped the Nation; and

(C) encourages the people of the United States to observe Juneteenth Independence Day with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future; and

(B) the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today Senator LEVIN and I are introducing a resolution recognizing the historic Juneteenth Independence Day. June 19 is an ordinary day for many Americans but is a significant day for those who know its history. Juneteenth Independence Day celebrates June 19, 1865, when Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free.

Americans across the United States continue the tradition of celebrating Juneteenth Independence Day as an inspiration and encouragement for future generations. This legislation recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day and supports its continued celebration as an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to understand more fully the experiences that have shaped our nation.

As Americans, we must remember the lessons learned from slavery. Juneteenth is a day that all Americans, of all races, creeds and ethnic backgrounds, can celebrate freedom and the end of slavery in the United States. Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to recognize historic Juneteenth Independence Day and support this important resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 232—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER MEN'S CROSS COUNTRY TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2006 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I MEN'S CROSS COUNTRY CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 232

Whereas, on November 20, 2006, the University of Colorado at Boulder men's cross country team (referred to in this preamble as the ''Colorado Buffaloes'') won the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Men's Cross Country National Championship in Terre Haute, Indiana;

Whereas the Colorado Buffaloes team of junior Brent Vaughn, junior Stephen Pifer, senior Erik Heinonen, junior James Strang, and senior Billy Nelson won the NCAA Cross Country Championships with a score of 94, which was 48 points ahead of their nearest opponent;

Whereas this championship is the Colorado Buffaloes men's cross country team's 3rd national championship and also their 3rd championship in 6 years;

Whereas the Colorado Buffaloes won the Big 12 Conference Championship for the 11th consecutive year and the NCAA Mountain Region Championship for the 4th consecutive year in 2006;

Whereas senior Erik Heinonen and junior Brent Vaughn were named to the United States Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA) All-Academic Men's Team;

Whereas Colorado Buffaloes Head Coach Mark Wetmore was named USTFCCCA Men's Cross Country Coach of the Year for 2006;

Whereas Colorado Buffaloes Head Coach Mark Wetmore has successfully coached the University of Colorado men's and women's cross country teams to top 10 finishes in all of his 12 years as head coach; and

Whereas this championship marks the 23rd national title in the University of Colorado's athletic history and the 2nd championship of 2006: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) Congratulates the University of Colorado men's cross country team, the Colorado Buffaloes, for winning the 2006 NCAA Division I Men's Cross Country Championship;

(2) Recognizes the achievements of all the players, coaches, students, and support staff whose dedication was instrumental in helping the Colorado Buffaloes win the 2006 NCAA Division I Men's Cross Country Championship; and

(3) Respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit copies of this resolution to the following for appropriate display—

(A) The University of Colorado at Boulder;

(B) The President of the University of Colorado, Hank Brown;

(C) The Chancellor of the University of Colorado at Boulder, Dr. G.P. ''Bud'' Peterson;

(D) The Athletic Director of the University of Colorado at Boulder, Mike Bohn; and

(E) The Head Coach of The University of Colorado at Boulder men's cross country team, Mark Wetmore.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1505. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. THUNE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes.

SA 1506. Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1507. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. TESTER) 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 1508. Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Mr. KOHL, Mr. REED, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. NELSON, of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes.

SA 1509. Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table .

SA 1510. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1511. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1512. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1513. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. STEVENS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1514. Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1515. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. SALAZAR) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra.

SA 1516. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1517. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1518. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1519. Mr. KOHL (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BIDEN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1520. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1521. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1522. Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1523. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1524. Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON, of Nebraska, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KERRY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TESTER, Ms . CANTWELL, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1525. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1526. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1527. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1505. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. THUNE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VIII—GAS PRICE ACT

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Gas Petroleum Refiner Improvement and Community Empowerment Act'' or ''Gas PRICE Act''.

SEC. 802. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) COAL-TO-LIQUID.—The term ''coal-to-liquid'' means—

(A) with respect to a process or technology, the use of a feedstock, the majority of which is derived from the coal resources of the United States, using the class of reactions known as Fischer-Tropsch, to produce synthetic fuel suitable for transportation; and

(B) with respect to a facility, the portion of a facility related to producing the inputs for the Fischer-Tropsch process, or the finished fuel from the Fischer-Tropsch process, using a feedstock that is primarily domestic coal at the Fischer-Tropsch facility.

(3) DOMESTIC FUELS FACILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''domestic fuels facility'' means—

(i) a coal liquification or coal-to-liquid facility at which coal is processed into synthetic crude oil or any other transportation fuel;

(ii) a facility that produces a renewable fuel (as defined in section 211(o)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1))); and

(iii) a facility at which crude oil is refined into transportation fuel or other petroleum products.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term ''domestic fuels facility'' includes a domestic fuels facility expansion.

(4) DOMESTIC FUELS FACILITY EXPANSION.—The term ''domestic fuels facility expansion'' means a physical change in a domestic fuels facility that results in an increase in the capacity of the domestic fuels facility.

(5) DOMESTIC FUELS FACILITY PERMITTING AGREEMENT.—The term ''domestic fuels facility permitting agreement'' means an agreement entered into between the Administrator and a State or Indian tribe under subsection (b).

(6) DOMESTIC FUELS PRODUCER.—The term ''domestic fuels producer'' means an individual or entity that—

(A) owns or operates a domestic fuels facility; or

(B) seeks to become an owner or operator of a domestic fuels facility.

(7) INDIAN LAND.—The term ''Indian land'' has the meaning given the term ''Indian lands'' in section 3 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4302).

(8) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(9) PERMIT.—The term ''permit'' means any permit, license, approval, variance, or other form of authorization that a refiner is required to obtain—

(A) under any Federal law; or

(B) from a State or Indian tribal government agency delegated with authority by the Federal Government, or authorized under Federal law to issue permits.

(10) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

(11) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

Subtitle A—Collaborative Permitting Process for Domestic Fuels Facilities

SEC. 811. COLLABORATIVE PERMITTING PROCESS FOR DOMESTIC FUELS FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the Governor of a State or the governing body of an Indian tribe, the Administrator shall enter into a domestic fuels facility permitting agreement with the State or Indian tribe under which the process for obtaining all permits necessary for the construction and operation of a domestic fuels facility shall be improved using a systematic interdisciplinary multimedia approach as provided in this section.

(b) AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR.—Under a domestic fuels facility permitting agreement—

(1) the Administrator shall have authority, as applicable and necessary, to—

(A) accept from a refiner a consolidated application for all permits that the domestic fuels producer is required to obtain to construct and operate a domestic fuels facility;

(B) establish a schedule under which each Federal, State, or Indian tribal government agency that is required to make any determination to authorize the issuance of a permit shall—

(i) concurrently consider, to the maximum extent practicable, each determination to be made; and

(ii) complete each step in the permitting process; and

(C) issue a consolidated permit that combines all permits that the domestic fuels producer is required to obtain; and

(2) the Administrator shall provide to State and Indian tribal government agencies—

(A) financial assistance in such amounts as the agencies reasonably require to hire such additional personnel as are necessary to enable the government agencies to comply with the applicable schedule established under paragraph (1)(B); and

(B) technical, legal, and other assistance in complying with the domestic fuels facility permitting agreement.

(c) AGREEMENT BY THE STATE.—Under a domestic fuels facility permitting agreement, a State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall agree that—

(1) the Administrator shall have each of the authorities described in subsection (b); and

(2) each State or Indian tribal government agency shall—

(A) make such structural and operational changes in the agencies as are necessary to enable the agencies to carry out consolidated project-wide permit reviews concurrently and in coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency and other Federal agencies; and

(B) comply, to the maximum extent practicable, with the applicable schedule established under subsection (b)(1)(B).

(d) INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator and a State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall incorporate an interdisciplinary approach, to the maximum extent practicable, in the development, review, and approval of domestic fuels facility permits subject to this section.

(2) OPTIONS.—Among other options, the interdisciplinary approach may include use of—

(A) environmental management practices; and

(B) third party contractors.

(e) DEADLINES.—

(1) NEW DOMESTIC FUELS FACILITIES.—In the case of a consolidated permit for the construction of a new domestic fuels facility, the Administrator and the State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall approve or disapprove the consolidated permit not later than—

(A) 360 days after the date of the receipt of the administratively complete application for the consolidated permit; or

(B) on agreement of the applicant, the Administrator, and the State or governing body of the Indian tribe, 90 days after the expiration of the deadline established under subparagraph (A).

(2) EXPANSION OF EXISTING DOMESTIC FUELS FACILITIES.—In the case of a consolidated permit for the expansion of an existing domestic fuels facility, the Administrator and the State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall approve or disapprove the consolidated permit not later than—

(A) 120 days after the date of the receipt of the administratively complete application for the consolidated permit; or

(B) on agreement of the applicant, the Administrator, and the State or governing body of the Indian tribe, 30 days after the expiration of the deadline established under subparagraph (A).

(f) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Each Federal agency that is required to make any determination to authorize the issuance of a permit shall comply with the applicable schedule established under subsection (b)(1)(B).

(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any civil action for review of any determination of any Federal, State, or Indian tribal government agency in a permitting process conducted under a domestic fuels facility permitting agreement brought by any individual or entity shall be brought exclusively in the United States district court for the district in which the domestic fuels facility is located or proposed to be located.

(h) EFFICIENT PERMIT REVIEW.—In order to reduce the duplication of procedures, the Administrator shall use State permitting and monitoring procedures to satisfy substantially equivalent Federal requirements under this section.

(i) SEVERABILITY.—If 1 or more permits that are required for the construction or operation of a domestic fuels facility are not approved on or before any deadline established under subsection (e), the Administrator may issue a consolidated permit that combines all other permits that the domestic fuels producer is required to obtain other than any permits that are not approved.

(j) SAVINGS.—Nothing in this section affects the operation or implementation of otherwise applicable law regarding permits necessary for the construction and operation of a domestic fuels facility.

(k) CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—Congress encourages the Administrator, States, and tribal governments to consult, to the maximum extent practicable, with local governments in carrying out this section.

(l) EFFECT ON LOCAL AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section affects—

(1) the authority of a local government with respect to the issuance of permits; or

(2) any requirement or ordinance of a local government (such as zoning regulations).

Subtitle B—Environmental Analysis of Fischer-Tropsch Fuels

SEC. 821. EVALUATION OF FISCHER-TROPSCH DIESEL AND JET FUEL AS AN EMISSION CONTROL STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In cooperation with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Secretary of Health and Human Services, and Fischer-Tropsch industry representatives, the Administrator shall—

(1) conduct a research and demonstration program to evaluate the air quality benefits of ultra-clean Fischer-Tropsch transportation fuel, including diesel and jet fuel;

(2) evaluate the use of ultra-clean Fischer-Tropsch transportation fuel as a mechanism for reducing engine exhaust emissions; and

(3) submit recommendations to Congress on the most effective use and associated benefits of these ultra-clean fuels for reducing public exposure to exhaust emissions.

(b) GUIDANCE AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT.—The Administrator shall, to the extent necessary, issue any guidance or technical support documents that would facilitate the effective use and associated benefit of Fischer-Tropsch fuel and blends.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The program described in subsection (a) shall consider—

(1) the use of neat (100 percent) Fischer-Tropsch fuel and blends with conventional crude oil-derived fuel for heavy-duty and light-duty diesel engines and the aviation sector; and

(2) the production costs associated with domestic production of those ultra clean fuel and prices for consumers.

(d) REPORTS.—The Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an interim report on actions taken to carry out this section; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, a final report on actions taken to carry out this section.

Subtitle C—Domestic Coal-to-Liquid Fuel and Cellulosic Biomass Ethanol

SEC. 831. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT COMMERCIAL-SCALE CELLULOSIC BIOMASS ETHANOL PROJECTS AND COAL-TO-LIQUIDS FACILITIES ON BRAC PROPERTY AND INDIAN LAND.

(a) PRIORITY.—Notwithstanding section 206 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3146), in awarding funds made available to carry out section 209(c)(1) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 3149(c)(1)) pursuant to section 702 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 3232), the Secretary and the Economic Development Administration shall give priority to projects to support commercial-scale cellulosic biomass ethanol projects and coal-to-liquids facilities.

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—Except as provided in subsection (c)(3)(B) and notwithstanding the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3121 et seq.), the Federal share of a project to support a commercial-scale biomass ethanol facility or coal-to-liquid facility shall be—

(1) 80 percent of the project cost; or

(2) for a project carried out on Indian land, 100 percent of the project cost.

(c) ADDITIONAL AWARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make an additional award in connection with a grant made to a recipient (including any Indian tribe for use on Indian land) for a project to support a commercial-scale biomass ethanol facility or coal-to-liquid facility.

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of an additional award shall be 10 percent of the amount of the grant for the project.

(3) USE.—An additional award under this subsection shall be used—

(A) to carry out any eligible purpose under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3121 et seq.);

(B) notwithstanding section 204 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 3144), to pay up to 100 percent of the cost of an eligible project or activity under that Act; or

(C) to meet the non-Federal share requirements of that Act or any other Act.

(4) NON-FEDERAL SOURCE.—For the purpose of paragraph (3)(C), an additional award shall be treated as funds from a non-Federal source.

(5) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall use to carry out this subsection any amounts made available—

(A) for economic development assistance programs; or

(B) under section 702 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3232).

Subtitle D—Alternative Hydrocarbon and Renewable Reserves Disclosures Classification System

SEC. 841. ALTERNATIVE HYDROCARBON AND RENEWABLE RESERVES DISCLOSURES CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall appoint a task

force composed of government and private sector representatives, including experts in the field of dedicated energy crop feedstocks for cellulosic biofuels production, to analyze, and submit to Congress a report (including recommendations) on—

(1) modernization of the hydrocarbon reserves disclosures classification system of the Commission to reflect advances in reserves recovery from nontraditional sources (such as deep water, oil shale, tar sands, and renewable reserves for cellulosic biofuels feedstocks); and

(2) the creation of a renewable reserves classification system for cellulosic biofuels feedstocks.

(b) DEADLINE FOR REPORT.—The Commission shall submit the report required under subsection (a) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Subtitle E—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 851. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title.

SA 1506. Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE — ENERGY EFFICIENT LIGHT BULBS

SEC. —01. TECHNICAL STANDARDS FOR GENERAL SERVICE LAMPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall initiate a project to establish technical standards for general service lamps.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH INTERESTED PARTIES.—In carrying out the project, the Secretary shall consult with representatives of environmental organizations, labor organizations, general service lamp manufacturers, consumer organizations, and other interested parties.

(3) MINIMUM INITIAL STANDARDS; DEADLINE.—The initial technical standards established shall be standards that enable those general service lamps to provide levels of illumination equivalent to the levels of illumination provided by general service lamps generally available in 2007, but with—

(A) a lumens per watt rating of not less than 30 by calendar year 2013; and

(B) a lumens per watt rating of not less than 45 by calendar year 2018.

(b) MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE.—If the Secretary of Energy, after consultation with the interested parties described in subsection (a)(2), determines that general service lamps meeting the standards established under subsection (a) are generally available for purchase throughout the United States at costs that are substantially equivalent (taking into account useful life, lifecycle costs, domestic manufacturing capabilities, energy consumption, and such other factors as the Secretary deems appropriate) to the cost of the general service lamps they would replace, then the Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to require that at least 95 percent of general service lamps sold, offered for sale, or otherwise made available in the United States meet the standards established under subsection (a), except for those general service lamps described in subsection (c).

(c) EXCEPTION.—The standards established by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall not apply to general service lamps used in applications in which compliance with those standards is not feasible, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) REVISED STANDARDS.—After the initial standards are established under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult periodically with the interested parties described in subsection (a)(2) with respect to whether those standards should be changed. The Secretary may change the standards, and the dates and percentage of lamps to which the changed standards apply under subsection (b), if after such consultation the Secretary determines that such changes are appropriate.

(e) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit reports periodically to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Technology, the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and the House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce with respect to the development and promulgation of standards for lamps and lamp-related technology, such as switches, dimmers, ballast, and non-general service lighting, that includes the Secretary's findings and recommendations with respect to such standards.

SEC. —02. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy may carry out a lighting technology research and development program—

(1) to support the research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of lamps and related technologies sold, offered for sale, or otherwise made available in the United States; and

(2) to assist manufacturers of general service lamps in the manufacturing of general service lamps that, at a minimum, achieve the lumens per watt ratings described in section —01(a).

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013.

(c) SUNSET.—The program under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2015.

SEC. —03. CONSUMER EDUCATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Federal Trade Commission, shall carry out a comprehensive national program to educate consumers about the benefits of using light bulbs that have improved efficiency ratings.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2014.

SEC. —04. REPORT ON MERCURY USE AND RELEASE.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in cooperation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall submit to Congress a report describing recommendations relating to the means by which the Federal Government may reduce or prevent the release of mercury during the manufacture, transportation, storage, or disposal of light bulbs.

SEC. —05. REPORT ON LAMP LABELING.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission, in cooperation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Energy, shall submit to Congress a report describing current lamp labeling practices by lamp manufacturers and recommendations for a national labeling standard.

SA 1507. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. TESTER) 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 133, between lines 29 and 30, insert the following:

(j) IDENTIFICATION CARD STANDARDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or the amendments made by this Act—

(1) no Federal agency may require that a driver's license or personal identification card meet the standards specified under the REAL ID Act of 2005 (division B of Public Law 109–13) to establish employment authorization or identity in order to be hired by an employer; and

(2) no Federal funds may be provided to assist States to meet such standards.

SA 1508. Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Mr. KOHL, Mr. REED, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. NELSON of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 251 and insert the following:

SEC. 251. OIL SAVINGS PLAN AND REQUIREMENTS.

(a) OIL SAVINGS TARGET AND ACTION PLAN.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as the ''Director'') shall publish in the Federal Register an action plan consisting of—

(1) a list of requirements proposed or to be proposed pursuant to subsection (b) that are authorized to be issued under law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and this Act, that will be sufficient, when taken together, to save from the baseline determined under subsection (e)—

(A) 2,500,000 barrels of oil per day on average during calendar year 2016;

(B) 7,000,000 barrels of oil per day on average during calendar year 2026; and

(C) 10,000,000 barrels per day on average during calendar year 2031; and

(2) a Federal Government-wide analysis demonstrating—

(A) the expected oil savings from the baseline to be accomplished by each requirement; and

(B) that all such requirements, taken together, will achieve the oil savings specified in this subsection.

(b) STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On or before the date of publication of the action plan under subsection (a), the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the

Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the head of any other agency the President determines appropriate shall each propose, or issue a notice of intent to propose, regulations establishing each standard or other requirement listed in the action plan that is under the jurisdiction of the respective agency using authorities described in paragraph (2).

(2) AUTHORITIES.—The head of each agency described in paragraph (1) shall use to carry out this subsection—

(A) any authority in existence on the date of enactment of this Act (including regulations); and

(B) any new authority provided under this Act (including an amendment made by this Act).

(3) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency described in paragraph (1) shall promulgate final versions of the regulations required under this subsection.

(4) CONTENT OF REGULATIONS.—Each proposed and final regulation promulgated under this subsection shall—

(A) be sufficient to achieve at least the oil savings resulting from the regulation under the action plan published under subsection (a); and

(B) be accompanied by an analysis by the applicable agency demonstrating that the regulation will achieve the oil savings from the baseline determined under subsection (e).

(c) INITIAL EVALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall—

(A) publish in the Federal Register a Federal Government-wide analysis of—

(i) the oil savings achieved from the baseline established under subsection (e); and

(ii) the expected oil savings under the standards and requirements of this Act (and amendments made by this Act); and

(B) determine whether oil savings will meet the targets established under subsection (a).

(2) INSUFFICIENT OIL SAVINGS.—If the oil savings are less than the targets established under subsection (a), simultaneously with the analysis required under paragraph (1)—

(A) the Director shall publish a revised action plan that is sufficient to achieve the targets; and

(B) the head of each agency referred to in subsection (b)(1) shall propose new or revised regulations that are sufficient to achieve the targets under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively, of subsection (b).

(3) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which regulations are proposed under paragraph (2)(B), the head of each agency referred to in subsection (b)(1) shall promulgate final versions of those regulations that comply with subsection (b)(1).

(d) REVIEW AND UPDATE OF ACTION PLAN.—

(1) REVIEW.—Not later than January 1, 2011, and every 3 years thereafter, the Director shall submit to Congress, and publish, a report that—

(A) evaluates the progress achieved in implementing the oil savings targets established under subsection (a);

(B) analyzes the expected oil savings under the standards and requirements established under this Act and the amendments made by this Act; and

(C)(i) analyzes the potential to achieve oil savings that are in addition to the savings required by subsection (a); and

(ii) if the President determines that it is in the national interest, establishes a higher oil savings target for calendar year 2017 or any subsequent calendar year.

(2) INSUFFICIENT OIL SAVINGS.—If the oil savings are less than the targets established under subsection (a), simultaneously with the report required under paragraph (1)—

(A) the Director shall publish a revised action plan that is sufficient to achieve the targets; and

(B) the head of each agency referred to in subsection (b)(1) shall propose new or revised regulations that are sufficient to achieve the targets under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively, of subsection (b).

(3) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which regulations are proposed under paragraph (2)(B), the head of each agency referred to in subsection (b)(1) shall promulgate final versions of those regulations that comply with subsection (b)(1).

(e) BASELINE AND ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS.—In performing the analyses and promulgating proposed or final regulations to establish standards and other requirements necessary to achieve the oil savings required by this section, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the head of any other agency the President determines to be appropriate shall—

(1) determine oil savings as the projected reduction in oil consumption from the baseline established by the reference case contained in the report of the Energy Information Administration entitled ''Annual Energy Outlook 2005'';

(2) determine the oil savings projections required on an annual basis for each of calendar years 2009 through 2026; and

(3) account for any overlap among the standards and other requirements to ensure that the projected oil savings from all the promulgated standards and requirements, taken together, are as accurate as practicable.

(f) NONREGULATORY MEASURES.—The action plan required under subsection (a) and the revised action plans required under subsections (c) and (d) shall include—

(1) a projection of the barrels of oil displaced by efficiency and sources of energy other than oil, including biofuels, electricity, and hydrogen; and

(2) a projection of the barrels of oil saved through enactment of this Act and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.).

SA 1509. Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VIII—THOR KIILSGAARD MEMORIAL GEOLOGIC MAPPING REAUTHORIZATION ACT

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Thor Kiilsgaard Memorial Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2007''.

SEC. 802. FINDINGS.

Section 2(a) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31a(a)) is amended—

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

''(1) although significant progress has been made in the production of geologic maps since the establishment of the national cooperative geologic mapping program in 1992, no modern, digital, geologic map exists for approximately 75 percent of the United States;''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''homeland and'' after ''planning for'';

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''predicting'' and inserting ''identifying'';

(C) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

''(J) recreation and public awareness; and''; and

(3) in paragraph (9), by striking ''important'' and inserting ''available''.

SEC. 803. PURPOSE.

Section 2(b) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31a(b)) is amended by inserting ''and management'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 804. DEADLINES FOR ACTIONS BY THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Section 4(b)(1) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31c(b)(1)) is amended in the second sentence—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''not later than'' and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting ''not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Thor Kiilsgaard Memorial Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2007;'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''not later than'' and all that follows through ''in accordance'' and inserting ''not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Thor Kiilsgaard Memorial Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2007 in accordance''; and

(3) in the matter preceding clause (i) of subparagraph (C), by striking ''not later than'' and all that follows through ''submit'' and inserting ''submit biennially''.

SEC. 805. GEOLOGIC MAPPING PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.

Section 4(c)(2) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31c(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''geophysical-map data base, geochemical-map data base, and a''; and

(2) by striking ''provide'' and inserting ''provides''.

SEC. 806. GEOLOGIC MAPPING PROGRAM COMPONENTS.

Section 4(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31c(d)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) the needs of land management agencies of the Department of the Interior.''.

SEC. 807. GEOLOGIC MAPPING ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 5(a) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31d(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''the Secretary of the Interior or a designee from a land management agency of the Department of the Interior,'' after ''Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or a designee,'';

(B) by inserting ''and'' after ''Energy or a designee,''; and

(C) by striking '', and the Assistant to the President for Science and Technology or a designee''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''Not later than'' and all that follows through ''consultation'' and inserting ''In consultation'';

(B) by striking ''Chief Geologist, as Chairman'' and inserting ''Associate Director for Geology, as Chair''; and

(C) by striking ''one representative from the private sector'' and inserting ''2 representatives from the private sector''.

(b) DUTIES.—Section 5(b) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31d(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

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

''(3) provide a scientific overview of geologic maps (including maps of geologic-based hazards) used or disseminated by Federal agencies for regulation or land-use planning; and''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5(a)(1) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31d(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''10-member'' and inserting ''11-member''.

SEC. 808. FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL GEOLOGIC-MAP DATABASE.

Section 7(a) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31f(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''geologic map'' and inserting ''geologic-map''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) all maps developed with funding provided by the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program, including under the Federal, State, and education components;''.

SEC. 809. BIENNIAL REPORT.

Section 8 of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31g) is amended by striking ''Not later'' and all that follows through ''biennially'' and inserting ''Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Thor Kiilsgaard Memorial Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2007 and biennially''.

SEC. 810. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; ALLOCATION.

Section 9 of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31h) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $64,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2016.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2000'' and inserting ''2005'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''48'' and inserting ''50''; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking 2 and inserting ''4''.

SA 1510. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewable Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 314, after line 2, add the following:

SEC. 708. INCREASE IN CAPACITY OF STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE.

(a) STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE.—

(1) POLICY.—Section 151(b) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6231(b)) is amended by striking ''1 billion'' and inserting ''1,500,000,000''.

(2) CREATION.—Section 154(a) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6234(a)) is amended by striking ''1 billion'' and inserting ''1,500,000,000''.

(b) FILLING STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE TO CAPACITY.—Section 301(e) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 6240 note; Public Law 109–58) is amended by striking ''1,000,000,000-barrel'' and inserting ''1,500,000,000-barrel''.

SA 1511. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewable Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 277, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 521. STUDY OF CAFE STANDARDS FOR COMMERCIAL TRUCKS.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration shall conduct a study of the anticipated economic impacts and fuel saving benefits that would result from a requirement that all vehicles manufactured for sale in the United States with a gross vehicle weight of not less than 10,000 pounds meet specific average fuel economy standards.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) the results of the study conducted under subsection (a); and

(2) a recommendation on whether the vehicles described in subsection (a) should be subject to average fuel economy standards.

SA 1512. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewable Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 215(b), strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use amounts appropriated under this section to make grants for use in carrying out, with respect to a renewable energy project—

(A) a finance feasibility or reconnaissance study;

(B) energy resource monitoring;

(C) construction of the renewable energy project; or

(D) construction or installation of transmission and distribution infrastructure associated with the renewable energy project, including power lines necessary to connect the renewable energy project to a distribution grid for the purpose of distributing energy generated by the renewable energy project.

SA 1513. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. STEVENS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ADMINISTRATION.

Section 106 of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (15 U.S.C. 720d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Coordinator may appoint and terminate such personnel as the Federal Coordinator determines to be appropriate.

''(B) AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL COORDINATOR.—Personnel appointed by the Federal Coordinator under subparagraph (A) shall be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

''(2) COMPENSATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), personnel appointed by the Federal Coordinator under paragraph (1)(A) shall be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code (relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates).

''(B) MAXIMUM LEVEL OF COMPENSATION.—The rate of pay for personnel appointed by the Federal Coordinator under paragraph (1)(A) shall not exceed the maximum level of rate payable for level III of the Executive Schedule.

''(C) APPLICABILITY OF SECTION 5941.—Section 5941 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to personnel appointed by the Federal Coordinator under paragraph (1)(A).

''(3) TEMPORARY SERVICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Coordinator may procure temporary and intermittent services in accordance with section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) MAXIMUM LEVEL OF COMPENSATION.—The level of compensation of an individual employed on a temporary or intermittent basis under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed the maximum level of rate payable for level III of the Executive Schedule.

''(4) FEES, CHARGES, AND COMMISSIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Coordinator shall have the authority to establish, change, and abolish reasonable filing and service fees, charges, and commissions, require deposits of payments, and provide refunds as provided to the Secretary of the Interior in section 304 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1734), except that the authority shall be with respect to the duties of the Federal Coordinator, as delineated in the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (15 U.S.C. 720 et seq.), as amended.

''(B) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Subparagraph (A) shall not affect the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to establish, change, and abolish reasonable filing and service fees, charges, and commissions, require deposits of payments, and provide refunds under section 304 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1734).

''(C) USE OF FUNDS.—The Federal Coordinator is authorized to use, without further

appropriation, amounts collected under subparagraph (A) to carry out this section.''.

SEC. _____. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 107(a) of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (15 U.S.C. 720e(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) the validity of any determination, permit, approval, authorization, review, or other related action taken under any provision of law relating to a gas transportation project constructed and operated in accordance with section 103, including—

''(A) subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Administrative Procedure Act');

''(B) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

''(C) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

''(D) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.); and

''(E) the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.).''.

SA 1514. Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be propsoed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewable Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO STANDARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 610. FEDERAL RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO STANDARD.

''(a) RENEWABLE ENERGY REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each electric utility that sells electricity to electric consumers shall obtain a percentage of the base amount of electricity it sells to electric consumers in any calendar year from new renewable energy or existing renewable energy. The percentage obtained in a calendar year shall not be less than the amount specified in the following table:

''Calendar year:	Minimum annual percentage:
2009 through 2012	5
2013 through 2016	10
2017 through 2019	15
2020 through 2030	20

''(2) MEANS OF COMPLIANCE.—An electric utility shall meet the requirements of paragraph (1) by—

''(A) submitting to the Secretary renewable energy credits issued under subsection (b);

''(B) making alternative compliance payments to the Secretary at the rate of 2 cents per kilowatt hour (as adjusted for inflation under subsection (g)); or

''(C) a combination of activities described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

''(b) FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT TRADING PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 1, 2008, the Secretary shall establish a Federal renewable energy credit trading program under which electric utilities shall submit to the Secretary renewable energy credits to certify the compliance of the electric utilities with respect to obligations under subsection (a)(1).

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—As part of the program, the Secretary shall—

''(A) issue tradeable renewable energy credits to generators of electric energy from new renewable energy;

''(B) issue nontradeable renewable energy credits to generators of electric energy from existing renewable energy;

''(C) issue renewable energy credits to electric utilities associated with State renewable portfolio standard compliance mechanisms pursuant to subsection (h);

''(D) ensure that a kilowatt hour, including the associated renewable energy credit, shall be used only once for purposes of compliance with this Act;

''(E) allow double credits for generation from facilities on Indian land, and triple credits for generation from small renewable distributed generators (meaning those no larger than 1 megawatt); and

''(F) ensure that, with respect to a purchaser that, as of the date of enactment of this section, has a purchase agreement from a renewable energy facility placed in service before that date, the credit associated with the generation of renewable energy under the contract is issued to the purchaser of the electric energy to the extent that the contract does not already provide for the allocation of the Federal credit.

''(3) DURATION.—A credit described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (2) may only be used for compliance with this section during the 3-year period beginning on the date of issuance of the credit.

''(4) TRANSFERS.—An electric utility that holds credits in excess of the quantity of credits needed to comply with subsection (a) may transfer the credits to another electric utility in the same utility holding company system.

''(5) DELEGATION OF MARKET FUNCTION.—The Secretary may delegate to an appropriate market-making entity the administration of a national tradeable renewable energy credit market for purposes of creating a transparent national market for the sale or trade of renewable energy credits.

''(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Any electric utility that fails to meet the compliance requirements of subsection (a) shall be subject to a civil penalty.

''(2) AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—The amount of the civil penalty shall be determined by multiplying the number of kilowatt-hours of electric energy sold to electric consumers in violation of subsection (a) by the greater of—

''(A) the value of the alternative compliance payment, as adjusted to reflect changes for the 12-month period ending the preceding November 30 in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor; or

''(B) 200 percent of the average market value of renewable energy credits during the year in which the violation occurred.

''(3) MITIGATION OR WAIVER.—The Secretary may mitigate or waive a civil penalty under this subsection if the electric utility was unable to comply with subsection (a) for reasons outside of the reasonable control of the utility. The Secretary shall reduce the amount of any penalty determined under paragraph (2) by an amount paid by the electric utility to a State for failure to comply with the requirement of a State renewable energy program if the State requirement is greater than the applicable requirement of subsection (a).

''(4) PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSING PENALTY.—The Secretary shall assess a civil penalty under this subsection in accordance with the procedures prescribed by section 333(d) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 6303).

''(d) STATE RENEWABLE ENERGY ACCOUNT PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury a State renewable energy account program.

''(2) DEPOSITS.—All money collected by the Secretary from alternative compliance payments and the assessment of civil penalties under this section shall be deposited into the renewable energy account established pursuant to this subsection.

''(3) USE.—Proceeds deposited in the State renewable energy account shall be used by the Secretary, subject to appropriations, for a program to provide grants to the State agency responsible for developing State energy conservation plans under section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322) for the purposes of promoting renewable energy production, including programs that promote technologies that reduce the use of electricity at customer sites such as solar water heating.

''(4) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary may issue guidelines and criteria for grants awarded under this subsection. State energy offices receiving grants under this section shall maintain such records and evidence of compliance as the Secretary may require.

''(5) PREFERENCE.—In allocating funds under this program, the Secretary shall give preference—

''(A) to States in regions which have a disproportionately small share of economically sustainable renewable energy generation capacity; and

''(B) to State programs to stimulate or enhance innovative renewable energy technologies.

''(e) RULES.—The Secretary shall issue rules implementing this section not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

''(f) EXEMPTIONS.—This section shall not apply in any calendar year to an electric utility—

''(1) that sold less than 4,000,000 megawatt-hours of electric energy to electric consumers during the preceding calendar year; or

''(2) in Hawaii.

''(g) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Not later than December 31 of each year beginning in 2008, the Secretary shall adjust for inflation the rate of the alternative compliance payment under subsection (a)(2)(B) and the amount of the civil penalty per kilowatt-hour under subsection (c)(2).

''(h) STATE PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section diminishes any authority of a State or political subdivision of a State to adopt or enforce any law or regulation respecting renewable energy or the regulation of electric utilities, but, except as provided in subsection (c)(3), no such law or regulation shall relieve any person of any requirement otherwise applicable under this section. The Secretary, in consultation with States having such renewable energy programs, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, facilitate coordination between the Federal program and State programs.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with States, shall promulgate regulations to ensure that an electric utility that is subject to the requirements of this section and is subject to a State renewable energy standard receives renewable energy credits if—

''(i) the electric utility complies with State standard by generating or purchasing renewable electric energy or renewable energy certificates or credits; or

''(ii) the State imposes or allows other mechanisms for achieving the State standard, including the payment of taxes, fees, surcharges, or other financial obligations.

''(B) AMOUNT OF CREDITS.—The amount of credits received by an electric utility under this subsection shall equal—

''(i) in the case of subparagraph (A)(i), the renewable energy resulting from the generation or purchase by the electric utility of existing renewable energy or new renewable energy; and

''(ii) in the case of subparagraph (A)(ii), the pro rata share of the electric utility, based on the contributions to the mechanism made by the electric utility or customers of the electric utility, in the State, of the renewable energy resulting from those mechanisms.

''(C) PROHIBITION ON DOUBLE COUNTING.—The regulations promulgated under this paragraph shall ensure that a kilowatt-hour associated with a renewable energy credit issued pursuant to this subsection shall not be used for compliance with this section more than once.

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) BASE AMOUNT OF ELECTRICITY.—The term 'base amount of electricity' means the total amount of electricity sold by an electric utility to electric consumers in a calendar year, excluding—

''(A) electricity generated by a hydroelectric facility (including a pumped storage facility but excluding incremental hydropower); and

''(B) electricity generated through the incineration of municipal solid waste.

''(2) DISTRIBUTED GENERATION FACILITY.—The term 'distributed generation facility' means a facility at a customer site.

''(3) EXISTING RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The term 'existing renewable energy' means, except as provided in paragraph (7)(B), electric energy generated at a facility (including a distributed generation facility) placed in service prior to January 1, 2001, from solar, wind, or geothermal energy, ocean energy, biomass (as defined in section 203(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005), or landfill gas.

''(4) GEOTHERMAL ENERGY.—The term 'geothermal energy' means energy derived from a geothermal deposit (within the meaning of section 613(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

''(5) INCREMENTAL GEOTHERMAL PRODUCTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'incremental geothermal production' means for any year the excess of—

''(i) the total kilowatt hours of electricity produced from a facility (including a distributed generation facility) using geothermal energy; over

''(ii) the average annual kilowatt hours produced at such facility for 5 of the previous 7 calendar years before the date of enactment of this section after eliminating the highest and the lowest kilowatt hour production years in such 7-year period.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE.—A facility described in subparagraph (A) that was placed in service at least 7 years before the date of enactment of this section shall, commencing with the year in which such date of enactment occurs, reduce the amount calculated under subparagraph (A)(ii) each year, on a cumulative basis, by the average percentage decrease in the annual kilowatt hour production for the 7-year period described in subparagraph (A)(ii) with such cumulative sum not to exceed 30 percent.

''(6) INCREMENTAL HYDROPOWER.—The term 'incremental hydropower' means additional energy generated as a result of efficiency improvements or capacity additions made on or after January 1, 2001, or the effective date of an existing applicable State renewable portfolio standard program at a hydroelectric facility that was placed in service before that date. The term does not include additional energy generated as a result of operational changes not directly associated with efficiency improvements or capacity additions. Efficiency improvements and capacity additions shall be measured on the basis of the same water flow information used to determine a historic average annual generation baseline for the hydroelectric facility and certified by the Secretary or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

''(7) NEW RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The term 'new renewable energy' means—

''(A) electric energy generated at a facility (including a distributed generation facility) placed in service on or after January 1, 2001, from—

''(i) solar, wind, or geothermal energy or ocean energy;

''(ii) biomass (as defined in section 203(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852(b));

''(iii) landfill gas; or

''(iv) incremental hydropower; and

''(B) for electric energy generated at a facility (including a distributed generation facility) placed in service before January 1, 2001—

''(i) the additional energy above the average generation during the period beginning on January 1, 1998, and ending on January 1, 2001, at the facility from—

''(I) solar or wind energy or ocean energy;

''(II) biomass (as defined in section 203(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852(b));

''(III) landfill gas; or

''(IV) incremental hydropower; and

''(ii) incremental geothermal production.

''(8) OCEAN ENERGY.—The term 'ocean energy' includes current, wave, tidal, and thermal energy.

''(j) SUNSET.—This section expires on December 31, 2030.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. prec. 2601) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title VI the following:

''Sec. 610. Federal renewable portfolio standard.''.

SA 1515. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. SALAZAR) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 277, and insert the following:

SEC. 277. ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY WORKER TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 1101 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16411) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c), the following:

''(d) ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY WORKER TRAINING PROGRAM.—

''(1) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subsection to—

''(A) create a sustainable, comprehensive public program that provides quality training that is linked to jobs that are created through renewable energy and energy efficiency initiatives;

''(B) satisfy industry demand for a skilled workforce, to support economic growth, to boost America's global competitiveness in the expanding energy efficiency and renewable energy industries, and to provide economic self-sufficiency and family-sustaining jobs for America's workers, including low wage workers, through quality training and placement in job opportunities in the growing energy efficiency and renewable energy industries;

''(C) provide grants for the safety, health, and skills training and education of workers who are, or may be engaged in, activities related to the energy efficiency and renewable energy industries; and

''(D) provide funds for national and State industry-wide research, labor market information and labor exchange programs, and the development of nationally and State administered training programs.

''(2) GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor (referred to in this subsection as the 'Secretary'), in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall establish an energy efficiency and renewable energy worker training program under which the Secretary shall carry out the activities described in paragraph (3) to achieve the purposes of this subsection.

''(B) ELIGIBILITY.—For purposes of providing assistance and services under the program established under this subsection—

''(i) target populations of individuals eligible for training and other services shall include, but not be limited to—

''(I) veterans, or past and present members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces;

''(II) workers affected by national energy and environmental policy;

''(III) workers displaced by the impacts of economic globalization;

''(IV) individuals, including at-risk youth, seeking employment pathways out of poverty and into economic self-sufficiency;

''(V) formerly incarcerated, adjudicated, non-violent offenders; and

''(VI) individuals in need of updated training related to the energy efficiency and renewable energy industries; and

''(ii) energy efficiency and renewable energy industries eligible for such assistance and services shall include—

''(I) the energy-efficient building, construction, and retrofits industries;

''(II) the renewable electric power industry;

''(III) the energy efficient and advanced drive train vehicle industry;

''(IV) the bio-fuels industry; and

''(V) the deconstruction and materials use industries.

''(3) ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) NATIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Under the program established under paragraph (2), the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shall provide assistance to support national research to develop labor market data and to track future workforce trends resulting from energy-related initiatives carried out under this section. Activities carried out under this paragraph shall include—

''(i) linking research and development in renewable energy and energy efficiency technology with the development of standards and curricula for current and future jobs;

''(ii) the tracking and documentation of academic and occupational competencies as well as future skill needs with respect to renewable energy and energy efficiency technology;

''(iii) tracking and documentation of occupational information and workforce training data with respect to renewable energy and energy efficiency technology;

''(iv) assessing new employment and work practices including career ladder and upgrade training as well as high performance work systems; and

''(v) collaborating with State agencies, industry, organized labor, and community and nonprofit organizations to disseminate successful innovations for labor market services and worker training with respect to renewable energy and energy efficiency technology.

''(B) NATIONAL ENERGY TRAINING PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Under the program established under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall award National Energy Training Partnerships Grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to enable such entities to carry out national training that leads to economic self-sufficiency and to develop an energy efficiency and renewable energy industries workforce. Grants shall be awarded under this subparagraph so as to ensure geographic diversity with at least 2 grants awarded to entities located in each of the 4 Petroleum Administration for Defense Districts with no subdistricts and at least 1 grant awarded to an entity located in each of the subdistricts of the Petroleum Administration for Defense District with subdistricts.

''(ii) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under clause (i), an entity shall be a non-profit partnership that—

''(I) includes the equal participation of industry, including public or private employers, and labor organizations, including joint labor-management training programs, and may include community-based organizations, educational institutions, small businesses, cooperatives, State and local veterans agencies, and veterans service organizations; and

''(II) demonstrates—

''(aa) experience in implementing and operating worker skills training and education programs;

''(bb) the ability to identify and involve in training programs carried out under this grant, target populations of workers who are, or will be engaged in, activities related to energy efficiency and renewable energy industries; and

''(cc) the ability to help workers achieve economic self-sufficiency.

''(iii) ACTIVITIES.—Activities to be carried out under a grant under this subparagraph may include—

''(I) the provision of occupational skills training, including curriculum development, on-the-job training, and classroom training;

''(II) the provision of safety and health training;

''(III) the provision of basic skills, literacy, GED, English as a second language, and job readiness training;

''(IV) individual referral and tuition assistance for a community college training program;

''(V) the provision of customized training in conjunction with an existing registered apprenticeship program or labor-management partnership;

''(VI) the provision of career ladder and upgrade training; and

''(VII) the implementation of transitional jobs strategies.

''(C) STATE LABOR MARKET RESEARCH, INFORMATION, AND LABOR EXCHANGE RESEARCH PROGRAM.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Under the program established under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall award competitive grants to States to enable such States to administer labor market and labor exchange informational programs that include the implementation of the activities described in clause (ii).

''(ii) ACTIVITIES.—A State shall use amounts awarded under a grant under this subparagraph to provide funding to the State agency that administers the Wagner-Peyser Act and State unemployment compensation programs to carry out the following activities using State agency merit staff:

''(I) The identification of job openings in the renewable energy and energy efficiency sector.

''(II) The administration of skill and aptitude testing and assessment for workers.

''(III) The counseling, case management, and referral of qualified job seekers to openings and training programs, including energy efficiency and renewable energy training programs.

''(D) STATE ENERGY TRAINING PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Under the program established under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall award competitive grants to States to enable such States to administer renewable energy and energy efficiency workforce development programs that include the implementation of the activities described in clause (ii).

''(ii) ACTIVITIES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—A State shall use amounts awarded under a grant under this subparagraph to award competitive grants to eligible State Energy Sector Partnerships to enable such Partnerships to coordinate with existing apprenticeship and labor management training programs and implement training programs that lead to the economic self-sufficiency of trainees.

''(II) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subparagraph, a State Energy Sector Partnership shall—

''(aa) consist of non-profit organizations that include equal participation from industry, including public or private nonprofit employers, and labor organizations, including joint labor-management training programs, and may include representatives from local governments, worker investment agency one-stop career centers, community based organizations, community colleges, other post-secondary institutions, small businesses, cooperatives, State and local veterans agencies, and veterans service organizations;

''(bb) demonstrate experience in implementing and operating worker skills training and education programs; and

''(cc) demonstrate the ability to identify and involve in training programs, target populations of workers who are, or will be engaged in, activities related to energy efficiency and renewable energy industries.

''(iii) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall give priority to States that demonstrate linkages of activities under the grant with—

''(I) meeting national energy policies associated with energy efficiency, renewable energy, and the reduction of emissions of greenhouse gases; and

''(II) meeting State energy policies associated with energy efficiency, renewable energy, and the reduction of emissions of greenhouse gases.

''(iv) COORDINATION.—A grantee under this subparagraph shall coordinate activities carried out under the grant with existing apprenticeship and labor management training programs and implement training programs that lead to the economic self-sufficiency of trainees, including providing—

''(I) outreach and recruitment services, in coordination with the appropriate State agency;

''(II) occupational skills training, including curriculum development, on-the-job training, and classroom training;

''(III) safety and health training;

''(IV) basic skills, literacy, GED, English as a second language, and job readiness training;

''(V) individual referral and tuition assistance for a community college training program;

''(VI) customized training in conjunction with an existing registered apprenticeship program or labor-management partnership;

''(VII) career ladder and upgrade training; and

''(VIII) services under transitional jobs strategies.

''(4) WORKER PROTECTIONS AND NONDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) APPLICATION OF WIA.—The provisions of sections 181 and 188 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2931 and 2938) shall apply to all programs carried out with assistance under this subsection.

''(B) CONSULTATION WITH LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—If a labor organization represents a substantial number of workers who are engaged in similar work or training in an area that is the same as the area that is proposed to be funded under this subsection, the labor organization shall be provided an opportunity to be consulted and to submit comments in regard to such a proposal.

''(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection, $100,000,000 for each fiscal year, of which—

''(A) not to exceed 20 percent of the amount appropriated in each fiscal year shall be made available for, and shall be equally divided between, national labor market research and information under paragraph (3)(A) and State labor market information and labor exchange research under paragraph (3)(C); and

''(B) the remainder shall be divided equally between National Energy Partnership Training Grants under paragraph (3)(B) and State energy training partnership grants under paragraph (3)(D).

''(6) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'renewable electric power' has the meaning given the term 'renewable energy' in section 203(b)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58).''.

SA 1516. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 801. STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF PRIVATE WIRE LAWS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMBINED HEAT AND POWER FACILITIES.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the States and other appropriate entities, shall conduct a study of the laws (including regulations) limiting the siting of privately owned electric distribution wires on and across public rights-of-way.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The study under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an evaluation of the effect the laws have on the development of combined heat and power facilities; and

(B) a determination of whether a change in the laws would create any operating problems for electric utilities.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SA 1517. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title II, insert the following:

SEC. 2___. DEFINITION OF STATE.

Section 412 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6862) is amended by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

''(8) STATE.—The term 'State' means—

''(A) a State;

''(B) the District of Columbia; and

''(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.''.

SA 1518. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VIII—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

SEC. 801. PROHIBITION OF OIL AND GAS LEASING IN CERTAIN AREAS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.

Section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(q) PROHIBITION OF OIL AND GAS LEASING IN CERTAIN AREAS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or any other law, the Secretary of the Interior shall not issue a lease for the exploration, development, or production of oil, natural gas, or any other mineral in—

''(1) the Mid-Atlantic planning area; or

''(2) the North Atlantic planning area.''.

SA 1519. Mr. KOHL (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BIDEN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NO OIL PRODUCING AND EXPORTING CARTELS ACT OF 2007.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act of 2007'' or ''NOPEC''.

(b) SHERMAN ACT.—The Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 7 the following:

''SEC. 7A. OIL PRODUCING CARTELS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be illegal and a violation of this Act for any foreign state, or any instrumentality or agent of any foreign state, to act collectively or in combination with any other foreign state, any instrumentality or agent of any other foreign state, or any other person, whether by cartel or any other association or form of cooperation or joint action—

''(1) to limit the production or distribution of oil, natural gas, or any other petroleum product;

''(2) to set or maintain the price of oil, natural gas, or any petroleum product; or

''(3) to otherwise take any action in restraint of trade for oil, natural gas, or any petroleum product;

when such action, combination, or collective action has a direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect on the market, supply, price, or distribution of oil, natural gas, or other petroleum product in the United States.

''(b) SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—A foreign state engaged in conduct in violation of subsection (a) shall not be immune under the doctrine of sovereign immunity from the jurisdiction or judgments of the courts of the United States in any action brought to enforce this section.

''(c) INAPPLICABILITY OF ACT OF STATE DOCTRINE.—No court of the United States shall decline, based on the act of state doctrine, to make a determination on the merits in an action brought under this section.

''(d) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General of the United States may bring an action to enforce this section in any district court of the United States as provided under the antitrust laws.''.

(c) SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—Section 1605(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) in which the action is brought under section 7A of the Sherman Act.''.

SA 1520. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title II, add the following:

SEC. 255. SUPPORT FOR ENERGY INDEPENDENCE OF THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to provide support for projects and activities to facilitate the energy independence of the United States so as to ensure that all but 10 percent of the energy needs of the United States are supplied by domestic energy sources by calendar year 2017.

SEC. 256. ENERGY POLICY COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established a commission, to be known as the ''National Commission on Energy Independence'' (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'').

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall be composed of 15 members, of whom—

(A) 3 shall be appointed by the President;

(B) 3 shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(C) 3 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;

(D) 3 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(E) 3 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(3) CO-CHAIRPERSONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall designate 2 co-chairpersons from among the members of the Commission appointed.

(B) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—The co-chairpersons designated under subparagraph (A) shall not both be affiliated with the same political party.

(4) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) TERM; VACANCIES.—

(A) TERM.—A member of the Commission shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(B) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission—

(i) shall not affect the powers of the Commission; and

(ii) shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(b) PURPOSE.—The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive review of the energy policy of the United States by—

(1) reviewing relevant analyses of the current and long-term energy policy of, and conditions in, the United States;

(2) identifying problems that may threaten the achievement by the United States of long-term energy policy goals, including energy independence;

(3) analyzing potential solutions to problems that threaten the long-term ability of the United States to achieve those energy policy goals; and

(4) providing recommendations that will ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the energy policy goals of the United States are achieved.

(c) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 of each of calendar years 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015, the Commission shall submit to Congress and the President a report on the progress of United States in meeting the long-term energy policy goal of energy independence, including a detailed statement of

the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Commission.

(2) LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—If a recommendation submitted under paragraph (1) involves legislative action, the report shall include proposed legislative language to carry out the action.

(d) COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) STAFF AND DIRECTOR.—The Commission shall have a staff headed by an Executive Director.

(2) STAFF APPOINTMENT.—The Executive Director may appoint such personnel as the Executive Director and the Commission determine to be appropriate.

(3) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—With the approval of the Commission, the Executive Director may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency may detail, without reimbursement, any of the personnel of the Federal agency to the Commission to assist in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

(ii) NATURE OF DETAIL.—Any detail of a Federal employee under clause (i) shall not interrupt or otherwise affect the civil service status or privileges of the Federal employee.

(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon the request of the Commission, the head of a Federal agency shall provide such technical assistance to the Commission as the Commission determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Commission.

(e) RESOURCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall have reasonable access to materials, resources, statistical data, and such other information from Executive agencies as the Commission determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Commission.

(2) FORM OF REQUESTS.—The co-chairpersons of the Commission shall make requests for access described in paragraph (1) in writing, as necessary.

SA 1521. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 177, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 279. COMPACT FLUORESCENT LIGHTING GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLD.—The term ''low-income household'' means a household with a total annual household income that does not exceed the greater of—

(A) an amount equal to 150 percent of the poverty level of a State; or

(B) an amount equal to 60 percent of the State median income.

(2) MEDIUM BASE COMPACT FLUORESCENT LAMP.—The term ''medium base compact fluorescent lamp'' has the meaning given the term in section 321(30)(S) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291(30)(S)).

(3) POVERTY LEVEL.—The term ''poverty level'' has the meaning given the term in section 2603 of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8622).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State; and

(B) the District of Columbia.

(6) STATE MEDIAN INCOME.—The term ''State median income'' has the meaning given the term in section 2603 of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8622).

(b) COMPACT FLUORESCENT LIGHTING GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a program under which the Secretary shall provide grants to States for the distribution of medium base compact fluorescent lamps to households in the State.

(2) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section a State shall—

(A) submit to the Secretary an application, in such form and by such date as the Secretary may specify, that contains—

(i) a plan describing the means by which the State will use the grant funds; and

(ii) such other information as the Secretary may require; and

(B) agree—

(i) to conduct public education activities to provide information on—

(I) the efficiency of using medium base compact fluorescent lamps; and

(II) the cost savings associated with using medium base compact fluorescent lamps;

(ii) to conduct outreach activities to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that households in the State are informed of the distribution of the medium base compact fluorescent lamps in the State;

(iii) to coordinate activities under this section with similar and related Federal and State programs; and

(iv) to comply with such other requirements as the Secretary may establish.

(3) PRIORITY.—A State that receives a grant under this section shall give priority to distributing medium base compact fluorescent lamps to low-income households in the State.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 to carry out this section.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL INTENT.—It is the intent of Congress that the amounts made available under this section shall supplement, not supplant, amounts provided under sections 361 through 364 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 through 6324).

SA 1552. Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VIII—NATIONAL GEOLOGIC MAPPING

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2007''.

SEC. 802. FINDINGS.

Section 2(a) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31a(a)) is amended—

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

''(1) although significant progress has been made in the production of geologic maps since the establishment of the national cooperative geologic mapping program in 1992, no modern, digital, geologic map exists for approximately 75 percent of the United States;''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''homeland and'' after ''planning for'';

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''predicting'' and inserting ''identifying'';

(C) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

''(J) recreation and public awareness; and''; and

(3) in paragraph (9), by striking ''important'' and inserting ''available''.

SEC. 803. PURPOSE.

Section 2(b) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31a(b)) is amended by inserting ''and management'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 804. DEADLINES FOR ACTIONS BY THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Section 4(b)(1) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31c(b)(1)) is amended in the second sentence—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''not later than'' and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting ''not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2007;'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''not later than'' and all that follows through ''in accordance'' and inserting ''not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2007 in accordance''; and

(3) in the matter preceding clause (i) of subparagraph (C), by striking ''not later than'' and all that follows through ''submit'' and inserting ''submit biennially''.

SEC. 805. GEOLOGIC MAPPING PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.

Section 4(c)(2) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31c(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''geophysical-map data base, geochemical-map data base, and a''; and

(2) by striking ''provide'' and inserting ''provides''.

SEC. 806. GEOLOGIC MAPPING PROGRAM COMPONENTS.

Section 4(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31c(d)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) the needs of land management agencies of the Department of the Interior.''.

SEC. 807. GEOLOGIC MAPPING ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 5(a) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31d(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''the Secretary of the Interior or a designee from a land management agency of the Department of the Interior,'' after ''Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or a designee,'';

(B) by inserting ''and'' after ''Energy or a designee,''; and

(C) by striking '', and the Assistant to the President for Science and Technology or a designee''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''Not later than'' and all that follows through ''consultation'' and inserting ''In consultation'';

(B) by striking ''Chief Geologist, as Chairman'' and inserting ''Associate Director for Geology, as Chair''; and

(C) by striking ''one representative from the private sector'' and inserting ''2 representatives from the private sector''.

(b) DUTIES.—Section 5(b) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31d(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

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

''(3) provide a scientific overview of geologic maps (including maps of geologic-based hazards) used or disseminated by Federal agencies for regulation or land-use planning; and''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5(a)(1) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31d(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''10-member'' and inserting ''11-member''.

SEC. 808. FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL GEOLOGIC-MAP DATABASE.

Section 7(a) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31f(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''geologic map'' and inserting ''geologic-map''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) all maps developed with funding provided by the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program, including under the Federal, State, and education components;''.

SEC. 809. BIENNIAL REPORT.

Section 8 of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31g) is amended by striking ''Not later'' and all that follows through ''biennially'' and inserting ''Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2007 and biennially''.

SEC. 810. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; ALLOCATION.

Section 9 of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31h) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $64,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2016.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2000'' and inserting ''2005'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''48'' and inserting ''50''; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking 2 and inserting ''4''.

SA 1523. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR ESTABLISHING DISABLED VETERANS MATERIAL.

Public Law 106–348 is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''The establishment'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (e), the establishment''; and

(B) by striking ''the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.)'' and inserting ''chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''section 8(b) of the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1008(b))'' and inserting ''section 8906 of title 40, United States Code'';

(B) by striking ''or upon expiration of the authority for the memorial under section 10(b) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 1010(b)),''; and

(C) by striking ''section 8(b)(1) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 1008(b)(1)'' and inserting ''8906(b)(2) or (3) of such title''; and

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

''(e) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, the authority to establish a memorial under this section shall expire on October 24, 2015.''.

SA 1524. Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KERRY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 27, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 113. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE USE OF RENEWABLE RESOURCES TO GENERATE ENERGY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the United States has a quantity of renewable energy resources that is sufficient to supply a significant portion of the energy needs of the United States;

(2) the agricultural, forestry, and working land of the United States can help ensure a sustainable domestic energy system;

(3) accelerated development and use of renewable energy technologies provide numerous benefits to the United States, including improved national security, improved balance of payments, healthier rural economies, improved environmental quality, and abundant, reliable, and affordable energy for all citizens of the United States;

(4) the production of transportation fuels from renewable energy would help the United States meet rapidly growing domestic and global energy demands, reduce the dependence of the United States on energy imported from volatile regions of the world that are politically unstable, stabilize the cost and availability of energy, and safeguard the economy and security of the United States;

(5) increased energy production from domestic renewable resources would attract substantial new investments in energy infrastructure, create economic growth, develop new jobs for the citizens of the United States, and increase the income for farm, ranch, and forestry jobs in the rural regions of the United States;

(6) increased use of renewable energy is practical and can be cost effective with the implementation of supportive policies and proper incentives to stimulate markets and infrastructure; and

(7) public policies aimed at enhancing renewable energy production and accelerating technological improvements will further reduce energy costs over time and increase market demand.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is the goal of the United States that, not later than January 1, 2025, the agricultural, forestry, and working land of the United States should—

(1) provide from renewable resources not less than 25 percent of the total energy consumed in the United States; and

(2) continue to produce safe, abundant, and affordable food, feed, and fiber.

SA 1525. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 161, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 269. STANDARD RELATING TO SOLAR HOT WATER HEATERS.

Section 305(a)(3)(A) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834(a)(3)(A)) (as amended by section 266) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)(III), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) if life-cycle cost-effective, not less than 30 percent of the hot water demand for each new or substantially modified Federal building be met through the installation and use of solar hot water heaters.''.

SA 1526. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY PRODUCTION CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (9) of section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to qualified facilities) are each amended by

striking ''January 1, 2009'' each place it appears and inserting ''January 1, 2013''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 45(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''No adjustment shall be made under this paragraph with respect to the 1.5 cent amount in subsection (a) and the 8 cent amount in paragraph (1) for any year after 2007.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply to energy produced and sold after the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

SEC. ___. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF CREDIT TO HOLDERS OF CLEAN RENEWABLE ENERGY BONDS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 54(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to termination) is amended by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2012''.

(b) ANNUAL VOLUME CAP FOR BONDS ISSUED DURING EXTENSION PERIOD.—Subsection (f) of section 54 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to limitation on amount of bonds designated) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF BONDS DESIGNATED.—

''(1) ANNUAL NATIONAL LIMITATION.—There is a national clean renewable energy bond limitation for each calendar year of $2,250,000,000.

''(2) ALLOCATION BY SECRETARY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall allocate the amount described in paragraph (1) among qualified projects in such manner as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(B) LIMITATION ON ALLOCATIONS.—With respect to any calendar year, the Secretary may not allocate—

''(i) more than $750,000,000 of the amount described in paragraph (1) to finance qualified projects of qualified borrowers which are public power entities,

''(ii) more than $250,000,000 of the amount described in paragraph (1) to finance qualified projects of qualified borrowers which are Indian tribes,

''(iii) more than $500,000,000 of the amount described in paragraph (1) to finance qualified projects of qualified borrowers which are government entities (other than public power entities or Indian tribes), and

''(iv) more than $750,000,000 of the amount described in paragraph (1) to finance qualified projects of qualified borrowers which are cooperative electric companies or cooperative lenders.

''(C) PUBLIC POWER ENTITY.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term 'public power entity' means a State utility with a service obligation, as such terms are defined in section 217 of the Federal Power Act.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to bonds issued after December 31, 2007.

SA 1527. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—ETHANOL TARIFF EXTENSION

SEC. ____01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Ethanol Tariff Extension and Caribbean Basin Initiative Investigation Act''.

SEC. ____02. EXTENSION OF ADDITIONAL DUTY ON ETHANOL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subheading 9901.00.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by striking ''1/1/2009'' in the effective period column and inserting ''1/1/2011''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) applies to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. ____03. FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ''Renewable Energy Fund'' (referred to in this section as the ''Fund''), consisting of such amounts as may be transferred or credited to the Fund under subsection (b).

(b) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Fund out of the general fund of the Treasury amounts determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to the amounts received into such general fund that are attributable to the duty imposed under subheading 9901.00.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(c) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Up to $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2009 and up to $150,000,000 for fiscal year 2010 shall be available from the Fund, as provided in appropriation Acts, for the purposes described in section 206(c) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15853(c)).

(2) EXCESS AMOUNTS.—Any amount attributable to the duty imposed under subheading 9901.00.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States that exceeds the amounts authorized in paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2009 or 2010 shall be returned to the general fund of the Treasury.

(d) TRANSFERS OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts required to be transferred to the Fund under this section shall be transferred at least monthly from the general fund of the Treasury to the Fund on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—Proper adjustment shall be made in amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

SEC. ____04. STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF ETHANOL FROM CERTAIN CARIBBEAN BASIN COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall conduct a study into the source and quantity of ethanol, classifiable under subheading 9901.00.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that is imported into the United States from any country that is designated as a beneficiary country under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(b) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The study required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An identification of all countries that are not beneficiary countries designated under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act that produce ethanol that is imported duty-free into the United States through a country that is a beneficiary country under such Act.

(2) A determination of the quantity of ethanol on a country-by-country basis that is imported duty-free into the United States through a country that is a beneficiary country under such Act.

(3) Projections of the potential production capacity of all ofthe countries designated as beneficiary countries under such Actto dehydrate and export ethanol that originates in countries that are not beneficiary countries designated under such Act. The projections shall be made without regard to any import quotas relating to such beneficiary countries.

(4) A determination of the impact on the domestic and international marketplace of duty-free treatment for ethanol imported from countries designated as beneficiary countries under such Act with and without the current import quotas.

(5) A determination of the economic impact on countries designated as beneficiary countries under such Act if ethanol were not provided duty-free treatment and whether a stable political and economic climate would exist in the Caribbean region if duty-free treatment were not provided for ethanol.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the Secretary concludes the study described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall report to Congress on the results of that study, including the Secretary's conclusions regarding—

(1) the quantity of ethanol being passed through countries that are designated as beneficiary countries under the Caribbean Economic Recovery Act;

(2) where that ethanol originates;

(3) what the potential production capacity is for countries in the Caribbean region to act as a conduit for foreign ethanol if the current quota system is eliminated;

(4) what the economic impact on the domestic ethanol industry would be if the quota were eliminated; and

(5) whether the current duty-free treatment contributes to the political and economic stability of the Caribbean Basin region.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the oversight hearing before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources 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 has been rescheduled.

The rescheduled hearing will be held on Tuesday, June 26, 2007, at 10 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by e-mail to rachel_pasternack@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Scott Miller or Rachel Pasternack.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 12, 2007, at 9:30 a.m., in open session to consider the following nominations:

Mr. Michael G. Vickers to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict;

VADM Eric T. Olson, USN, for appointment to the grade of Admiral and to be Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command; and

The Honorable Thomas P. D'Agostino to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, Department of Energy and Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a hearing during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The hearing will focus on a recent proposal of the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service to limit the amount of universal service funding available to competitive eligible telecommunications carriers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 12, 2007 at 10 a.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in order to conduct a hearing entitled ''Examination of the Health Effects of Asbestos and Methods of Mitigating Such Impacts.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to hear testimony on ''Trade Enforcement for a 21st Century Economy.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 12, 2007, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a hearing on foreign assistance and a nomination hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 12, 2007 at 2:30 p.m. to hold an open hearing concerning Terrorist Ideology.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Assessing Telework Policies and Initiatives in the Federal Government.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Suzanne Wells from my office be given the privilege of the floor during the consideration of this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to Jack Wells on my staff for the duration of the debate on the Energy bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fellow in my office, Charlie Garlow, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the Energy bill debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER MEN'S CROSS COUNTRY TEAM

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 232, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 232) congratulating the University of Colorado at Boulder Men's Cross Country team for winning the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Cross Country Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 232) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 232

Whereas, on November 20, 2006, the University of Colorado at Boulder men's cross country team (referred to in this preamble as the ''Colorado Buffaloes'') won the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Men's Cross Country National Championship in Terre Haute, Indiana;

Whereas the Colorado Buffaloes team of junior Brent Vaughn, junior Stephen Pifer, senior Erik Heinonen, junior James Strang, and senior Billy Nelson won the NCAA Cross Country Championships with a score of 94, which was 48 points ahead of their nearest opponent;

Whereas this championship is the Colorado Buffaloes men's cross country team's 3rd national championship and also their 3rd championship in 6 years;

Whereas the Colorado Buffaloes won the Big 12 Conference Championship for the 11th consecutive year and the NCAA Mountain Region Championship for the 4th consecutive year in 2006;

Whereas senior Erik Heinonen and junior Brent Vaughn were named to the United States Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA) All-Academic Men's Team;

Whereas Colorado Buffaloes Head Coach Mark Wetmore was named USTFCCCA Men's Cross Country Coach of the Year for 2006;

Whereas Colorado Buffaloes Head Coach Mark Wetmore has successfully coached the University of Colorado men's and women's cross country teams to top 10 finishes in all of his 12 years as head coach; and

Whereas this championship marks the 23rd national title in the University of Colorado's athletic history and the 2nd championship of 2006: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) Congratulates the University of Colorado men's cross country team, the Colorado Buffaloes, for winning the 2006 NCAA Division I Men's Cross Country Championship;

(2) Recognizes the achievements of all the players, coaches, students, and support staff whose dedication was instrumental in helping the Colorado Buffaloes win the 2006 NCAA Division I Men's Cross Country Championship; and

(3) Respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit copies of this resolution to the following for appropriate display—

(A) The University of Colorado at Boulder;

(B) The President of the University of Colorado, Hank Brown;

(C) The Chancellor of the University of Colorado at Boulder, Dr. G.P. ''Bud'' Peterson;

(D) The Athletic Director of the University of Colorado at Boulder, Mike Bohn; and

(E) The Head Coach of The University of Colorado at Boulder men's cross country team, Mark Wetmore.

REPEALING CERTAIN SECTIONS OF THE ACT OF MAY 26, 1936, PERTAINING TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 44, H.R. 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 57) to repeal certain sections of the Act of May 26, 1936, pertaining to the Virgin Islands.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 57) was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 2007

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 13; that on Wednesday, following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day, and there be a period of morning business for 60 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the first half under the control of the majority and the second half under the control of the Republicans; that 20 minutes of the majority time be under the control of Senator BROWN or his designee; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 6, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:06 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 13, 2007, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING ALEX CHANDLER

HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I am honored to highlight an outstanding achievement of a young leader from my congressional district. Mr. Alex Chandler of Heritage High School in Littleton, Colorado was the elected Youth Governor of the YMCA Youth in Government Program and will attend the 2007 Youth Governor's Conference in Washington, DC this June.

Mr. Chandler's road to Washington is not unlike those taken by current Members of Congress. After a vigorous campaign, he was elected Youth Governor of Colorado to represent more than 50,000 of his peers. He was then given the task of executing the duties of his office against those of a mock legislature and judicial system. Due to his outstanding political and leadership abilities, Mr. Chandler will be one of 40 Youth Governors chosen to attend the conference.

The Youth Governor's Conference has been held annually in Washington, DC since 1964, granting high school students a rare and unique opportunity to meet and engage their elected officials in Congress, policy makers, and other prominent political personalities. This exceptional event seeks to provide these young individuals a greater understanding of America's political system, a familiarity of the major players within it, and exposure to the important issues of our era.

Madam Speaker, all of Colorado can take pride in the performance of Mr. Chandler and his great political potential. He is an excellent role model for his peers as well as a symbol of this country's future leadership. Please join me in commending Mr. Chandler for his successes.

SENATOR JOSEPH BIDEN PROPOSES INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR LIBRARY TO THWART NUCLEAR TERRORISM

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to a recent article by the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator JOSEPH BIDEN of Delaware. For the past 34 years that he has served in the Congress, Senator BIDEN has been a steadfast proponent of strong American policies to deal with nuclear non-proliferation.

In a column published last week in the Wall Street Journal Senator BIDEN proposed an "International Nuclear Library" that would store the nuclear signatures of the stockpiles of nuclear materials of all participating nations. Such a program would allow not only the United States but all participating countries to know that if any nuclear materials were inappropriately used, it would be possible to identify with certainty just where the culprits found their nuclear materials—a very strong deterrence to misuse.

Madam Speaker, Senator BIDEN's proposal would encourage more responsible behavior by countries with nuclear materials. It would provide a strong incentive for close monitoring of nuclear stockpiles. This plan would also give all participating countries a source for any radioactive materials that have entered or exited their borders.

I welcome Senator BIDEN's excellent and progressive proposal. Madam Speaker, I ask that Senator BIDEN's article be placed in the RECORD, and I urge all of my colleagues to give it careful and thoughtful attention.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 4, 2007]

CSI: NUKES

(By Senator Joseph Biden)

The most dangerous threat America faces is the possibility that one of the world's most extreme groups—like al Qaeda—gets its hands on a nuclear bomb. Luckily, a would-be nuclear terrorist cannot make the ingredients for a modern-day Hiroshima by himself. Either a state will have to give or sell him a bomb or the nuclear material to make one, or the terrorist will have to steal the material.

To bring deterrence into the 21st century and prevent an attack from ever occurring, the United States and other potential targets of nuclear terrorism must take advantage of nuclear terrorists' reliance on states.

The U.S. has long deterred a nuclear attack by states, by clearly and credibly threatening devastating retaliation. Now is the time for a new type of deterrence: We must make clear in advance that we will hold accountable any country that contributes to a terrorist nuclear attack, whether by directly aiding would-be nuclear terrorists or willfully neglecting its responsibility to secure the nuclear weapons or weapons-usable nuclear material within its borders. Deterrence cannot rest on words alone. It must be backed up by capabilities.

Before, we relied on being able to track incoming bombers or missiles to know who had attacked us. Today, because a nuclear bomb might be delivered in a rental van or a boat, the credibility of the new deterrence will rest on our scientific ability to examine the air and ground debris created by an attack to determine the source of the nuclear material.

Building on work from the Cold War, the U.S. is a leader in this new science of nuclear forensics. Any country today that aids a would-be nuclear terrorist, through action or neglect, has to be concerned about getting caught. But we can and must do more to improve our ability in this area, and to make our ability to trace the source of a nuclear explosion widely known. We need more nuclear forensics research, more scientists to analyze nuclear samples, and an assured ability—using our own aircraft or those of cooperating states—to quickly collect nuclear debris from the site of any attack, in this country or around the world.

While there is a lot the U.S. can do on its own to deter countries from helping nuclear terrorists, there is much more we can do through cooperation with other governments. In the aftermath of an attack—or much better, if terrorists are caught smuggling nuclear material before an attack—scientists would want to compare the samples they collect against what is known about other countries' nuclear material, to figure out the samples' country of origin. To enable such work, the U.S. should take the lead in creating an international nuclear forensics library.

The library could house actual samples of nuclear material contributed by participating countries, validated data about their material, or binding agreements to provide predetermined data in the immediate aftermath of an attack or smuggling incident. A library cannot guarantee that in the wake of an attack the world could assign blame to a country, but it could be a critical tool in narrowing an investigation and debunking wild rumors or allegations. Countries might hesitate to share their nuclear material, but the library could safeguard samples and identify their origin only if they matched smuggled material or nuclear debris. Any country that refused to contribute to a nuclear forensics library would risk condemnation or suspicion in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack.

Working out arrangements—to ensure that samples and data stay in trusted hands and that countries cannot fake the samples or data they submit—won't be easy. That is all the more reason to build on existing data collections in Russia and Germany and work with other countries to craft such a worldwide nuclear forensics library.

Four years ago, I proposed improving our nuclear forensics capabilities, but today funding for critical nuclear analysis by our National Laboratories remains dangerously low. Congress must give the labs the resources that they need—and that America's security demands.

This new form of deterrence must add to, not replace, other efforts to prevent nuclear terrorism. We must devote far more dollars and people to working with Russia and other countries to secure and reduce stockpiles of nuclear weapons and materials and to remove nuclear weapons-usable materials from as many sites as possible. The president must make this effort his or her personal priority.

Deterrence based on strong nuclear forensics is a critical tool to help prevent nuclear terrorism. To prevent a nuclear 9/11, we must use every tool we have.

TRIBUTE TO NOVI MEADOWS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Novi Meadows Elementary School, in Novi, Michigan, for

earning the distinguished Michigan Blue Ribbon Exemplary School award.

Since its establishment, Novi Meadows Elementary School has represented a pillar of educational excellence in our community. Characterized by a rigorous academic curriculum and an effective partnership between parents and teachers, Novi Meadows Elementary School offers students a constructive learning environment, caring friendships, and innovative educational opportunities to prepare them for life's challenges. Thanks to the dedicated teachers and staff, each year Novi Meadows Elementary School students graduate prepared for a promising future.

In fact, following an extensive assessment of their academic performance, in February of 2007, the Michigan State Board of Education and the Blue Ribbon committee of educators awarded Novi Meadows Elementary School the distinguished Michigan Blue Ribbon Exemplary School award. Established in 1982, the award recognizes schools demonstrating a strong commitment to educational excellence and significant academic improvement over five years. This year, the selection of Novi Meadows Elementary School demonstrates how dedicated teachers, a stellar learning environment, and an exemplary community benefit students.

Madam Speaker, in honor of its recent selection to receive the 2007 Michigan Blue Ribbon Exemplary School award, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Novi Meadows Elementary School's exceptional efforts to educate students, and its diligent service to our community and country.

RECOGNIZING HSBC BANK USA

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the 41st recipient of the Special Presentation Award given by the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce. The chamber of commerce wishes to recognize and honor HSBC Bank USA, NA for its contributions to the western New York community.

The employees of HSBC Bank USA, NA have demonstrated a commitment to service and community by volunteering over 135,000 hours of service for nonprofit organizations. HSBC employees donated their time by painting classrooms, picking up litter, tutoring children, and working to improve local areas such as Riverside Park.

HSBC Bank USA, NA has also contributed to the future of western New York and the country through its "HSBC Scholars" program, which last year boasted 1,800 recipients. In addition, the bank also partners with Junior Achievement, a nonprofit organization that works to educate students in the areas of free enterprise, business, and economics.

Cheektowaga has benefited from the presence and activities of HSBC Bank. HSBC Bank has contributed to the Cheektowaga community by acting as a member of the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce for 50 years, and has also sponsored events hosted by the chamber of commerce. Employees of the bank have continued to be an integral part of the western New York community through participation in organizations such as the United States Marine Corps Reserve and National Association of Women Business Owners.

Today, Madam Speaker, I would like to join the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce and many others in congratulating HSBC Bank USA, NA for its exceptional contributions to the western New York community and beyond.

IN RECOGNITION OF SHARNISHA BRAZZELL

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Sharnisha Brazzell as the recipient of the inaugural Tuskegee Scholarship, and to recognize the North Coast Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen for their service to our country.

As a member of the East Technical High School JROTC program, Sharnisha has demonstrated a strong desire to serve her country. As the 2007 Tuskegee Scholarship winner, Sharnisha will have the opportunity to develop her aviation skills as a student at the Summer Flight Academy of the Black Airline Pilots Association. Her hard work and dedication will take her to new and exciting heights, and I wish her luck in all her future endeavors.

Sharnisha will be carrying on a proud tradition of service to the United States started by the original Tuskegee Airmen. In the face of prejudice and segregation, the Tuskegee Airmen flew over 1,500 missions during World War II to help defeat Nazism and the spread of intolerance.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Sharnisha Brazzell as the recipient of the inaugural Tuskegee Scholarship. May she carry on the proud tradition of Black Aviation started by the Tuskegee Airmen.

HONORING DAVIE PIÑA, OF CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Davie Piña who is being honored by the Napa Valley Grapegrowers as their Grower of the Year on Friday, June 1, 2007. Mr. Piña is being recognized for his outstanding contribution both to the wine grape industry, and to the larger community of the Napa Valley.

Mr. Piña is a sixth generation farmer in the Napa Valley, where he was born and raised. After attending California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo, he took over and has substantially expanded the vineyard management business begun by his father, John Piña, Sr., over 40 years ago. Today he operates the thriving vineyard management group and is a partner running Piña Napa Valley winery as well as involving himself in numerous groups in the community.

Piña Vineyard Management has been at the forefront of sustainable farming practices in the Napa Valley for many years, incorporating ecologically friendly agricultural techniques with sophisticated technology to help clients ensure the long-term quality of their vineyards. Mr. Piña's environmental consciousness extends beyond his work in the vineyards, as he has cochaired a local environmental project referred to as the Rutherford Dust River Restoration Team that is working to restore the watershed of the Napa River as it passes through the Rutherford area. He is part of an excellent leadership team that has brought about significant and ongoing changes to the quality of the habitat along the river.

Mr. Piña has also served as the Assistant Fire Chief for the Rutherford Volunteer Fire Department for the past 18 years. During this time he has taken on numerous responsibilities, including storing the department's fire engine on his own property while spearheading the project for a permanent Silverado Fire Station that opened in 2006. As a professional vineyard manager, he was keenly attuned to problems in the industry, and last year he helped organize local farm managers, and ultimately facilitated the Vineyard Managers Facilities Ordinance. This important work has allowed the legalization of vineyard management operations, and will help ensure regulation and quality in Napa Valley agriculture.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, it is appropriate at this time that we thank Mr. Davie Piña for the hard work he has done on behalf of the Napa Valley. As a respected manager and now winemaker, he has advanced the reputation of Napa Valley grapes and wine, and he has also been a model citizen and superb steward of the land he lives on.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY E. FOSTER

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the memory of Larry E. Foster. Larry passed away Sunday, June 10, at the age of 66, after suffering with cancer for the past several months.

Larry Foster started in public service fighting for the rights of senior citizens after graduating from Mississippi Industrial College with a bachelor of arts degree. He was the director of the Detroit Street Senior Citizen Center and the Hasselbring Senior Center. Elected to the Beecher Board of Education in 1977, Larry has held elected office ever since. He served on the Beecher Board of Education for 14 years.

He went on to be elected as the Mt. Morris Township supervisor in 1992 and has held that position ever since, He was the first African-American ever elected to the supervisor post in the history of the township. He was a devoted servant of the people and worked tirelessly to make Mt. Morris Township a great place to live and work.

Larry was enthusiastic about his community and spent many hours volunteering with Beecher Community Schools. He was the junior high school basketball coach for the past 31 years and a coach for the elementary football and basketball teams. In addition Larry served on the boards of many community organizations and was a member of St. Paul Missionary Baptist Church.

Madam Speaker, Larry Foster was a wonderful friend, a great advocate for Mt. Morris Township, and a revered figure in Mt. Morris for the past 30 years. He leaves a lasting legacy of breaking down barriers, and compassion for his fellow human beings. The mark he left on the community is a true blessing and he will be greatly missed.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL PFANNES

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Daniel Pfannes, Chief of Police at the Westland Police Department, upon his retirement from a distinguished law enforcement career in Westland, Michigan.

For nearly five decades, Chief Pfannes dedicated his life to protecting the citizens of Michigan. Upon graduation from Central Michigan University with a Bachelor of Arts in Industrial Supervision and Management, Chief Pfannes joined the Westland Police Department as a Police Officer in the Uniform Patrol Division. Over the next 25 years, Chief Pfannes ascended through the Department's ranks, eventually serving as an Evidence Technician, Patrol Sergeant, Detective Sergeant, Patrol Lieutenant, Special Investigations Lieutenant, SWAT Commander, and Deputy Chief of Police. In 1993, Chief Pfannes graduated from the Police School of Staff and Command at Eastern Michigan University and Northwestern University. One year later, in 1994, he earned a Master's degree in Criminal Justice from the University of Detroit. Then, in March of 2003 he was promoted to the Chief of Police of the City of Westland.

Today, Chief Pfannes is a leader in the city of Westland and Wayne County. He serves on the Executive Board of the Wayne County Chiefs of Police Association, the Wayne County Regional Police Academy Advisory Board, the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police Legislative Committee, and the Advisory Board of the Wayne County Representative to the Courts and Law Enforcement Management Information System (C.L.E.M.I.S.). He is also a Juvenile Justice instructor at Schoolcraft College and an assistant adjunct professor at Madonna University in Livonia where he teaches Criminal Justice.

For his tireless service to the community, Chief Pfannes has been recognized with the "Most Influential Instructor Award" by Schoolcraft Police Academy; and for his heroic efforts in combating crime, the Westland Police Department has honored him with numerous citations and commendations. The Wayne County Executive, Robert Ficano, also recognized Chief Pfannes for his efforts to secure $23 million in federal Urban Area Security Initiative funding for Wayne County and the City of Detroit.

Madam Speaker, for 25 years, Chief Daniel Pfannes has unwaveringly protected and defended the citizens of Michigan. His long established legacy of dedication, loyalty, and courage will never be forgotten. As he enters the next phase of his life, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Chief Pfannes upon his retirement and in honoring his years of legendary service to our community and our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, on Monday I took part in a meeting in Denver at which the Advisory Board on Radiation and Health considered questions related to a petition to include people who worked at the Rocky Flats site as part of the "special exposure cohort" under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act (EEOICPA).

As a result, I was not able to be present for three votes in the House.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 448—H.R. 2356, to amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father's Day—I would have voted "yes."

Rollcall No. 449—S. 676, to provide that the Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank or the Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank may serve on the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation—I would have voted "yes."

Rollcall No. 450—H. Res. 418, Recognizing and welcoming the delegation of Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign Ministers from the Caribbean to Washington, DC, and commending the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) for holding the Conference on the Caribbean—I would have voted "yes."

HONORING GEORGE BUCCI

HON. RON LEWIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of George Bucci. Mr. Bucci, a noted musician and public servant in Bardstown, Kentucky, passed away on May 9, 2007.

Mr. Bucci retired from the St. Joseph's School, where he spent many years as a music instructor. He was well known throughout the community for his volunteer work at several area nursing homes and charity events. He also served 28 years as the Adjutant for the "My Old Kentucky Home" Post 121 of the American Legion.

His service to his country and dedication to the Nelson County community will be remembered by all who knew him. It is my privilege to honor the memory of George Bucci today before the entire U.S. House of Representatives. May he rest in peace.

RECOGNIZING PEOPLE INC. UPON RECEIVING THE CHEEKTOWAGA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2007 COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the accomplishments of People Inc., a nonprofit group that provides assistance to those with developmental disabilities, low-income seniors, and the general public. These accomplishments have earned People Inc. the 2007 Community Service Award from the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce.

Since its foundation in 1971, People Inc. has worked selflessly towards its goal of providing individuals with disabling conditions, or other special needs, the tools they need to succeed in society. These tools include over 100 group homes, senior housing complexes, day programs, early intervention programs, young adult life transition programs, and a medical clinic. People Inc. has helped over 10,000 members of the community to make progress in their daily lives.

In addition to this honor from the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce, People Inc.'s outstanding efforts have been recognized by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development through the National Best Practices Award.

People Inc. has given back to the western New York community not only through its tireless service towards aiding those in need, but also by employing almost 2,300 residents and has been ranked as number 22 out of the top 30 largest employers in western New York.

Not only has People Inc. provided western New York and beyond with direct assistance, it has also aided other nonprofit organizations with knowledge and resources in the hopes of spreading its fundamental goals even farther throughout the community.

I stand here today, Madam Speaker, to acknowledge the contributions of People Inc. to the community, and am certain that many others will recognize these outstanding contributions as well.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE COUNCIL ON AMERICAN-ISLAMIC RELATIONS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in order to recognize the achievements of the Council on American-Islamic Relations, on the occasion of their Fifth Anniversary. Since its inception, CAIR has been instrumental in creating dialogue between the diverse communities of northeast Ohio.

The Council on American-Islamic Relations is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to enhance understanding of Islam, encourage dialogue, protect civil liberties, empower American Muslims, and build conditions that promote justice and mutual understanding. With the help of CAIR, the Tenth District of Ohio has become a more inclusive community and a more welcoming place for American Muslims. I thank every member of the organization for their time and dedication to improving the lives of the citizens of the Cleveland area.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognizing the truly outstanding achievements of the Council on American-Islamic Relations. As our community continues to grow in its religious and cultural diversity, the work of CAIR is paramount if we are to thrive. May their efforts to create a more inclusive and peaceful world endure for years to come.

TRIBUTE TO THE MICHIGAN CHAPTER OF THE PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge the Michigan Chapter of the Paralyzed Veterans of America in partnering with Ford Motor Company to release ''The Ford Michigan Mobility Resource Guide'' during their Open House in Novi, Michigan, on April 12, 2007.

For nearly five decades, the Michigan Paralyzed Veterans of America have loyally served our community's veterans with spinal cord injury or disease. A congressionally chartered veteran's service organization, the Michigan Paralyzed Veterans of America have faithfully honored its commitment to advocate for improved health care access, research and development for spinal cord injury and spinal cord dysfunction, sports programs; and have enhanced the benefits and disability rights on behalf of all paralyzed veterans.

In honor of Michigan Paralyzed Veteran Awareness Week, April 8, 2007, through April 14, 2007, the Michigan Paralyzed Veterans of America have partnered with Ford Motor Company of Michigan's Mobility Motoring Division to introduce the ''Ford Michigan Mobility Resource Guide.'' On April 12, 2007, the 14-page guide for disabled drivers will debut at the Michigan Paralyzed Veterans of America's Open House and subsequently be available at Ford auto dealerships statewide.

Madam Speaker, this guide is key to helping the Michigan Paralyzed Veterans of America continue its noble mission to ensure all paralyzed veterans are empowered to lead healthy and fulfilling lives. Today, in honor of its legendary dedication to our disabled veterans and its tireless efforts to assist individuals with spinal cord injuries, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Michigan Paralyzed Veterans of America for its unwavering commitment to our veterans, our community and our country.

HONORING HELGA LEMKE, OF SONOMA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise with my colleague Rep. LYNN WOOLSEY with great pleasure to honor Helga Lemke on her 18 years of service with Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County. Since 1989, when she was hired as the agency's Executive Director, Helga has shown a steadfast commitment to increasing opportunities for low income residents of Sonoma County to gain self-sufficiency and contribute to their communities. We have found Helga to be fiercely focused on fighting poverty, wonderfully competent in running this large, multi-program agency, and yet very down-to-earth and authentic.

Helga has spent her entire career helping others, from her internship with the National Community Action Foundation nearly 40 years ago through her work at the United Nations to the present. One of the tenets she holds to dearly, says colleague John Way, is making a difference. He notes, ''I have heard her often say that one of the most enriching things about her work is having someone tell her, 'What you've done has changed my life.' ''

Helga's well-earned appointment to Director of Programs for the California Department of Community Services reminds us how much she has accomplished for our community. For one, she transformed a struggling nonprofit into one of the largest and most respected agencies in the county. She also initiated an award-winning staff diversity training program and a community-acclaimed annual conference on poverty, at the same time leading a staff of 225 at more than 20 sites with an annual budget of more than $11 million.

Despite all this, Helga has still made time for public service. The Sonoma County Board of Supervisors appointed her to the Workforce Investment Board and Youth Council; the Santa Rosa City Mayor has appointed her to the Mayor's Task Force on Gangs; and she has also served on numerous boards, including Roseland University Prep School. She has also testified before Congress on Head Start issues, where her expertise was valued.

Madam Speaker, we have appreciated working with Director Lemke on the many issues faced by the Sonoma community and thank her for her dedicated service. Her passion and energy are an inspiration to all of us who work with families. Congratulations on your appointment, Helga.

TRIBUTE TO BAY COUNTY'S SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I am happy to rise before you today, and to ask my colleagues in the 110th Congress to join me in celebrating Bay County's sesquicentennial anniversary. This momentous occasion will be marked by a series of events to take place Friday, June 15 through Sunday, June 17, 2007.

In 1857, a village, made up of land once used as a campground for the Chippewa Indians, was formed east of the Saginaw River. In 1865, this village, known as Bay City, was formally incorporated as a city. To the west of the river, the villages of Banks, Salzburg, and Wenona joined together forming West Bay City. Eventually, both Bay City and West Bay City joined together as ''Greater'' Bay City in 1905.

Bay County was formally recognized as an independent county in 1857, and consists of four cities: Bay City, Essexville, Pinconning, and Auburn; two villages: Munger and Linwood; in addition to fourteen townships.

Madam Speaker, in the 150 years since the formation of Bay County, we have seen a rise from a collection of small lumber villages to one of Michigan's most vibrant areas. The shipyards and sawmills of the past have given way to worldwide corporations that create opportunities each day. Bay County's rich heritage is seen in its renowned architecture and diverse history. For generations, the kind hearts and friendly manner of the residents have made Bay County a warm and welcoming community.

Madam Speaker, once again I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Bay County, Michigan on the 150th anniversary of its formation.

RECOGNIZING RAYMOND I. WOLNIEWICZ UPON BEING NAMED 2007 CITIZEN OF THE YEAR BY THE CHEEKTOWAGA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I stand before you today to honor and congratulate the 41st recipient of the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce's Citizen of the Year award. Raymond I. Wolniewicz is being recognized by the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce on June 14, 2007 for his outstanding commitment to the community.

Mr. Wolniewicz has demonstrated his dedication to the community through his devoted service as a World War II Air Force Veteran. Raymond served his country honorably and continues to do so through his participation in the Leonard Post V.F.W. Post 6251. Ray also acts as the Chairman and a trustee of the War of 1812 committee, demonstrating a passion for this country's rich history.

Ray Wolniewicz has also served his community through his dedication to his faith and social service. Ray and his wife Theresa have been devoted members of their church for the past 45 years. Ray also commits more of his time to his faith through his involvement in the Holy Name and Ushers Society. In addition, Ray helps to support the Cheektowaga community by delivering meals for the Meals on Wheels program and working at the Cheektowaga Senior Center.

In addition to these many accomplishments, Ray Wolniewicz has contributed to the community and country through his role as the President of the Cheektowaga Patriotic Commission, through which he helps to organize events such as the Town of Cheektowaga's Annual Fourth of July Festivities and Christmas Tree Lighting ceremony, as well as supporting numerous local organizations.

Ray's patriotism and commitment to community and country can be clearly seen in his professional and civic activities. I ask today, Madam Speaker, that Raymond Wolniewicz be recognized for this dedicated and selfless service.

HONORING MARIE STEWARD

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Marie Steward, a recent recipient of the Adams County Democratic Party's 2007 Life-Time Achievement Award. I am pleased to recognize her service and the many contributions she has made to her community.

Although her work in the Democratic Party has been a major part of her civic involvement, it is not her partisan work that I want to acknowledge so much as it is her long involvement in the civic life of Adams County. In fact, if there could be a ''Mrs. Adams County,'' it is Marie Steward. She is well known in Adams County through her involvement with her family, her neighborhood, organized labor and community activities.

Marie was born the youngest of eleven children in Minor, Kansas to John and Lena O'Brien. Her family lost their farm during the Great Depression and moved to live with her Uncle Benjamin. Marie graduated from Brewster High School, and has fond memories from this time of taking the train to Denver and stopping at the historic Oxford Hotel. She later moved to Sand Point, Idaho after marrying Mike Steward, a young man serving in the Navy. When Mike was discharged from service in World War II, he worked as a machinist for Ringsby Trucking, a company that owned the basketball team that later became the Denver Nuggets—and a team my father, Mo, used to play for. Mike and Marie were regular attendees at the games, and Marie was a key member of the Prospectors, a booster club for the team. She also volunteered at St. Vincent's Home for Orphans, where, thanks to Marie, no child ever went without a gift at Christmas.

Marie became politically active in northern Denver when she volunteered with her colleagues, Eileen Ray and Dolores Dickman. In 1954, the Stewards bought one of the first brick houses in Thornton, a new development project that was targeted for returning World War II soldiers and their families. Marie used skills learned in Denver politics and became a precinct committee person with her neighbor and long-time activist, Ed Lappart.

For many years, Marie 'ran' the Adams County Democratic Party Headquarters. She produced candidate literature and published the county newsletter, the GADFLY. Rumor has it that many Republicans would often drop by for a visit to see what Marie was serving volunteers for lunch. Marie made headquarters a fun place, and with her experience as a leader in the International Machinists Auxiliary, Marie served many meals and taught the basics of political participation.

She was elected as a delegate to county, congressional, and state committees, assemblies and conventions. At a mini-convention in Kansas City, Marie once met and dined with a young man named Warren Beatty. He told people later that he liked to ''pal around'' with Marie because she treated him like she treated everyone—for Marie every person is a celebrity.

Today, Marie's family includes her son Jim, who is retired from IBM/Lexmark and shares Marie's Thornton home; her daughter Anita; her husband Gary McCulloch and their four daughters and grandchildren. Not to be forgotten is ''Cookie'' the family rat terrier, who Marie walks several times during the day.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging Marie Steward for her involvement in public life and for her bipartisan interest in treating people well.

She is an example of the heroic generation and an advocate of those values, like hard work and compassion for others, that represent the very best in politics—values that both Republicans and Democrats can celebrate together.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LYNN KLEIMAN MALINOFF, THE RECIPIENT OF THE 2007 WOMEN OF WESTLAND ATHENA AWARD

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Dr. Lynn Kleiman Malinoff, the recipient of the 2007 Women of Westland ATHENA Award.

Each year, the Women of Westland organization recognizes exemplary women in Wayne-Westland, Michigan, who have succeeded in reaching their full leadership potential. This year, Lynn is recognized for improving the lives of countless women in our community. In addition to being the Special Education Counselor at the Tinkham Center in the Wayne-Westland School District, she serves as a role model to female high school students through the Youth Mentorship Program, a program she initiated seventeen years ago to help children from disadvantaged homes. Lynn also assists women in families affected by alcoholism and volunteers at her Synagogue to mentor and work with adolescents and their parents.

For her legendary commitment to bettering our community, Lynn was recognized with the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention Award. The Institute for Museum & Library Services also recognized Lynn's Youth Mentorship Program at the White House. Her efforts have succeeded in promoting educated, strong, and independent families who can also achieve their full potential.

Madam Speaker, on February 10, 2007, Lynn's selfless dedication to the women, children, and families of Wayne-Westland will be duly recognized with the Women of Westland's highest commendation, the ATHENA Award. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding her work and in honoring her tireless service to our community and our country.

HONORING JAMES ''AVON'' FOGLE

HON. RON LEWIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to James ''Avon'' Fogle, a constituent from my home district, who is retiring this month as a veterans service officer at the ''My Old Kentucky Home'' American Legion Post 121.

A lifelong resident of Nelson County, Mr. Fogle graduated from Holy Cross High School in Holy Cross, KY and served his country as a United States Marine during World War II. He has been a member of the Bardstown American Legion Post 121 for the past 38 years, serving as a veterans service officer for the past 12 years. In this capacity he has spent many Friday mornings providing counseling and guidance to local veterans in need of assistance.

Mr. Fogle's devotion to others in his community extends well beyond his work at the American Legion. He is also a regular volunteer at the local St. Vincent DePaul Society and continues to serve as an election official for the Nelson County government.

It is my great privilege to honor James ''Avon'' Fogle today before the entire U.S. House of Representatives for his dedicated service to our Nation as well as to veterans and neighbors in the Bardstown community. He is an outstanding citizen worthy of our collective honor and respect.

RECOGNIZING ANDERSON'S FROZEN CUSTARD ON BEING NAMED THE CHEEKTOWAGA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2007 SMALL BUSINESS OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Anderson's Frozen Custard as the recipient of the 41st Small Business of the Year award, given by the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce. Anderson's Frozen Custard has been given this honor because of the devoted efforts of its founders, Carl and Greta Anderson, who have transformed their small business into a successful and generous establishment in Western New York.

Carl, a Navy veteran, Greta, and their children Nels, Keith, and Holly Anderson, have transformed Anderson's Frozen Custard from a small New York City custard stand to a thriving business with several locations throughout Western New York due to their hard work and savvy business sense. The Andersons can credit much of their success to their ability to adapt their business to changing times and locations, as well as their dedication to making Anderson's a success.

Not only has Anderson's Frozen Custard succeed in the business world, but the company has also contributed to the Western New York community. Anderson's has worked to raise funds for organizations such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Camp Good Days and Special Times, and local schools. This commitment to maintaining both a successful business and community indicates the mark of a business deserving of this honor.

Madam Speaker, I ask that congratulations be extended to Anderson's Frozen Custard in receiving this honor because of its outstanding achievements in business and dedication to improving the lives of Western New York residents.

IN RECOGNITION OF CATHERINE BOHAN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Catherine Bohan, for her outstanding efforts in educating children, and for her lifelong commitment to family, colleagues, and friends.

Cathy has educated and enlightened our children and prepared them for life's journey

for approximately 40 years, including 13 years at Saint Richard School where she currently teaches third grade. She has proven herself a wonderful teacher, colleague and friend. Not only does she teach at Saint Richard School, but she also makes a tremendous contribution as member of the Liturgy Committee, a Eucharistic Minister, a Praxis Pathwise Mentor, and a member of the Retreat Committee.

Likewise, her services to Saint Clarence Church as RCIA Leader, Eucharistic Minister, PSR Teacher and Pre-Cana organizer while at the same time raising three beautiful children, is truly admirable. She has been married to her beloved husband, Patrick, for 30 years.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Catherine Bohan for her long and successful career as an educator and for her dedication to and care for the future generations of Northeast Ohio.

HONORING VIRGINIA HINSHAW OF DAVIS, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work of Virginia Hinshaw during her time as Provost and Executive Vice-Chancellor at the University of California, Davis. In this role, Dr. Hinshaw has provided superb guidance to the ongoing development and refinement of the University's academic program while overseeing many aspects of campus financial and operational planning. Dr. Hinshaw has made significant contributions to the UC Davis Community and she will be missed as she continues her career as Chancellor at the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Dr. Hinshaw received her Bachelor's and Master's degrees from the University of Auburn in 1966 and 1967, before working as a clinical microbiologist at the Medical College of Virginia. She returned to Auburn and received her Ph.D. in microbiology in 1973. She spent the next decade studying influenza viruses in humans, other mammals, and particularly migratory birds. She has studied the markers of transmission for individual viruses, and conducted early research on identifying markers of interspecies transmission of these viruses.

In 1985 Dr. Hinshaw was hired as an associate professor at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, where she was recognized with a number of awards honoring her unusually vibrant teaching and participation in the larger community of Madison. After promotion to professor in 1988, she served first as an Associate Dean for Research before being appointed Associate Vice-Chancellor in 1994. In 1995 she was promoted to Vice Chancellor for Research, and she was in charge of research and graduate education, overseeing thousands of students.

Dr. Hinshaw arrived at UC Davis in 2001, and has directed a wide variety of programs and departments during her time there. As sole member of the governing body of the UC Davis health system, she has helped direct the continued development of programs at the UC Davis Medical Center while also ensuring that it has remained financially sound. In addition, the medical school has opened a number of new facilities during her tenure. Her work on campus has been visible through the replacement of temporary classroom buildings with more permanent facilities, including increasing the number of teaching labs for undergraduates.

In addition to her accomplishments as an administrator, Dr. Hinshaw is well known around the university for providing a personal touch to the administration. Many people have commented on her empathy and interest in working with individuals to help resolve their problems, and each year she took the additional step of teaching a freshman seminar where she could engage younger students.

Madam Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we recognize Dr. Virginia Hinshaw for her leadership and vision during her time as Provost and Vice-Chancellor at UC Davis. Her work has led the development of the university in many different areas, and even as she moves on, her work will continue to yield great rewards for the community.

TRIBUTE TO BRENDA J. LUSSIER

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Brenda J. Lussier, as she retires from a distinguished career at the Novi Public Library in Novi, Michigan.

For twenty seven years, Brenda has tirelessly worked to improve our community with enhanced library services. Prior to working at the Novi Public Library, she graduated from the University of Michigan where she earned a Bachelor's degree in English and a Master's Degree in Library Science. On September 24, 1979, Brenda began working at Novi Public Library as Head of Reference, and later ascended to Director on April 8, 1985. She is a member of the American Library Association and the Michigan Library Association, and participated in the Michigan Library Association Leadership Academy from 1989 to 1991.

Brenda is credited with enhancing the quality of life in Novi by expanding library services in innovative ways. During her tenure, she served on various committees of The Library Network, including the Steering Committee. She also served on various committees of the Michigan Library Association, such as Chairwoman of the Public Library Division and the Management and Administration Division. As a member of the Novi Rotary Club, Brenda compiled the club newsletter for several years and was presented with the Paul Harris Fellowship Award in 2003 for her distinguished service. She has also received a national award for Intellectual Freedom from the Public Library Association and Novi's People's Choice Award in 2002 as the "best librarian for her grace, leadership, and commitment to public service under a barrage of demands from the information-hungry in Novi."

Madam Speaker, Brenda is a compassionate leader and visionary who's passion for excellence and support for a robust library system has positively impacted our Novi Community. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Brenda for twenty seven years of loyalty and dedication to the Novi Public Library, and in applauding her legendary service to our community and our country.

RECOGNIZING CATHOLIC HEALTH SYSTEM HOME CARE UPON BEING NAMED CHEEKTOWAGA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2007 LARGE BUSINESS OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Catholic Health Systems Home Care as the 41st recipient of the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce's Large Business of the Year award. Catholic Health Systems Home Care has maintained a commitment to providing superb health care assistance, both physical and spiritual, for residents of Western New York over the past 20 years.

During these 20 years of caring for the Western New York community, Catholic Health System Home Care has grown into three thriving companies dedicated to meeting the company's fundamental goal of providing health care that allows individuals to maintain independence in their own homes.

Not only has the Catholic Health Care Systems improved the physical and spiritual well-being of Western New Yorkers, it also provides jobs to over 400 residents and supports community events such as school supply drives, assisting the American Red Cross Blood Drive, and participating in the United Way Day of Caring, demonstrating an outstanding commitment to the Western New York community.

Catholic Health System Home Care's dedication to excellence can been seen in its many other honors, such as the Catholic Health Association Sharing Innovation Award, IPRO "Recognized Improvement in Patient Outcomes," and Outcome Concept System Vision Award. Catholic Health System Home Care had also been recognized by Business First as one of the best places to work in Western New York.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today to recognize with pride the accomplishments of Catholic Health System Home Care as a leader in providing care to the residents of Western New York.

SUPPORTING H.R. 811, VOTE CONFIDENCE AND INCREASED ACCESSIBILITY ACT

HON. JOE SESTAK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 811, the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act. This is an excellent, and much needed piece of legislation.

The right to vote is no doubt one of the cornerstones of our democracy, if not its greatest measurement. Through casting a vote, the voice of the people is made manifest in one simple, single act. President Johnson thought so highly of voting that he was quoted as saying it was "the most powerful instrument ever devised by man." Consequently, every effort must be utilized to ensure this process is as efficient and as fail proof as it possibly can be.

The 2000 elections undermined the confidence of voters as the saga of counting ballots and tallying votes lingered for months. As a result, the call for election reform implemented the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), which provided funding for election administration and electronic voting machines. This act was a giant step in the right direction of assuring voter security, and voter confidence.

However, the elections of 2004 exposed once again a call for further action. An estimated 50 million voters cast their ballots on the electronic voter machines that lacked a voter-verified paper audit trail. This leaves no mechanism to verify or resolve reported voter tallies. Simply put, this is unacceptable.

Madam Speaker—H.R. 811 takes aim at resolving this very problem. It mandates an independent audit mechanism, which means that every voter will verify on a permanent paper ballot his or her vote. And in order to ensure this is carried out in the right manner, this bill provides necessary funding and oversight.

With another Presidential election on the horizon, it is vitally important that we restore the confidence of voters across this nation. Every citizen must be heard, and thus their every vote must be recorded. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and ensure that the voice of Americans is never again placed in doubt.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND EXAMPLE OF CAPTAIN ROBERT E. CLARK

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert E. Clark, a decorated Captain in the United States Navy, and native of the 16th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

At a commencement ceremony later today, Captain Clark will be inducted into West Chester East High School's Hall of Fame—a deserving honor for a devoted servant of our great Nation. While a student at East High School, Clark was a scholar athlete—maintaining excellent grades while lettering in football, basketball, and track.

After graduation, Clark went on to attend the United States Naval Academy—the first graduate of West Chester East ever to do so. Since graduating from Annapolis, Clark has honorably served his country as an officer in the Navy's submarine fleet.

He has received several personal decorations for his distinguished service, including the prestigious Legion of Merit.

I thank Captain Clark for his selfless service to our Nation, and I congratulate him on his well-earned induction into West Chester East's Hall of Fame. He has set a fine example for our next generation of young leaders to follow.

CELEBRATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHEMICAL ABSTRACTS SERVICE (CAS)

HON. DEBORAH PRYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Chemical Abstracts Service, an American scientific institution and world's largest compendium of information on chemical substances.

Located in Columbus, Ohio, adjacent to the campus of Ohio State University, what is now called Chemical Abstracts Service, or "CAS" as it is popularly known, was founded in 1907 when a collaboration of leading chemists partnered with the American Chemical Society to begin publishing a new journal called Chemical Abstracts.

One hundred years later, Chemical Abstracts is recognized around the world as a leading source of indexed scientific literature and contains more than 27 million bibliographic records related to the chemical sciences. Its sister resource, the CAS Registry, comprises more than 32 million unique entries for chemical substances. These two massive and integrated databases, along with a wealth of related resources on chemistry and chemical reactions, form the backbone of today's Chemical Abstract Service. Scientists, information professionals, and academicians around the world access these databases daily through online services that have revolutionized the way scientists conduct research.

Speaking of the value of CAS services, 2005 Nobel Laureate in chemistry, Dr. Robert Grubbs, said, "CAS databases streamline the investigative process, allowing you to take an idea and rapidly find the important and necessary information before you forget about the idea or it loses its excitement. That really is invaluable."

This year CAS celebrates its 100th anniversary as a strong, vibrant national scientific treasure: fully electronic, web-enabled, and still growing every day. This month, CAS is being designated a National Historic Chemical Landmark and it is my honor to recognize this great scientific institution and wish CAS good luck for its next 100 years.

HONORING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS FOR THE STAMP OUT HUNGER FOOD DRIVE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Buffalo and Western New York letter deliverers who are part of the National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC).

This month, NALC collected more than 70 million pounds of food for local food banks, pantries, and shelters to help needy families as part of its nationwide "Stamp Out Hunger" drive. I would like to specifically recognize the Branch 3 carriers in Buffalo and Western New York for collecting more than 2 million pounds of donations, placing them as the top NALC local branch in the drive for the fifth consecutive year.

With one in five American children living in poverty, we must all do our part to end hunger. I am proud of the efforts that these hardworking men and women have taken to better their community and I ask that all Americans join in the effort to stamp out hunger.

TRIBUTE TO MR. RHYS LEWIS

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Mr. Rhys Lewis upon his receipt of the Wayne 11th Congressional District Republican Committee's 2007 Lifetime Achievement Award.

Throughout nearly seven decades, Mr. Lewis has served our nation with distinction. As a United States Marine Corps Sergeant, he defended our liberty in the South Pacific during World War II before returning home and marrying Ruth M. Lewis in 1947. Then, in 1958, Rhys was elected a Republican precinct delegate and, ultimately, a Redford Charter Township Trustee. In addition to his loyal public service, Mr. Lewis has been Chairman of Redford Civil Affairs and of the Wayne 17th Congressional District Republicans.

Rhys is a pillar of the Michigan Republican party, who has served on the Michigan GOP State Committee for eight years and in the Redford Republican party as for a decade. As a result of his loyalty to liberty and courage of his convictions, Rhys has enriched the lives of others and established a honorable legacy of courage, leadership and service.

Madam Speaker, in recognition of his legendary contributions to the Michigan Republican party and of his lifetime of extraordinary achievements, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Rhys Lewis for his tireless service to our community and our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, due to inclement weather, my flight to Washington, D.C. was delayed, and I regrettably missed rollcall votes 448–450. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: rollcall No. 448, "yea;" rollcall No. 449, "yea;" rollcall No. 450, "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably absent yesterday afternoon, June 11, on very urgent business. Had I been present for the three votes which occurred yesterday evening, I would have

voted "aye" on H.R. 2356, rollcall vote No. 448; I would have voted "aye" on S. 676, rollcall vote No. 449; I would have voted "aye" on H. Res. 418, rollcall vote No. 450.

RECOGNITION OF RABBI JAY ROSENBAUM AND THE NORTH AMERICAN BOARD OF RABBIS GERMAN-AMERICAN JEWISH EXCHANGE PROGRAM

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, Today, I rise to commend Rabbi Jay Rosenbaum and the North American Board of Rabbis (NABOR) on the fifth anniversary of the German-American Jewish youth exchange program.

NABOR has brought together young high school students from Germany for an exchange program with American Jewish youth living in a variety of cities and suburbs throughout the United States. The students have learned about each other's cultures and traditions and in the process established close and enduring bonds of friendship. They meet not only other students participating in the exchange programs but also the larger population of teenagers in their schools. The result is that over tens of thousands of young people in Germany and the United States have been touched by this program which has gone far in increasing understanding of two very rich cultures.

It is with real pleasure that I recognize Rabbi Jay Rosenbaum, who serves as the Spiritual Leader of Temple Israel of Lawrence, the oldest synagogue in Long Island. Rabbi Rosenbaum has been a leader in the Jewish community for over 30 years, and has been recognized for both the outstanding services he provides as a Congregational Rabbi as well as for work on his behalf of International Jewry and human rights. Rabbi Rosenbaum was the founder of the NABOR exchange. He was also among the leaders six years ago of a delegation of 50 Rabbis who visited Berlin to establish a closer relationship with the Jewish community, business community and leaders of the society in Germany.

This year the North American Board of Rabbis is bestowing its Tikkun Olam award to Mr. Jan Carendi, Chairman of Allianz of America, and Mr. Ernst Lieb, President of Mercedes-Benz USA. Both Allianz and Mercedes Benz have distinguished themselves as enlightened companies that have supported the exchange program since its inception. Operating on a global platform, they have a tradition of striving to improve relations and understanding between German and the Jewish communities throughout the world. The award was presented at a ceremony hosted by Dr. Hans-Juergen Heimsoeth, Consul General of the Federal Republic of Germany in New York City, which has also played a prominent role in support of the exchange program.

Madam Speaker, Germany has moved a long way from the dark days of the Third Reich and now has the fastest growing Jewish population in Europe. It is important for students to learn that past but also to develop an understanding of the dynamic positive changes taking place within German society. I therefore am pleased to recognize the great contributions being made by Rabbi Rosenbaum and the North American Board of Rabbis.

IN HONOR OF THE STUDENT GRADUATES OF THE D.A.R.E. PROGRAM

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, today, the township of Washington and borough of Westwood Police Departments will hold a D.A.R.E. graduation ceremony. Nearly 200 students are participating in this important program that gives young people the support they need to say no to drugs, underage drinking, and gang violence. Drug Abuse Resistance Education, or D.A.R.E., began as a small program in Los Angeles in 1983. Today, it is implemented in more than 75 percent of our Nation's school districts and in more than 43 other nations. It uses positive peer pressure to help children defeat the negative cultural influences that bombard them daily. I am proud of the young boys and girls who participated in this program in these communities, and I would like to recognize them all for taking this step toward positive citizenship:

Michaella Bermudez, Michael Bonhard, Sabrina Di Costanzo, Maureen Drivick, Amber Hermanns, Mariel Hohmann, Gabriella Khalil, Tyler Kocher, Xhenette Koci, Gina Lagomarsino, Connor McCarron, John Meluso, William Mitchell, Kathryn Neary, Sara Nestrowitz, Andrew Paterson, Matthew Rivera, Steven Shanley, Gregory Smith, Vincent Soccodato, Amanda Sonntag, Tie Stutzer, Dana Tannariello, Nile Tracy, Erin Wholey, Abigail Blumkin, Kirstyn Brendlen, Craig Carmilani, Ryan DeLoughry, Tristan DiMaria, Chiara Ferrari Wong, Justin Hrbek, Ethan Isaac, Caner Kardesoglu, Rebecca Koch, Patrick Korkuch, Bridget Kramer, Kylie Kuizema, Tess LaSala, Ryan Liggio, Matthew Macchione, Adrian Mena, Alycia Monaco, Corinne Myers, Scott Oberhelman, Justine Park, Samantha Roth, Jason Solomon, Raechel Sontag, Michelle Stewart, Roney Amir, Yessica Barrantes, Evan Botternan, Manuel Bravo, Maxwell Brungardt, Morgan Hans, Sabrina Herzing, Erin Hunter, Larysa Iwaskiw, Harrison Johnson, Marilyn Johnson, Jennifer Kang, Minseok Kim, Susana Londono Vasco, Marcela Ortiz, Alesia Passaro, Alison Pimpinella, Larry Pirone, Catherine Saunders, Jessica Sheldon, Michael Wiegman, Lee Wilson, Tyler Yurkin, Armando Amador, Paul Antonick, Michael Best, Kathy Bilias, Paris Birkner, Slater Brown, Melissa Bui, Hana Butler, Alyssa Foss, James Giordano, Meghan Harrington, Ryan Mansfield, Ryan McKinley, Emilie McLaughlin, Chelsea Moriarty, Kailee Oakes, Gabriela Paredes, Ankira Patel, Sandy Restrepo, Troy Ribitzki, Maria Rosca, Alex Ruiz, Nicole Scordo, Cynthia Smith, Elias Bermudez, Erin Bianchi, Alyssa Blundo, Frank Cofone, Ryan Dahm, Raven Donahue, Ashley Driscoll, Lisa Firriolo, Rachel Fischer, Travis Gallo, Kristen Greenstein, Ryan Liddy, Karine Liu, David Londono Vasco, Allison Maskin, Zachary Miros, Michael Miuccio, Megan Robinson, Tierney Rosen, Jason Sangastiano, Travis Segarra, Alexandra Serpikov, Sam Zitomer, Vanessa Beulel, Maria Campos, Joseph Corra, Nina D' Ambrosio, Amy Dadamo, Jennifer Dunn, Brandon Eo, Andrew Ferreira, Keith Haas, Mechele Hudspeth, Jennifer Keri, Matthew Kornhauser, Vikas Lohana, Kiyoshi Lopez, Samantha Malnick, Robert Marino, Kyle Marshall, Christian Merkle, Taylor Meyers, Rachel Mosca, Denee Oliver, Ashley Puk, Robert Schroeder, Cassandra Trovini, Faviola Vivar, Jake Campanella, Andrew Cirillo, Robert Ciringione, Christopher DeTitta, Elise Fedele, Renee Gioe, Olivia Guerriero, Darian Henry, Samuel Hutchinson, Brittany Kanabar, Colin Keating, Aracelis Lombardi, Michael LoSardo, Scott Loverich, Adina Millman, Kahna Miyoshi, Kayla Navarro, Kumal Nekiwala, Emiri Nezu, Brendan O'Sullivan, Jessica Potestivo, Paige Rios, Phillip Sabbagh, Joseph Sabbers, Samuel Bernhardt, Zachary Charkonis, Natasha Collova, Alex Contreras, Elliott Cortes, Hope Di Pasquale, Jessica Easterbrook, Victoria Geimke, Emily Griffin, Michael Haas, Samantha Lewis, Quinton Long, Lauren Marsiglia, Luke Mazzarini, Nicholas Napoli, Jaime Pallatta, Chelsea Pate, John Rivera, Jacqueline Romeo, Joseph Scotto, Michael Spezial, Janell Spigner, Ryan Stapleton, Andrew Toto.

TRIBUTE TO CORPORAL MARK KIDD

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, I am here today with my colleague Mike Rogers to extend our sincerest gratitude to Corporal Mark Kidd—a son, grandson, brother, Marine and American—for his service to our nation, and to extend our deepest condolences to his family and friends. As a friend of the family it is very difficult for us to try to serve the dual roles that, in many ways, you helped give us on this sorrowful day.

Mark, as we all know, grew up cradled in the arms of his loved ones and strengthened here in the cradle of liberty. When he was called to serve he served in the defense of his nation, not by oppressing his fellow human beings in foreign lands, but by bringing emancipation to them so that they, too, could yearn to breathe free. It is in such a way of service to our fellow human beings that we honor not only our nation, but more importantly, we honor the universal spirit of a loving God who created us all. Thus, it is important that we remember, even as we grieve today, how we are all frail ephemeral human beings, groping through this veil of tears toward the infinite eternal perfection of the loving God, who created and awaits us all. It is a daunting calling, then, that we must answer; to strive, suffer and serve on behalf of our fellow human beings.

But Mark was not daunted. Mark accepted this challenge and he devotedly, courageously, and honorably strove to help free an entire people. Now he is cradled in the arms of our loving God and, no doubt, having not slumbered through this earthly life he may truly say with joyous rapture; now God be thanked, who has matched us with his hour and caught our youth and wakened us from sleeping.

Thank you and may God continue to bless you, Corporal Mark Kidd—beloved son, grandson, brother, Marine, American.

IN TRIBUTE TO LUCY BENOIT LEGER ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. CHARLES BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to send birthday wishes from the Congress to Lucy Benoit Leger on the occasion of her 100th birthday. Born in 1907, Ms. Leger is the mother of two children. Her husband, Elliott, worked tirelessly as a barber so that she could remain at home to raise their son and daughter.

In 100 years many things have changed in southwest Louisiana. One constant is the value and joy we find in our families. I am pleased that Lucy's family and friends will gather June 16 to celebrate this joyous occasion.

I offer my best wishes for continued good health to Lucy Benoit Leger.

IN RECOGNITION OF LEMOYNE COLLEGE MEN'S LACROSSE TEAM

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to praise the LeMoyne College Men's Lacrosse team on winning their second consecutive Division II National Championship on May 27, 2007.

The LeMoyne College Dolphin's capped their season in dramatic fashion, scoring the game winning goal with only one second remaining on the clock to defeat Mercyhurst College by a score of 6–5. At the conclusion of their season the Dolphin's record stood at an impressive 15–2. The LeMoyne College Lacrosse team had five student-athletes selected to the United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association All-American teams.

On behalf of the people of the 25th District of New York, I congratulate Head Coach Dan Sheehan, Assistant Coaches Rich Barnes, Brian Datellas, Eric MacCaull, Rob Trowbridge, and the players of the LeMoyne College Men's Lacrosse Team:

Jared Corcoran, Nick Gatto, Alex Bily, Markus Fallico, Brian Cost, Tim Spillett, Jamie Dodge, Brian Griffin, Tim MacLean, Drew Bezek, Matt Juriga, Matt Emerson, Jordan Witt, Keith Vetter, and Brian Welch.

Paul Sullivan, Ed Street, Mike McDonald, Doug McIver, Pete Gibbons, Blake Gale, Mike Rabbit, Tom Donahue, Kevin Kohl, Brad Wolken, Matt Crandall, Marc Cizenski, Mike McLaughlin, Dan Brown, and Jeff Lewis.

Joe Vincent, Jesse Demase, Russ Oechsle, Brian Orlando, Mike Cignarale, Dustin Mulcahey, Andre Carducci, Mike Malone, Matt Cassalia, Dan Ziegler, Pat O'Donnell, Pat McPartlin, and Matt Foster.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, unfortunately yesterday, June 11, 2007, I was unable to cast my votes on the following bills.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 448 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2356, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father's Day, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 449 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 676, to provide that the Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank or the Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank may serve on the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 450 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 418, recognizing and welcoming the delegation of Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign Ministers from the Caribbean to Washington, DC, and commending the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) for holding the Conference on the Caribbean, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. THOMAS H. ALLEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, on June 10, 2007, I was unavoidably absent from the Capitol. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 448, a motion by Ms. BALDWIN to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2356, a bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father's Day.

I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 449, a motion by Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA to suspend the rules and pass S. 676, a resolution to provide that the Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank or the Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank may serve on the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation.

I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 450, a motion by Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 418, a resolution recognizing and welcoming the delegation of Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign Ministers from the Caribbean to Washington, D.C., and commending the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) for holding the Conference on the Caribbean.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. DOROTHY GAY

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Mrs. Dorothy Gay, upon her retirement from the Highland Lakes Condominiums Board of Directors after thirty-six years of dedicated service.

Throughout her life, Dorothy has striven to better our community. Born and raised in Detroit, she wrote stories for the Northeastern High School newspaper and later graduated from Wayne State University with a Bachelors Degree in Political Science. As a secretary in the Veterans Office at Wayne State University, she met Alva Gay, an English professor specializing in Shakespeare and modern novels, who Dorothy married in 1948 for 48 years until his death. Following graduation, in 1947, she joined the Detroit Police Department where she served in the Woman's Division. During her 25-year career, she investigated sex offenses against delinquent, neglected, and abused females, and for her dedication she was promoted to Sergeant, then Lieutenant, and finally Inspector in charge of the Division.

Since then, Dorothy has proudly served as a leader in our community. Later, in 1973, she moved to Highland Lakes and joined the Condominiums Board of Directors. In the early 1980s, Dorothy was named to the Northville Township Planning Commission and she is a member of the Board of Directors for Heartline, a Detroit halfway house for female offenders on parole. Dorothy has also been a volunteer peer counselor at the Women's Resource Center at the Schoolcraft College for Women and has served as President, Vice President, Secretary and Editor and Board Liason for the Herald. For her dedication to our community, the 1960s Detroit Free Press named Dorothy "Woman of the Year."

Madam Speaker, after 36 tireless years, Dorothy will be retiring from the Highland Lakes Condominiums Board of Directors. In honor of her leadership and unwavering dedication to the citizens of Michigan, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Dorothy Gay for years of loyal service to our community and our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I regret that I did not votes on rollcall votes 448, 449, and 450 on June 11, 2007. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Aye" on rollcall No. 448 on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2356 that would amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father's Day;

"Aye" on rollcall No. 449 on motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 676, which would provide that the Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank or the Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank may serve on the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation;

"Aye" on rollcall No. 450 on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 418, recognizing and welcoming the delegation of Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign Ministers from the Caribbean to Washington, DC, and commending the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) for holding the Conference on the Caribbean.

RECOGNIZING HIS EXCELLENCY KANAT SAUDABAYEV ON HIS APPOINTMENT AS SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter signed by 24 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives in recognition of our dear friend, His Excellency Kanat Saudabayev, who on May 15, 2007, was appointed by President Nursultan Nazarbayev as Secretary of State for the Republic of Kazakhstan. Prior to his appointment, His Excellency Saudabayev served as Ambassador of Kazakhstan to the United States.

In gratitude for his service, in honor of his appointment, and with confidence that he will spare no effort in serving the people of Kazakhstan, we include the following letter to be made part of our Congressional history:

His Excellency KANAT SAUDABAYEV,
Secretary of State, Republic of Kazakhstan, Ak Orda, Astana.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is with pleasure that we commend you on your new appointment as Secretary of State of the Republic of Kazakhstan which we note is one of the highest positions in your country which ranks fifth in seniority, behind the President, the Prime Minister and the Speakers of both Houses.

We also applaud your six and a half years of service in Washington as Ambassador of Kazakhstan to the United States. During your tenure, you advanced U.S.-Kazakhstan relations by strengthening friendship between our peoples and cooperation between our countries. The United States and the people of Kazakhstan have much to be proud of from your long career of selfless service.

We acknowledge your invaluable contributions as a distinguished diplomat and esteemed statesman, and we are confident that in your new position you will take an active part in fostering our strategic partnership.

We wish you well and convey to you our sincere appreciation for your service. You will be missed.

Sincerely,

Tom Lantos, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Chairman, Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and the Global Environment, Alcee L. Hastings, Chairman, U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Chris Cannon; Jim McDermott; Phil English; Darrell E. Issa; Robert Wexler; Pete Sessions; Jim Saxton.

Patrick J. Tiberi; Shelley Berkley; Madeleine Z. Bordallo; Maurice D. Hinchey; Albio Sires; Charlie Melancon; Robert D. Aderholt; Tom Price; Edolphus Towns; Gregory W. Meeks; Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon; Ellen O. Tauscher; Eddie Bernice Johnson; Donna M. Christensen.

AIR FORCE HEALTH STUDY/ OPERATION RANCH HAND

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to ensure that the assets, including electronic data files and biological specimens on all participants in the Air Force Health Study, are transferred to the Medical Follow-Up Agency from the Air Force Health Study and are maintained, managed, and made available as a resource for future research for the benefit of veterans and their families, and for other humanitarian purposes.

This legislation is a companion to legislation introduced in the Senate by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs Chairman, DANIEL AKAKA.

Operation Ranch Hand was the military code name for the spraying of herbicides from U. S. Air Force aircraft in Southeast Asia from 1962 through 1971. During this time, Ranch Hand sprayed about 19 million gallons of herbicide, 11 million of which consisted of Agent Orange. The spray fell mostly on the forests of South Vietnam, but some was used in Laos, and some killed crops to deprive Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops of food. In all, Ranch Hand sprayed herbicide over about 6 million acres.

The Air Force Health Study (AFHS)—also known as the Ranch Hand Study—was initiated by the U.S. Air Force in 1979 to assess the possible health effects of military personnel's exposure to Agent Orange and other chemical defoliants sprayed during the Vietnam War, some of which contained dioxin.

The initial physical examination and surveying of study subjects was conducted in 1982 and subsequent cycles were conducted in 1985, 1987, 1992, 1997, and 2002. The data from the physical examinations should not be lost, and in fact, should be available to researchers for the benefit of all.

My bill is consistent with the recommendations of the Institute of Medicine's report on the disposition of the study. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO MS. PATRICIA ''PATTIE'' COUGHLAN

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Ms. Patricia ''Pattie'' Coughlan upon her receipt of the Wayne 11th Congressional District Republican Committee's 2007 Lifetime Achievement Award.

Throughout her career, Ms. Coughlan has dedicated herself to bettering our community. As an active member of the Suburban Republican Women's Club since 1985, she has assisted in the election of qualified and capable leaders—with perhaps one notable Congressional exception currently serving—to public office at the local, county, state, and federal levels. She is credited with the creation of the redoubtable and renowned Suburban Republican Women's Club newsletter, for which she is currently the Editor-in-Chief.

Ms. Coughlan has also served in various senior leadership positions of the Club, in which she has promoted the ideas and principles of fiscal responsibility, equal opportunity, and responsive governance. Through her devotion to Republican principles, Patti continues to ennoble and enlighten our world.

Madam Speaker, Ms. Coughlan's legendary dedication to the founding principles of our great democracy and her tireless efforts to perpetuate America's revolutionary experiment in human freedom are an inspiration to all. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Patricia ''Pattie'' Coughlan upon her receipt of the 2007 Lifetime Achievement Award and in recognizing her selfless service to our community and our country.

VETERAN'S DAY POEM

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor our country's veterans with a poem by my constituent, Jack Richards.

VETERAN'S DAY FOR SGT. JOSHUA P. MORGAN, USMC

I think of your valor
In being willing to take a stand for liberty
I am speechless
In light of your bravery
I know your type
Is not charmed, by show-offs, in the ranks
Nonetheless
Please, lower your guard for a moment
And hear a grateful nation's thanks
It's not the battles you fight, it's signing the line, saying you will.

HONORING PROJECT INSTAR AND DR. GENEVIEVE HEALY

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Project INSTAR and Dr. Genevieve Healy, its director. Dr. Healy was a middle school teacher in Ohio before pursuing a masters degree at the University of Miami's Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science. During her graduate studies, Dr. Healy foresaw a potential benefit for K–12 teachers through research being performed at the Rosenstiel School. She introduced a collaboration between professors, graduate students, and K–12 public school teachers.

With the help of her professors, Dr. Peter Swart, current chairman of marine geology, and Dr. Michael Grammar, at the time an assistant professor with the Rosenstiel School, Dr. Healy initiated Project INSTAR in 1997. This concept brought local public school science teachers from Miami-Dade County to the University of Miami where they had the opportunity to perform research side by side with graduate students and their professors. Ten years later, this program's success has been made possible in large part due to Dr. Healy's dedication and efforts. With the University of Miami's generous support, this initiative continues to grow.

The Rosenstiel School, located in proximity to so many vital natural resources on Virginia Key, enhances the learning experience of its graduate students through substantial research opportunities. Project INSTAR seeks to help public school teachers gain hands-on knowledge of ocean sciences through their close involvement with this research. It annually invites fifty K–12 teachers from public schools in Miami-Dade County to participate in the program.

This year marks its 10th anniversary. I would like to reiterate its significance as one of the top science programs, which actively enhances the development of K–12 teachers. Engagement in this Institute helps teachers implement their experiences at Project INSTAR into their own curriculum, benefiting countless public school students in science classes.

I am grateful to the many professors and school teachers who have made Project INSTAR a reality. This innovative program spreads opportunity for hands-on experience to so many teachers. I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Dr. Healy and everyone who has participated in this unique partnership.

TRIBUTE TO COACH MIKE CAMERON

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, in Ohio and elsewhere this week, thousands of Americans are saluting the contributions of a great coaching legend. Mike Cameron, the longtime baseball coach at Moeller High School in Cincinnati, OH, has announced his retirement after 39 seasons—bringing to a close what the Cincinnati Enquirer has aptly described as ''one of the greatest high school coaching careers in Ohio history.''

Coach Cameron compiled a record of 767–303 during his career as coach of the Moeller Crusader baseball team, a record that includes four state championships. His retirement announcement came just weeks after he reached a key milestone in his decorated coaching career: on April 30, 2007, Coach Cameron became the ''All-time Winningest'' Division I baseball coach in Ohio history with a win against LaSalle High School at the new Crosley Field in Blue Ash, OH.

The numbers tell a great story, but not the whole story. As a member of the Moeller High School Class of 1968—one of our school's first graduating classes—I've known Mike for decades. Before he became the baseball coach at Moeller, Mike was an assistant football coach under another Moeller legend, Gerry Faust, where he coached me during my junior and senior years. We also knew each other through our neighbors and our mutual interest in community service.

Since my graduation nearly 40 years ago, I've watched Moeller build a proud national reputation for all-around excellence in Catholic education, and Mike has always been a big part of it. The Moeller tradition emphasizes students' growth in all areas—academic growth, athletic and extra-curricular growth, and spiritual growth. There are few members of the Moeller family who have done as much as Mike Cameron has over the years to help Moeller establish and cultivate this proud tradition.

If you talk to Mike's players, it's clear he's been a positive force in the lives of countless young people in the Greater Cincinnati area. But his legacy at Moeller is not limited to the baseball diamond. During his decades at Moeller, Coach Cameron earned the gratitude and respect of thousands of students he didn't coach, as well as that of countless Moeller parents and faculty members. Coach Cameron also has the admiration of many Americans, from local fans of Moeller baseball to parents who have taken their children to watch one of the multiple players he helped to reach the big leagues.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I salute my friend, Coach Mike Cameron, on a long and distinguished career that is a source of pride for the entire Moeller family and the people of Southwest Ohio.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN GILBERT GUDE

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of former Congressman Gilbert Gude and to reflect on his remarkable public career. Gil Gude was a man of great civic vision who served his community with great passion and dedication. He served in this body with great distinction from 1967–77, representing Maryland's Eighth Congressional District, which I am now honored to represent.

Gil Gude led a remarkable life. He grew up on a farm near Rockville, Maryland, where he developed a deep love of nature. He answered his country's call to duty in 1943, joining the Army Medical Corps during World War II. He served in the Maryland House of Delegates from 1953–57 and in the State Senate from 1963–68.

Elected to Congress in 1966, Gil Gude made his mark as a creative legislator whose ideas crossed party lines. He did not accept ''conservative'' or ''liberal'' labeling but rather worked with great personal integrity to do what he believed was right for his Nation. Even as a member of the Republican Party, he opposed the Vietnam War, called for the impeachment of President Nixon, worked to limit cigarette advertisement, and fought to restrict handgun ownership.

Gude was a devoted environmentalist. He worked to improve air quality in the District, save wild horses in the West, and create the C & O National Historical Park, among his many other accomplishments. In 1975 he spent a Congressional recess leading a 400-mile trip down the Potomac River in an attempt to give it a national designation.

Gude resigned from Congress in 1977 after a decade of dedicated and compassionate service. However, this did not mark the end of his public service. In 1977 he became Director of the Congressional Research Service, and worked to establish the CRS as a premier and reliable research institution for Members of Congress. He retired from CRS in 1985.

Gil Gude spent a great amount of time focusing on his greatest passion—the Potomac River. He helped found the Potomac River Basin Consortium and took many trips to explore the small communities surrounding the river. He wrote two books about the upriver towns and viewed these tight-knit communities and the river as sources of immense history and cultural importance. He shared his wisdom with others, teaching courses at Georgetown University on history and the environment.

Our Nation mourns the passing of Gilbert Gude. He was a model of bipartisan cooperation who left a legacy that serves as an inspiration for us all.

To Gil Gude's family, please know that you are in our hearts and prayers. We share your grief during this painful time, but are proud to celebrate this extraordinary American's life of service and accomplishment.

TRIBUTE TO JAMIE COE

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and remember the life of Jamie Coe, the beloved Detroit area entertainer and musician, who passed away on January 27, 2007.

For over five decades, Jamie Coe inspired generations of Americans through music. Born by the name of George Colovas in Highland, Michigan, Jamie Coe's musical abilities were discovered by singer Bobby Darin during a performance at the Cavalcade of Stars show at the Michigan State Fair Coliseum in 1959. Darin named Colovas ''Jamie Coe'' after a song he wrote called ''Jamie Boy,'' and signed him to Addison Records label. Later, Jamie also recorded songs for Big Top and ABC Paramount labels

Since then, Jamie Coe led a successful rock and roll music career, during which his remarkable voice drew countless loyal fans. After forming the popular Detroit band ''Jamie Coe and the Gigolos,'' he performed nightly before packed crowds at local Detroit night clubs. While he was best known for his hit song ''The Fool'' and numerous appearances on Dick Clark's television broadcast ''American Bandstand,'' Jamie Coe also donated his time to numerous philanthropic causes. He performed regularly to raise money for charities like multiple sclerosis, leukemia, and for the Livonia Symphony Orchestra.

Madam Speaker, although the legendary Jamie Coe passed away on Saturday, January 27, 2007, his memory will live on in the hearts

of his loving wife Jamie, four children, two grandchildren, and scores of adoring fans. In honor of his enduring contributions to rock and roll music and to the people of our community, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the life of Jamie Coe and his selfless service to our community and our country.

RECOGNIZING MS. ROSA GIBBS ON HER CELEBRATING HER ONE HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of a woman celebrating a milestone so few are able to attain, her One Hundredth Birthday. Ms. Rosa Gibbs was born June 21, 1907, in Georgetown, South Carolina. She is the daughter of Shedwick and Anne Jenkins Gibbs.

Ms. Rosa Gibbs graduated from Howard High School in South Carolina in 1925. After graduation, she moved to New York City where she lived for over five decades. For the past twenty years she has resided in Florida, though at heart I know she will always be a New Yorker.

Ms. Gibbs is a testament to aging beautifully. She regularly attends church, and is of both sound mind and body. Ms. Gibbs will be celebrating her birthday with her friends and loved ones on June 23, 2007 at the Wayman Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Jacksonville, Florida.

Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize Ms. Gibbs' life and honor her birth.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating the One Hundredth Birthday of Ms. Rosa Gibbs.

WELCOMING THE ROMANIAN DELEGATION

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise as co-chair of the Romanian Caucus to welcome Foreign Minister Adrian Cioroianu of Romania to the United States. Foreign Minister Cioroianu represents an increasingly pivotal ally in our country's efforts to preserve global security, prosperity, and democracy.

Foreign Minister Cioroianu picked up the reins of Romania's diplomatic corps just 2 months ago and he is already proving his commitment to a strong transatlantic unity in his visit. Foreign Minister Cioroianu's delegation hopes to plan an April 2008 NATO summit to be hosted in his country, discuss global antiterrorism initiatives with his counterparts here, and collaborate with them on regional security issues. The delegation's agenda is a symbol of a Romania that is steadfast in its responsible pursuit of global welfare.

Romania has played a leading geopolitical role as a regional power in Eastern Europe with its position at the crossroads of Europe and Russia. The country recently hosted an Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe meeting regarding anti-Semitism, an issue still fresh in the minds of leaders in the region.

Romania is taking a leading diplomatic role in the western Balkans, particularly in mediating talks on the status of Kosovo. Through these diplomatic efforts and others, Romania is ensuring an Eastern Europe that is peaceful and stable for freedom and prosperity to take root.

The country is also playing a growing economic role in the region. On January 1, 2007, Romania entered the European Union, after achieving a decade of substantial economic development even in the face of a global economic recession. Romania is embracing a free market while fostering the growth of a new middle class that will serve as a key to a successful economic society. Romania is becoming an economic engine for its neighbors to the East and West.

Inducted to NATO only 3 years ago, Romania is already an active participant in NATO operations and has contributed troops to both U.S. wars, with NATO troops in Afghanistan and with around 500 military personnel in Iraq. The Romanian military is playing an honorable and cooperative role in providing security in numerous spots throughout the globe.

I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Foreign Minister Cioroianu and the Romanian delegation to the United States. Congress will continue to promote a strong cooperative relationship between our two countries and I thank the Foreign Minister for his service.

TRIBUTE TO SCHAGEN'S SHOES

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the work of an outstanding business, Schagen's Shoes, which will be closing its doors after 117 years of dedicated service to its clients, and by extension, to the greater community.

It is only fitting that Schagen's Shoes and the Schagen family be honored in this, the permanent record of the greatest democracy ever known, for all they have provided to the residents of Paterson as they fulfilled their American Dream.

The history of Schagen's Shoes began in 1888, when Willem Schagen arrived in Paterson, NJ from the Netherlands. Having been an apprentice shoemaker in his native land, he decided to open a shop at 176 Lewis Street. At this shop he repaired shoes, but it was sales of "ready made" shoes that really made the business take off. In 1894, Willem married Reinoutje Eelman and built a house, said to be the first in the area with indoor plumbing, across from the shop. In 1909, Willem had another building erected at what is now 394 21st Avenue. It housed the business, an apartment for the family upstairs, and an attic, which later became a third floor to accommodate his 10 children.

With the move, business grew, and in 1917 Willem's son Albert joined in the store. Soon, Albert married Rose Zuercher, and they had 2 children, Albert William and Rose Claire. Albert brought new ideas, adding comfort and orthopedic shoes. In 1930, Willem and Reinoutje moved to a new home in Glen Rock, and Albert and Rose moved above the store. In 1943, when Willem passed away, Albert assumed ownership of Schagen's and remained actively involved there until his death at the age of 93.

In 1948, after graduating from East Side High School, serving in the United States Navy, and graduating from Columbia University, Albert William joined his father in the business. He, too, brought fresh ideas, and Schagen's began to emphasize corrective shoes and appliances for children. In 1951, Albert married Mina Heines, a fellow Paterson native, and they purchased a home in Glen Rock, where Albert still resides. They were blessed with a daughter, Wendy and two sons, Donald and Kurt. In 1963, young Albert became the new proprietor.

Over the years, the clientele of Schagen's has represented a cross section of Paterson and the region. It has included professionals, doctors, lawyers, judges and political leaders, as well as many tradesmen and service personnel. The final owner, Albert W. Schagen, who devoted six decades to this multi-generational family business, retired on March 31, 2007, writing the final chapter of Schagen's Shoes' history. Schagen's Shoes was a vital part of the community for 117 years, and the generations of customers that were served so well over the years will surely miss the dedication and expertise of the Schagen family.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing the efforts of family businesses like Schagen's Shoes.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, the members of the Schagen family, all those who have been touched by their caring service, and me in recognizing the outstanding contributions of this business to the Northern New Jersey community and beyond.

IN HONOR OF STEPHEN B. KAHN

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mr. Stephen B. Kahn, philanthropist, political progressive, and innovator, who passed away on Friday, April 27, 2007, at the age of 96.

Stephen was born in St. Louis, MO, on June 8, 1910. In his youth he called both San Francisco and New York home, and finally settled in Manhattan with his mother. She was an early feminist and supporter of Margaret Sanger; her political activities surely encouraged the development of his own progressive ideas. He returned to California to reunite with his father and later earned a degree in journalism from the University of Oregon at Eugene. He completed a law degree at the University of Tennessee and worked in the legal division of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

During World War II, he was drafted into the Army and served with the 7th Armored Division in Europe. Stephen and his wife, Ruth, then moved to Carmel and he began a successful career in the timber business as a conservationist and champion of healthy timber practices. He also supported the ACLU,

progressive journals, and noncommercial listener-supported radio in its early years, notably Radio Station KPFA and the Pacifica Foundation.

After Ruth's death in 1994, Steven created the Arkay Foundation as a tribute to her memory. The foundation supports innovative civil, environmental, and health care programs. He was a strong advocate for alternative medicine and helped naturopaths become licensed in California. He also promoted the use of vitamin C and megavitamin therapy for physical and mental illnesses. Remaining remarkably energetic himself, he led this foundation up to the end of his life.

However, he was best known for his progressive style of politics and commitment to the Democratic Party. He believed passionately that individuals could make a difference both at the local and national level by supporting political change. He also believed that songs could change the world. Steve was most proud of his early discovery of Woody Guthrie while filming a documentary in Oregon. Woody's part in producing was what he liked to call ''art with a social message.''

Madam Speaker, the life of Stephen Kahn was full of joy and purpose. He directly impacted the lives of thousands of people who came to respect, admire, and love him. I offer condolences to his two children Karen Kahn and Robert Kahn, his stepson David Goldschmidt; and the rest of his family. Stephen's passion, energy and wonderful spirit will be greatly missed by all who knew him.

HONORING MR. BOB IANNACONE

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Bob Iannacone as he retires from his position as Director of Economic Development for the Williamson County Economic Development Council.

Since he first assumed this responsibility in 1991, Bob has been instrumental in attracting corporations looking for a place to relocate and encouraging the expansion and growth of existing Williamson County companies. Together, these efforts have had an impact of approximately one billion dollars to the local economy. Through innovative marketing strategies, including the award-winning Economic Development Showcase program, Bob has ensured that corporate leaders around the country and around the world know that Williamson County is a great place to do business, and a great place to live.

A proud veteran of the United States Air Force, Bob Iannacone has also served our community through his work with multiple nonprofit civic organizations and has impacted countless lives. Again, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Bob for his contributions to our nation and to Tennessee. I'm certain that his wife, Pat, children and grandchildren are all proud of the outstanding work he has done to improve not just the economy, but the quality of life in Williamson County.

HONORING JACK O'CONNELL

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jack O'Connell on the occasion of his retirement as President and CEO of the Health and Welfare Council of Long Island, Inc. For over 30 years, Mr. O'Connell has tirelessly served the area's poor and vulnerable children, families and individuals. Mr. O'Connell began his career with the Health and Welfare Council in 1976 and has served as the organization's chief executive since 1988.

Mr. O'Connell was instrumental in creating the first ever studies of hunger and homelessness on Long Island in 1984 and 1985. Mr. O'Connell's other accomplishments on behalf of the poor are too numerous to name, but they include initiating the Child Health Plus Facilitated Enrollment Consortium, a program that has enrolled more than 30,000 Long Islanders into Child and Family Health Plus; organizing Long Island's social services response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001; and the organization of advocacy coalitions that helped give a voice to the poor and hungry.

Mr. O'Connell has been a tremendous asset to Long Island, and particularly to the people he has helped bring out of the shadows through his work. The future of this country depends on the well-being of our children and families, and the contributions of talented, passionate and committed public servants like Jack O'Connell.

SHUTTLE ''ATLANTIS'' LAUNCH

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to recognize John ''Danny'' Olivas, who, with the launch of the Space Shuttle *Atlantis* this past Friday, became the first El Pasoan to enter space.

Astronaut Olivas worked his way through the El Paso school system, and, upon graduating from Burges High School, went on to receive a B.S. in mechanical engineering from the University of Texas at El Paso, an M.S. in mechanical engineering from the University of Houston, and, finally, a doctorate in mechanical engineering and materials science from Rice University.

Beyond being the first El Pasoan in space, Astronaut Olivas is also one of only a handful of minorities, and even fewer Hispanics, to participate in a Shuttle mission. The importance of Mr. Olivas' participation in this space flight is underscored by the lack of minorities in the areas of science, technology, engineering and math. According to the U.S. Census, as of 2000, only 4.4 percent of jobs related to science and engineering were held by African Americans, with only 3.4 percent being held by Hispanics. It is estimated that by 2050, over 50 percent of the population under the age of 18 will be a racial or ethnic minority. It is imperative that we work to engage our minority populations in these fields.

In the face of growing foreign competition from technology sectors in India, Japan, and China, among others, it is increasingly important that we support opportunities in science, technology, engineering, and math. Advancing our understanding of these areas guarantees the vitality of our nation as a whole by ensuring that our country remains a leader of technological innovation and economic competitiveness. In creating opportunities for minorities, we ensure that the face of our high-tech workforce reflects the true face of America, and that our face in space echoes our face on Earth.

I have long supported NASA in its pursuit of greater understanding of the universe through exploration. Supporting NASA creates not only opportunities for people like Mr. Olivas, but also tangible benefits that affect our everyday life. Airmen and -women flying training maneuvers over El Paso's Fort Bliss-Biggs Army Airfield, and Army PATRIOT units deployed at home and overseas, use technology developed by NASA. Additionally, the NASA Johnson Space Center in Houston, where Astronaut Olivas first developed his fascination with space exploration at the age of seven, provides jobs for Texas, and, in doing so, fuels our local economies through tourism and contracting. As Astronaut Olivas noted in a recent interview, NASA itself is like a rocket engine: hundreds of thousands of small parts, working in tandem within the machinery of our Nation to fuel the engine of progress.

Having met Danny Olivas on a number of occasions, I applaud the example he encapsulates; wish him and the whole crew of Atlantis a safe return; and look forward to a successful mission!

WORLD DAY AGAINST CHILD LABOR

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate World Day Against Child Labor. Today serves to remind us of the exploitation of child workers around the world and to encourage us to act as global leaders in ending these atrocities.

I learned of the brutal working conditions of children who labored in the cocoa fields through a series of articles published by Knight Ridder several years ago. One young boy, Aly Diabate, told how he was sold into slavery when he was barely four feet tall. He said, ''Some of the bags were taller than me. It took two people to put the bag on my head. And when you didn't hurry, you were beaten. The beatings were a part of my life. Any time they loaded you with bags and you fell while carrying them, no one helped you. Instead, they beat you and beat you until you picked it up again.''

In response to stories like these, I, along with Senator TOM HARKIN, authored the Harkin-Engel Protocol to hold chocolate companies accountable to American consumers and the global community. The Harkin-Engel Protocol provides for the development and implementation of industry-wide global standards for the growing of cocoa beans and the manufacturing of chocolate products that are sold in

the United States. This framework provides a reliable capacity for the first time to publicly certify that cocoa used in chocolate or related products has been grown and processed without abusive child labor. The Harkin-Engel Protocol allows chocolate manufacturers to agree to take responsibility for the labor conditions of cocoa farms which they do not own.

It is not and should not be the way of this Congress to stand by while children anywhere are sold into slavery. And it is not our way to provide a marketplace for products tainted with the blood of children. I encourage the Members of this Congress to act as global leaders and help end child slave labor throughout the world. Madam Speaker, my hope is that we will use World Day Against Child Labor to raise American awareness of the pressing issue of child slavery and to rise to the challenge of accountability in American products.

IN HONOR OF THEODORE DAVID ENGLEHORN, SR.

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Theodore David Englehorn, Sr., M.D., a true hero who passed away on May 27, 2007. Throughout his long and passionate career, Dr. Englehorn served our country in the military and later became the first orthopedic surgeon in Monterey County. I offer his sister Helen Winsted, daughter Frances Mill, son Theodore Englehorn, Jr., and the rest of Dr. Englehorn's family my deepest condolences.

Growing up on a farm in rural South Dakota, Dr. Englehorn became interested in medicine at a young age while taking care of injured farm animals. After graduating from undergraduate school, he attended medical school at Northwestern University in Chicago. During his internship at Iowa Methodist Hospital, he received his M.D. and also met Arleta Lane, whom he later married in 1930.

During the depression, Dr. Englehorn joined the Army Reserves as a 1st Lieutenant Medical Corps and worked with the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) program in South Dakota until 1937. After this time, Dr. Englehorn and his family took the long journey to California. In King City, he set up his own private practice where he worked until 1942, when he was called into the military service as a Captain. He served honorably in the military for 4 more years and was discharged in December 1945 with the rank of Major, M.C.

Upon his return to Monterey County in 1946, Dr. Englehorn began working for the Salinas Community Hospital Association. His gift for compassion and talent for surgery helped him to gain the title of Chief of Surgery at the Salinas Valley Memorial Hospital in 1959 and later Chief of Staff in 1960. Dr. Englehorn's dedication to the field of medicine was obvious and as a result he held numerous positions on several Medical Associations. He was the Medical Director of the National Foundation for Monterey County and the President of the Monterey County Medical Society, to name a few.

Dr. Englehorn was well known within his community as he was deeply involved in it. He was a member of Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Salinas Lodge of Masons and Eastern Star, the Commonwealth Club of California and the Salinas Elks Lodge.

Madam Speaker, I wish to remember Dr. Englehorn for his honor, humanity, and love for helping others. He was consistently caring and loyal as a friend, husband, father and doctor. While Dr. Englehorn may no longer be with us, his memory and life's work will carry on in all those whose lives he touched.

HONORING HELGA LEMKE

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise with my colleague Representative MIKE THOMPSON with great pleasure to honor Helga Lemke on her 18 years of service with Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County. Since 1989, when she was hired as the agency's executive director, Helga has shown a steadfast commitment to increasing opportunities for low income residents of Sonoma County to gain self-sufficiency and contribute to their communities. We have found Helga to be fiercely focused on fighting poverty, wonderfully competent in running this large, multi-program agency, and yet very down-to-earth and authentic.

Helga has spent her entire career helping others, from her internship with the National Community Action Foundation nearly 40 years ago through her work at the United Nations to the present. One of the tenets she holds so dearly, says colleague John Way, is making a difference. He notes, "I have heard her often say that one of the most enriching things about her work is having someone tell her, 'What you've done has changed my life.' "

Helga's well-earned appointment to director of programs for the California Department of Community Services reminds us how much she has accomplished for our community. For one, she transformed a struggling nonprofit into one of the largest and most respected agencies in the county. She also initiated an award-winning staff diversity training program and a community-acclaimed annual conference on poverty, at the same time leading a staff of 225 at more than 20 sites with an annual budget of more than $11 million.

Despite all this, Helga has still made time for public service. The Sonoma County Board of Supervisors appointed her to the Workforce Investment Board and Youth Council; the Santa Rosa City Mayor has appointed her to the Mayor's Task Force on Gangs; and she has also served on numerous boards, including Roseland University Prep School. She has also testified before Congress on Head Start issues where her expertise was valued.

Madam Speaker, we have appreciated working with Director Lemke on the many issues faced by the Sonoma community and thank her for her dedicated service. Her passion and energy are an inspiration to all of us who work with families. Congratulations on your appointment, Helga.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, sixty-three years ago, on June 12, 1944, Big Bend National Park was established in southwest Texas along the Rio Grande River. The scenic national park encompasses more than 800,000 acres of pristine desert and mountain terrain.

Known as "Texas' Gift to the Nation," Big Bend began as a modestly-sized State park, but its area was expanded greatly by the state before being awarded to the Nation. After Congress passed legislation allowing for the acquisition of land in the region to establish the park the state of Texas purchased approximately 600,000 acres of land from private owners, at a cost of $1.5 million, in 1942.

The purchase of such a vast expanse of land at such a high price in the midst of the Great Depression was an incredible feat for the State of Texas. Despite the cost, the State donated the land to the Federal Government for the establishment of the national park. With that gesture Texas provided the nation with a majestic national park that has been enjoyed for over a half a century so far.

Big Bend National Park has a rich history. For thousands of years it was traversed by and inhabited by native peoples. For the past century and a half it has also seen Spanish prospectors; Comanche Indians; Mexican settlers; and Anglo-American farmers, ranchers and miners.

Everett Ewing Townsend, the "Father" of Big Bend National Park, was the champion of adding Big Bend to the National Parks Service's purview and is most responsible for the preservation of this region where the Chihuahuan Desert intersects with the Chisos Mountains and the flow of the mighty Rio Grande River shifts from southeast to northeast forming the bend after which the park is named. Sixty-three years ago Everett Townsend's efforts provided the United States with an unspoiled tract of land that has since been enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of visitors. In its first year, Big Bend National Park recorded 1,409 visitors, but today it receives over 300,000 visitors a year. Today, I recognize Big Bend National Park on its 63rd anniversary and thank the National Park Service for preserving this region for future generations.

THE BELLS OF BALANGIGA MUST RING AGAIN

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support H. Con. Res. 168, legislation that I have just introduced, which urges the President to authorize the return of two church bells, currently on display at F.E. Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming, to the people of the Philippines.

I am introducing the resolution today, June 12th, because of the historical significance of this date to 85 million Filipinos. It is the 109th yearly celebration of Philippine Independence from Spain. The introduction of this resolution will bring hope for the return of the church bells, especially to the parishioners of Balangiga.

It was a result of a conflict, between Filipino and American soldiers in 1901 in the town of Balangiga on the island of Samar, Philippines, that the bells in the Balangiga church were taken to the United States as war trophies where they have been on display ever since at F.E. Warren Air Force Base.

I am introducing this resolution because of a vote by the Wyoming Veterans Commission in favor of the return of the bells to the church in Balangiga.

The citizens of Balangiga have erected a memorial that includes the names of the Filipino and American soldiers who lost their lives in the 1901 incident, and the town honors these war dead, both those from the Philippines and those from America, on September 28 each year. Filipino people have requested the return of the bells to the original setting in the Balangiga Parish where they could ring again, after 106 years of muteness, as a symbol of this bond.

The acts of conflict that surrounded the Bells of Balangiga are not consistent with the friendship that is an integral part of the relationship between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States. Filipino soldiers have fought side by side with American troops in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, and the bells should more properly serve as a symbol of friendship and not of conflict.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 168.

IN HONOR OF GERALD ''JERRY'' FRY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a man committed to serving his country and community. Gerald ''Jerry'' Fry, former mayor of the city of Monterey, passed away on May 24, 2007. With a profound love for his city, Jerry devoted his career to improving the community around him. Jerry was a great example of the impact one man can have on so many people's lives, and without him the world is a bit dimmer. I offer his wife Mary, children Lisa, Luke, Terri, and Leslie, and the rest of Jerry's family my deepest condolences.

Jerry grew up in Pacific Grove and attended Pacific Grove High School. After graduating from Santa Clara University, Jerry joined the Marines and served during the Korean war. After his time in the military, Jerry returned to his home on the Monterey Bay where he met his future wife, Mary. Upon his return to the peninsula, Jerry began managing a taxi company and also a stationary store. His long and dedicated career of service to the city, however, did not begin until 1963 when a position on the city council opened and Jerry was elected to fill the remaining 2 years in the position.

Jerry was first elected as mayor of the city of Monterey in 1977 and went on to win two more reelections. He began to shine as an outstanding mayor and great leader the instant he was in office. Friends described Jerry as ''one of the best mayors I think we've ever had.'' His ability to listen and to acknowledge everyone's desire to be heard was a gift and was what defined him in his 20 years on the Monterey City Council.

After serving on the city council, Jerry still remained very interested in city politics and would enjoy discussing controversial issues with his friends. The city always remained close to Jerry's heart even long after he was out of office.

Madam Speaker, Gerald ''Jerry'' Fry was a remarkable figure in our community, and he will live on in the memory of many people whose lives he has touched. I would like to express my sincere gratitude for his commitment to the city of Monterey.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7497–S7572

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1591–1602, and S. Res. 231–232. **Pages S7544–45**

Measures Passed:

Congratulating University of Colorado at Boulder Men's Cross Country: Senate agreed to S. Res. 232, a resolution. **Page S7571**

Virgin Islands: Senate passed H.R. 57, to repeal certain sections of the Act of May 26, 1936, pertaining to the Virgin Islands, clearing the measure for the President. **Pages S7571–72**

Measures Considered:

Clean Energy Act: Senate began consideration of H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, and taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S7504–35**

Adopted:

Sanders Amendment No. 1515 (to Amendment No. 1502), to establish an energy efficiency and renewable energy worker training program. **Pages S7524–28**

By 63 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 209), Lieberman (for Bayh) Amendment No. 1508 (to Amendment No. 1502), to provide for the publication and implementation of an action plan to reduce the quantity of oil used annually in the United States. **Pages S7522–24, S7534**

Pending:

Reid Amendment No. 1502, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S7513–15**

Inhofe Amendment No. 1505 (to Amendment No. 1502), to improve domestic fuels security. **Pages S7515–22**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Wednesday, June 13, 2007, and that the time until 11:45 a.m. be equally divided and controlled between Senators Inhofe and Boxer, or their designees, on Inhofe Amendment No. 1505 (to Amendment No. 1502) (listed above); that no amendment be in order to Amendment No. 1505 (to Amendment No. 1502) prior to the vote; provided further, that at 11:45 a.m., Senate vote on or in relation to Inhofe Amendment No. 1505 (to Amendment No. 1502). **Pages S7534–35**

Messages from the House: **Page S7543**

Measures Referred: **Page S7543**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S7543**

Executive Communications: **Pages S7543–44**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S7544**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7545–47**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S7547–58**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7540–43**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7559–70**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S7570**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7571**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S7571**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—209) **Page S7534**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:06 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 13, 2007. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7572.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Vice Admiral Eric T. Olson, USN, for appointment to the grade of Admiral and to be Commander, United States Special Operations Command, Thomas P.

D'Agostino, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Energy for Nuclear Security, and Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, and Michael G. Vickers, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

UNIVERSAL SERVICE FUND

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Universal Service Fund, focusing on assessing the recommendations of the Federal-State Joint Board, after receiving testimony from Deborah Taylor Tate, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission; Everett B. Flannery, Jr., Kennebec County Sheriff's Office, Augusta, Maine, on behalf of the Maine Sheriffs' Association; John E. Rooney, U.S. Cellular, Chicago, Illinois; Roger Nishi, Waitsfield and Champlain Valley Telecom, Waitsfield, Vermont, on behalf of sundry organizations; Jonathan D. Foxman, Chinook Wireless, Great Falls, Montana; and Joel E. Lubin, AT&T Services, Inc., Washington, D.C.

HEALTH EFFECTS OF ASBESTOS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the health affects of asbestos, focusing on methods of mitigating such impacts, after receiving testimony from Senator Murray; David N. Weissman, Director, Division of Respiratory Disease Studies, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services; Captain Aubrey Miller, United States Public Health Service, Region 8, United States Environmental Protection Agency; Melanie Marty, California Environmental Protection Agency Office of Environment Health Hazard Assessment, Oakland; Ann G. Wylie, University of Maryland Department of Geology, College Park; David Weill, Stanford University Medical Center Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care, Stanford, California; Richard A. Lemen, Assistant Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, (Ret.), Canton, Georgia; Linda Reinstein, Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, Redondo Beach, California; Barry Castleman, Garrett Park, Maryland

TRADE ENFORCEMENT

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine trade agreement enforcement for a 21st century economy, after receiving testimony from former Representative Dan Glickman, Motion Picture Association of America, Jennifer A. Hillman, Georgetown University Law Center Institute of International Economic Law, Robert E. Lighthizer, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher and Flom LLP, and Erik O. Autor, National Retail Federation, all of Washington, D.C.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE REFORM

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on International Development and Foreign Assistance, Economic Affairs and International Environmental Protection concluded a hearing to examine the efficacy of the Foreign Assistance Reform, focusing on successes, failures, and the future of foreign aid programs, after receiving testimony from Henrietta H. Fore, Acting U.S. Director of Foreign Assistance, and Acting Administrator, United States Agency for International Development; and Lael Brainard, Brookings Institution, Samuel A. Worthington, InterAction, and Steven Radelet, Center for Global Development, all of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of the Reuben Jeffery, III, to be Under Secretary of State for Economic, Energy and Agricultural Affairs, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Chambliss, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

ASSESSING TELEWORK POLICIES

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine assessing telework policies and initiatives in the federal government, after receiving testimony Daniel A. Green, Deputy Associate Director for Employee and Family Support Policy, Strategic Human Resources Policy Division, Office of Personnel Management; Jon W. Dudas, Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property, Director, United States Patent and Trademark Office; Stanley Kaczmarczyk, Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Governmentwide Policy, United States General Services Administration; Bernice Steinhardt, Director of Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; Tom Davison, Federal Managers Association, and Stephen W.T. O'Keeffe, Telework Exchange, both of Alexandria, Virginia; and David Isaacs, Hewlett-Packard Company, Washington, D.C.

TERRORIST IDEOLOGY

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine terrorist ideology, after receiving testimony from Stephen Ulph, Jamestown Foundation, and Daniel Kimmage, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, both of Washington, D.C.; and Rebekah Cragin, RAND Corporation, Arlington, Virginia.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced will appear in the next issue of the Record. **(See next issue.)**

Additional Cosponsors: **(See next issue.)**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 480, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2642) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008 (H. Rept. 110-189) and

H. Res. 481, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008 (H. Rept. 110-190). **(See next issue.)**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Sarbanes to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H6241**

Recess: The House recessed at 9:05 a.m. and reconvened at 10 a.m. **Page H6241**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Michael D. Pfingsten, St. Paul Lutheran Church, Harvard, Illinois. **Page H6241**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 478, electing Representative Davis (CA) to the Joint Committee on Printing, to rank after Representative Capuano. **Page H6245**

Authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug: Agreed by unanimous consent to discharge from committee and agree to H. Con. Res. 164, authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug. **Pages H6245–46**

Dismissing Election Contest—21st District of Florida: The House agreed to H. Res. 459, dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty-first Congressional District of Florida. **Page H6246**

Dismissing Election Contest—24th District of Florida: The House agreed to H. Res. 461, dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of Florida. **Page H6246**

Dismissing Election Contest—4th District of Louisiana: The House agreed to H. Res. 462, dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Reresentative from the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana. **Page H6246**

Dismissing Election Contest—5th District of Florida: The House agreed to H. Res. 463, dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Florida. **Page H6246**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Native American $1 Coin Act: H.R. 2358, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins in commemoration of Native Americans and the important contributions made by Indian tribes and individual Native Americans to the development of the United States and the history of the United States; **Pages H6246–48**

Congratulating the Barton College men's basketball team for winning the 2007 NCAA Division II Men's Basketball National Championship: H. Res. 329, to congratulate the Barton College men's basketball team for winning the 2007 NCAA Division II Men's Basketball National Championship; **Pages H6248–50**

Amending the Fair Labor Standards Act, with respect to civil penalties for child labor violations: H.R. 2637, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, with respect to civil penalties for child labor violations; **Pages H6250–51**

Recognizing the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day: H. Res. 474, to recognize the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 420 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 452; **Pages H6251–54, H6267**

Supporting the goals and ideals of National Internet Safety Month: H. Res. 455, amended, to support the goals and ideals of National Internet Safety Month; and **Pages H6254–57**

Truth in Caller ID Act of 2007: H.R. 251, amended, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit manipulation of caller identification information. **Pages H6257–60**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:03 p.m. and reconvened at 1:22 p.m. **Page H6260**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:50 p.m. and reconvened at 2:55 p.m. **Pages H6267–68**

Official Photograph of the House in Session: The official photograph of the House in session was taken pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 460, permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker. **(See next issue.)**

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2008: The House began consideration of H.R. 2638, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008. Further consideration is expected to resume June 13th. **Pages H6260–H6317**

Agreed to:

Crowley amendment (No. 21 printed in the Congressional Record of June 11, 2007) that increases funding, by offset, for state and local programs under Protection, Preparedness, Response and Recovery by $50,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 244 ayes to 174 noes, Roll No. 453); **Pages H6295–96**

Reichert amendment that reduces funding for the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management by $1,000,000 and reduces funding for the Office of the Under Secretary for Management by $11,000,000 and increases funding, by offset, for information analysis and operations coordination activities by $10,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 218 ayes to 205 noes, Roll No. 455); **Pages H6281–84, H6297**

King (IA) amendment that reduces funding for the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management by $79,000 (by a recorded vote of 379 ayes to 45 noes, Roll No. 456); and **Pages H6284–91, H6297–98**

Lamborn amendment (No. 32 printed in the Congressional Record of June 11, 2007) that reduces funding for the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management by $300,000 (by a recorded vote of 381 ayes to 41 noes, Roll No. 457). **Pages H6291–95, H6298–99**

Rejected:

Campbell (CA) amendment (No. 43 printed in the Congressional Record of June 11, 2007) that sought to reduce funding for the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management by $9,961,000 (by a recorded vote of 201 ayes to 221 noes, Roll No. 454). **Pages H6277–80, H6296–97**

Withdrawn:

Kucinich amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to increase funding (by offset) for the Federal Emergency Management Agency by $500,000. **Pages H6280–81**

Pending:

Foxx amendment (No. 33 printed in the Congressional Record of June 11, 2007) that seeks to reduce funding for the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management by $1,241,000 and **Pages H6299–H6308**

McHenry amendment to Foxx amendment that seeks to replace the dollar amount proposed in the Foxx amendment for the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management with "$8,961,000". **Pages H6308–6311**

Rejected the Blunt motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 221 noes, Roll No. 458. **Pages H6311–12**

Rejected the Gingrey motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 218 noes, Roll No. 459. **Page H6313**

Rejected the Bachus motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 220 noes, with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 460. **Page H6314**

Rejected the Shadegg motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 216 noes, Roll No. 461. **Pages H6316–17**

Rejected the McCotter motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 216 noes, Roll No. 462. **(See next issue.)**

Rejected the Boehner motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 213 noes, Roll No. 463. **(See next issue.)**

Rejected the Roskam motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 214 noes, Roll No. 464. **(See next issue.)**

Agreed to the Flake motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 312 ayes to 82 noes with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 465. **(See next issue.)**

H. Res. 473, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by voice vote after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 451. **Pages H6260–67**

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages in the next issue of the Record.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and thirteen recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6266–67, H6267, H6295–96, H6296–97, H6297, H6297–98, H6298–99, H6312, H6313, H6314–15, H6316–17, continued in the next issue of the Record. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:10 a.m. on Wednesday, June 13th.

Committee Meetings

STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FISCAL YEAR 2008; REVISED SUBALLOCATIONS OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FISCAL BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2008

Committee on Appropriations: Ordered reported amended the following appropriations for fiscal year 2008: State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs; and Legislative Branch.

The Committee also approved Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations, Fiscal Year 2008.

SECURITY FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on the development of the Iraqi Security Forces. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: LTG Martin Dempsey, USA, Commander, Multi-National Security Transition Command—Iraq; and Mark T. Kimmit, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Office of the Secretary.

SUPREME COURT'S EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION DECISION

Committee on Education and Labor: Held a hearing entitled "Justice Denied? The Implications of the Supreme Court's *Ledbetter* v. *Goodyear* Employment Discrimination Decision." Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HEALTH LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Discussion Drafts concerning Prescription Drug User Fee Act Reauthorization, Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act Reauthorization, Drug Safety, and Certain Pediatric Pharmaceutical and Device legislation. Testimony was heard from Randall L. Lutter, Associate Commissioner, Policy and Planning, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

CAMP LEJEUNE CONTAMINATED DRINKING WATER

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Poisoned Patriots: Contaminated Drinking Water at Camp Lejeune." Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: MG Robert C. Dickerson, Jr., USMC, Commanding General, Camp Lejeune; and Pat Leonard, Director. Office of The Judge Advocate General, Claims, Investigations, Department of the Navy; Thomas Sinks, Deputy Director, National Center for Environmental Health/ATSDR, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Department of Health and Human Services; the following officials of the EPA: Peter J. Murtha, Director, Office of Criminal Enforcement, Forensics, and Training, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance; and Franklin Hill, Director, Superfund Division; Marcia G. Crosse, Director, Public Health and Military Health Care Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATIONS ACT OF 2007

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing on H.R. 1682, Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act of 2007. Testimony was heard from Edward L. Connor, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Insurance, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation and the Subcommittee on Management, Investigations and Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security held a joint hearing on National Flood Insurance Program: Issues Exposed by the 2005 Hurricanes. Testimony was heard from Matt Jadacki, Deputy Inspector General, Disaster Assistance Oversight, Department of Homeland Security; and Orice M. Williams, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, GAO.

MANDATORY ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing on the Mandatory Arbitration Agreements: Are They Fair For Consumers? Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EMMETT TILL UNSOLVED CIVIL RIGHTS CRIME ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberty Liberties and the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held a joint hearing on H.R. 923, Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act. Testimony was heard from Grace Chung Becker, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

EMMETT TILL UNSOLVED CIVIL RIGHTS CRIME ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 923, Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act.

BAIL BOND FAIRNESS ACT OF 2007

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security approved for full Committee action H.R. 2286, Bail Bond Fairness Act of 2007.

WATER RECYCLING MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 31, Elisnore Valley Municipal Water District Wastewater and Recycled Water Facilities Act of 2007; H.R. 716, amended, Santa Rosa Urban Water Reuse Plan Act; H.R. 1462, Platte River Recovery Implementation Program and Pathfinder Modification Authorization Act; H.R. 1503, amended, Avra/Black Wash Reclamation and Riparian Restoration Project; H.R. 1526, amended, Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program Authorization Act of 2007; and H.R. 1725, Rancho California Water District Recycled Water Reclamation Facility Act of 2007.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Ordered reported the following measures: H.R. 2635, amended, Carbon-Neutral Government Act of 2007; H.R. 404, amended, Federal Customer Service Enhancement Act; H.R. 2127, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 408 West 6th Street in Chelsea, Oklahoma, as the ''Clem Rogers McSpadden Post Office Building;'' H.R. 2309, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3916 Milgen Road in Columbus, Georgia, as the '' Frank G. Lumpkin, Jr. Post Office Building;'' S. 1352, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 127 East Locust Street in Fairbury, Illinois, as the ''Dr. Frances Townsend Post Office Building;'' H. Con. Res. 87, Supporting the goals and ideals of a world day of remembrance for road crash victims; H. Res. 361, Recognizing and Honoring Jack Valenti and expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to his family on his death; H. Con. Res. 155, Recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and expressing the sense of Congress that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and more effectively facing the challenges of the future; H. Con. Res. 148, Recognizing the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage Month; H. Res. 189, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a ''Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day'' should be established; H. Res. 257, Supporting the goals and ideals of Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month; H. Con. Res. 142, Expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be established a National Pet Week; H.R. 2570, 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;'' and H.R. 2563, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 309 East Linn Street in Marshalltown, Iowa, as the ''Major Scott Nisley Post Office.''

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FISCAL YEAR 2008

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a voice vote, an open rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 2641, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule permits the Chair, during consideration of the bill in the House, to postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker. Testimony was heard from Representatives Visclosky and Hobson.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FISCAL YEAR 2008

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a voice vote, an open rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2642) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment

has caused it to be printed in the Congressional Record. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Finally, the rule permits the Chair, during consideration of the bill in the House, to postpone further consideration to a time designated by the Speaker. Testimony was heard from Representatives Farr and Wicker.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT GLOBALIZATION

Committee on Science and Technology: Held a hearing on the Globalization of R&D and Innovation. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DUPONT AEROSPACE DP–2 AIRCRAFT

Committee on Science and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight held a hearing on the duPont Aerospace DP–2 Aircraft. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: John Kinzer, DP–2 Program Manager, Office of Naval Research, Department of the Navy; and LTC Michael Tremper, USAF, Defense Contract Management Agency; and public witnesses.

COAST GUARD DEEPWATER PROGRAM UPDATE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing on Deepwater: 120-Day Update. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Homeland Security: ADM Thad W. Allen, USCG, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard; and Richard L. Skinner, Inspector General.

AMTRAK STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines and Hazardous Materials held a hearing on Amtrak Strategic Initiatives. Testimony was heard from the following officials of AMTRAK: David Laney, Chairman, Board of Directors; and Alexander Kummant, President and CEO.

VA SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE BONUSES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on the process of awarding SES bonuses at the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Testimony was heard from Christopher Mihm, Managing Director, Strategic Management Team, GAO; Gordon Mansfield, Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; and a public witness.

HEALTH CARE SERVICES EFFECTIVENESS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Strategies to Increase Information on Comparative Clinical Effectiveness. Testimony was heard from Representative Allen; Carolyn M. Clancy, M..D., Director, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Department of Health and Human Services; Peter R. Orszag, Director, CBO; Mark Miller, Executive Director, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission; and public witnesses.

BRIEFING—ICM

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Intelligence Community Management met in executive session to receive a briefing on ICM. The Subcommittee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL TERRORISM: OVERSEAS THREATS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence met in executive session to hold a hearing on Chemical/Biological Terrorism: Overseas Threats. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 2007

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies, business meeting to mark up proposed legislation making appropriations for Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, 10 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, business meeting to mark up proposed legislation making appropriations for Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, 2 p.m., S–128, Capitol.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 1257, to provide the District of Columbia a voting seat and the State of Utah an additional seat in the House of Representatives, S. 274, to amend chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the disclosures of information protected from prohibited personnel practices, require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements that such policies, forms, and agreements conform with certain disclosure protections, provide certain authority for the Special Counsel, H.R. 1254, to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, S. Res. 22, reaffirming the constitutional and statutory protections accorded sealed domestic mail, S. 967, to amend chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and authorization of funding for certain training programs for supervisors of Federal employees, S. 1046, to modify pay provisions relating to certain senior-level positions in the Federal Government, S. 1099, to amend

chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to make individuals employed by the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission eligible to obtain Federal health insurance, S. 597, to extend the special postage stamp for breast cancer research for 2 years, H.R. 1255, and S. 886, bills to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and S. 381, to establish a fact-finding Commission to extend the study of a prior Commission to investigate and determine facts and circumstances surrounding the relocation, internment, and deportation to Axis countries of Latin Americans of Japanese descent from December 1941 through February 1948, and the impact of those actions by the United States, and to recommend appropriate remedies, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Rules and Administration: to hold hearings to examine nominations to the Federal Election Commission, 10 a.m., SR–301.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Defense, and Department of Labor collaboration and cooperation to meet the employment needs of returning military service members, 9:30 a.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on China: Recent Security Developments, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, to mark up H.R. 2669, College Cost Reduction Act of 2007, 11:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, to mark up the following: Prescription Drug User Fee Amendments of 2007; Medical Device User Fee Amendments of 2007; Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Amendment of 2007; Pediatric Research Improvement Act; to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve drug safety; To amend the Public Health Service to provide for the establishment of a clinical trial registry database and a clinical trial registry database and a clinical trial results database; To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to conflicts of interest; To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the establishment of the Reagan-Udall Institute for Applied Biomedical Research; and the Pediatric Medical Device Safety and Improvement of 2007, 5 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, hearing on Improving Federal Consumer Protection in Financial Services, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, hearing on U.N. Peacekeeping Forces: A Force Multiplier for the U.S.? 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade, hearing on the United States-South Korea FTA: The Foreign Policy Implications, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response, hearing entitled ''Citizen Preparedness: Helping Our Communities Help Themselves,'' 11 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 923, Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act; H.R. 660, Court Security Improvement Act of 2007, and H.R. 2286, Bail Bond Fairness Act of 2007, 11:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, to continue markup of H.R. 2337, Energy Policy Reform and Revitalization Act of 2007; and to hold a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 673, Cocopah Lands Act; H.R. 1575, Burt Lake Band of Ottoawa and Chippewa Indians Reaffirmation Act; and H.R. 2120, To direct the Secretary of the Interior to proclaim as reservation for the benefit of the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians a parcel of land now held in trust by the United States for that Indian tribe, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, hearing on Continuing Allegations of Misconduct at the GSA, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, to consider the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2008, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science and Technology, to consider the following bills: 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, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing on U.S. Trade Policy and Small Business, 10 a.m., 12360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, June 12, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on the process of awarding SES bonuses at the Department of Veterans' Affairs, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, briefing on Hot Spots, 8:45 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 60 minutes), Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 6, CLEAN Energy Act, and vote on or in relation to Inhofe Amendment No.1505 (to Amendment 1502) at approximately 11:45 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, June 13

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E1268
Allen, Thomas H., Me., E1269
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1267
Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E1273
Boehner, John A., Ohio, E1271
Boustany, Charles W., Jr., La., E1269
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1270
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E1267
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1273
Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E1270
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1272, E1274, E1275
Filner, Bob, Calif., E1274
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E1268
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1262, E1263, E1264, E1265, E1266, E1267
Johnson, Timothy V., Ill., E1269
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E1262, E1264
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1262, E1263, E1265
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E1261
Larson, John B., Conn., E1269
Lewis, Ron, Ky., E1263, E1265
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1270
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E1273
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E1261, E1263, E1264, E1265, E1266, E1267, E1268, E1269, E1270, E1271
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E1272
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E1272
Pitts, Joseph R., Pa., E1267
Pryce, Deborah, Ohio, E1267
Reyes, Silvestre, Tex., E1273
Rodriguez, Ciro D., Tex., E1274
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E1270
Sestak, Joe, Pa., E1266
Tancredo, Thomas G., Colo., E1261
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1262, E1264, E1266
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1272
Udall, Mark, Colo., E1263, E1264
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1271
Walsh, James T., N.Y., E1269
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1274

(House proceedings for today will be continued in the next issue of the Record.)

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.