



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 18, 2007

No. 98

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 18, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO 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 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

REGRETTABLE REMITTANCES

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, the immigration problem has been a topic of contentious debate for years now, with few results. The influx, both legal and illegal, of immigrants from Mexico to North America numbers at a minimum about 500,000 people a year. It is clear that the majority of these immigrants are coming to our country for the better wages to provide for their families. And this is the heart of the problem. The Mexican economy is continually stunted in its growth by fiscal

mismanagement, corruption, and a perpetual dependence upon foreign aid and remittances. Mexico must make tough decisions and get its economy in shape. Until then, Madam Speaker, we will continue to face massive immigration from the south.

While we are painfully aware of the problems illegal immigration is causing our society, consider what it is doing to Mexico in the long run. The massive immigration is draining many villages across Mexico of their important labor pool. Families are separated while the husbands and fathers choose to cross our borders to get better lives for themselves and for their families. Mexico is slow in reforming their economic policies, in part perhaps because of the influx of money from the remittances from the United States that enables them to continue their unhealthy policies.

Let me explain. The money sent in the form of remittances amounted to about \$23 billion in 2006, according to the Bank of Mexico, the country's central bank. That amount is up almost sevenfold in a dozen years. As that number has grown, the fee for remitting money has dropped from an average of about 9.2 percent in 1999 to just about 3 percent this year, according to Bancomer, a Mexican bank.

Sending money back to Mexico has become cheaper partly because the amounts have become bigger. It was about \$290 on average 8 years ago, and now is up to over \$350. More importantly, according to the Bank of Mexico, over 90 percent of remittances are now sent by electronic wire transfer compared with only 50 percent in 1995. In rural poor communities in Mexico, even the 3 percent transaction fee is a huge chunk cut out of a remittance check. That is why the Bank of Mexico and America's Federal Reserve are running a program called Directo a Mexico, or FedACH International Mexico Service, to cut the cost further for these folks.

In this program, people receive an overnight transfer from an American bank account to a Mexican one. The two central banks act as middlemen, taking a cut of about 67 cents no matter what the size of the transaction. According to Elizabeth McQuerry of the Federal Reserve, banks then typically charge \$2.50 to \$5 to transfer about \$350. In total, this new program cuts the costs of remittances by at least half. In America, 200 banks are now signed up for this service compared with just six that signed up when it was initiated in 2004. So far, the program is just beginning, handling about 27,000 transactions a month. However, another point of serious concern is that about 26,000 of which are Social Security payments made by the American government to beneficiaries in Mexico.

One kink in the program was that most of Mexico's poor, who are often the intended recipients of the funds, do not have bank accounts to pay them into. So to ensure that these funds can still get to Mexico, they developed another program, run by Bansefi, a Mexican government bank, that allows people in America to open bank accounts for their relatives in Mexico. Their relatives can then use these accounts to withdraw the money deposited through the remittance program.

Madam Speaker, another question is, do the legal and illegal immigrants themselves have accounts to send money from? Statistics indicate as many as 70 percent do, according to a recent report by the Bank of Mexico. This is largely because hundreds of American banks, eager for deposits, will happily open accounts for people carrying only a Mexican consular identity card, rather than requiring official United States Government identification. This allows people without officially sanctioned rights to be in this country to send money out of it. As a result, the Mexican bank has seen rapid growth, with 3.4 million accounts

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H6581

now open, compared to just 850,000 in the year 2001.

If this trend continues, Madam Speaker, it will enable the Mexican government to continue to operate as it is today. Their economy will continue to stagnate, immigration will continue to bleed across our border, and the Mexican people will be caught in a downward spiral for generations to come.

Obviously another part of any immigration reform is making sure that U.S. banks only open accounts for persons who have legally sanctioned rights to be in this country and not illegal aliens.

HONORING LIEUTENANT GENERAL KEVIN J. SULLIVAN

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand to honor Lieutenant General Kevin J. Sullivan upon his promotion to Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Installations and Logistics.

Kevin Sullivan was born in Bridgeport, Connecticut, and grew up in an Air Force family. He married the former June Young, also from Connecticut. He is an alumnus of the University of Connecticut, and he and June are Husky fans through and through.

General Sullivan entered the Air Force and was commissioned through the Air Force ROTC program upon graduation. His first assignment took him in 1975 to England Air Force Base, Louisiana, as a weapons loading officer. He has since had assignments in the Philippines, North Dakota, Nebraska, here in Washington, Alabama, Germany, Utah, Ohio, Florida, and most recently a return engagement to Hill Air Force Base as Commander of the Ogden Air Logistics Center.

General Sullivan is the longest serving commander in the history of the Ogden ALC and he has led with superb application of financial, human and material resources during his tenure.

Despite living the itinerant life that is part and parcel of the Air Force, and despite his affection and affinity to his alma mater, we consider Kevin and June to be true Utahns, and we look forward to their future visits, official and not-so-official.

General Sullivan, please accept my heartfelt thanks for your outstanding leadership and stewardship at Hill Air Force Base during the past 4 years and my very best wishes upon your important new assignment. You exemplify the tradition of "Integrity first, Service before self, and Excellence in all we do" that is the hallmark of the United States Air Force.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Great Creator and Ruler of the universe, every creature of Yours quickens to a new day. Each in proper order gives You glory simply by its being. Every plant, animal and element lives according to its own unique pattern of life as beautiful, irregular or routine as that may be.

Only we, as Your people, with minds and hearts can spontaneously and consciously give You praise and thanks.

Outside our moments of prayer, we become focused on primal responsibilities. In doing so, Lord, we continue to give You glory by simply performing our work with dedication and whole-hearted effort, by following Your holy inspiration and by keeping Your commands. Empower us with Your spirit, that we may fulfill Your law today, always trusting in Your promises.

To Your holy name be all honor and praise, forever and ever. 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 Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE 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 MEMBERS TO DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 431 note, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission:

Mr. MOORE, Kansas

Mr. BOSWELL, Iowa

Mr. THORNBERRY, Texas

Mr. MORAN, Kansas

IT'S STILL A BAD DEAL

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the "Grand Bargain" is what people are calling the new inclusive, comprehensive give-America-away immigration bill. Since it got nowhere in the Senate last week, Senators have returned to the back room and behind closed doors to come up with a "Greater Grand Bargain" than before. In other words, throw in something for the left, more family reunification for illegals, and something for the right, more border security promises, and this all done in an effort to get a deal, any deal, passed quickly. Of course, the underlying principle of this deal is if you are here illegally, you're going to get to stay.

Now, smart people on the left and the right say this is not amnesty. Of course they say it's not amnesty because these smart people know Americans are overwhelmingly opposed to amnesty. So they call it a reform.

Mr. Speaker, if 12 to 20 million people are on our land illegally, and shall I speak politically incorrect and call it trespassing, and if they pay some kick-back fees to Uncle Sam but get to stay on our land, it's still amnesty.

So let's be honest. The new "Greater Grand Bargain" is a bargain for illegals, but a costly, bad deal for Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING ADMIRAL EDMUND GIAMBASTIANI

(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, in the coming months, the United States Navy will lose one of its greatest leaders. ADM Edmund P. Giambastiani, Jr., will retire as vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in August of this year. Admiral Giambastiani has held this post since August 2005.

A native of Canastota, New York, Admiral Giambastiani graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy with leadership distinction in 1970. Admiral Giambastiani and his wife, Cindy, have two children, Pete and Cathy.

We are grateful to work closely with Pete, who serves as military legislative assistant to Congressman JEFF MILLER of Florida. Pete, an academy graduate and lieutenant in the Navy, followed proudly in his father's footsteps.

I appreciate Admiral Giambastiani, his family, and their service to the people of the United States.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

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

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

RECOGNIZING STAX RECORDS FOR
ENRICHING THE NATION'S CULTURAL
LIFE WITH "50 YEARS OF
SOUL"

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 154) recognizing Stax Records for enriching the Nation's Cultural life with "50 years of soul," as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 154

Whereas the origins of southern soul may be traced back to Memphis, Tennessee;

Whereas soul music integrates elements of gospel music and rhythm and blues;

Whereas soul music became a new genre of American music in the 1950's with Stax Records paving the way for soul recordings;

Whereas Stax Records of Memphis, Tennessee is an icon of the American recording industry;

Whereas Stax Records produced some of the earliest recordings by such soul music legends as Isaac Hayes, Otis Redding, the Staple Singers, Wilson Pickett, Luther Ingram, Albert King, the Bar-Kays, Booker T. and the M.G.'s, Johnnie Taylor, The Mark-Twins, Sam & Dave, B.B. King, Rufus and Carla Thomas, and many other artists whose work continues to exert a profound influence on popular music today;

Whereas Stax Records also produced important recordings by, among others, the Reverend Jesse Jackson, Bill Cosby, and Richard Pryor;

Whereas Memphis, Tennessee, over 5 decades as the epicenter of all genres of soul music, earned the moniker "Soulsville, USA";

Whereas the Royal Studio for the Hi Records label served as the birthplace of trailblazing soul artists Aretha Franklin, Al Green, and Maurice White of Earth, Wind, and Fire who also added to the depth of soul Memphis produced for the international music community;

Whereas in 2007 the Memphis Convention and Visitors Bureau, Concord Music Group/Stax Records, and the Soulsville Foundation will celebrate American soul music and the 50th anniversary of the founding of Stax Records through their "50 Years of Soul" celebration; and

Whereas the influence of soul music permeates some modern music art forms, including Contemporary R & B, and deepens American music history and the Nation's cultural life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 50th anniversary of the founding of Stax Records and its role in launching the careers of many legendary soul music artists;

(2) recognizes the important role Memphis, Tennessee played in immortalizing soul music; and

(3) recognizes the continuing contributions and influence of soul music to America's music history and cultural life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the influence of soul music on this Nation and the contributions of the city of Memphis, Tennessee, and Stax Records for enriching the Nation's cultural life with 50 years of soul.

Soul music became a new genre of American music in the 1950s and incorporates various types of music including gospel and rhythm and blues. The origins of Southern soul music can be traced back to Memphis, Tennessee, the home of Stax Records.

Stax Records produced some of the earliest recordings of soul music legends including Isaac Hayes, Otis Redding, and B.B. King. Over time, other important recordings were produced at their studios, including works from the Reverend Jesse Jackson, Bill Cosby and Richard Pryor.

Throughout 2007, the Memphis Convention and Visitors Bureau, Concord Music Group/Stax Records, and the Soulsville Foundation will celebrate American soul music and the 50th anniversary of the founding of Stax Records with an event titled "50 Years of Soul."

Mr. Speaker, soul music has greatly contributed to the music culture in our Nation and has a lasting influence on current art forms, such as contemporary rhythm and blues. I would like to thank the city of Memphis and Stax Records for their commitment to this inspirational music, and I encourage my colleagues to pass this resolution.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 154, recognizing Stax Records for enriching the Nation's cultural life with its 50 years of soul.

Stax Records is a name which is synonymous with Southern soul music. The record label began as Satellite Records in Memphis, Tennessee, in 1959. Founded by Jim Stewart, a former country fiddler, and Estelle Axton, the

company had its first top 10 hit in 1961 with "Gee Whizz" by Carla Thomas. During the next few years, Stax developed a branch of music which was to have worldwide repercussions. With its house rhythm section, better known as Booker T. and the MGs, its tight horn section, which later became the Memphis Horns, and its gospel-rooted recording artists such as Otis Redding and Sam and Dave, Stax virtually created contemporary soul music.

The death of Otis Redding in 1967 signaled the end of the first Stax era, but it was soon to be revitalized with a successful new breed of Stax artists, including Isaac Hayes. In his own way, Hayes developed a unique blend, part jazz, part soul, part easy listening. He talked on his records in a mellow, bantering manner, and he used an orchestra in many ways to provide instrumental cushioning. In many ways, Hayes was a founding father of the sweet soul of the 1970s.

Stax's roster ran the gamut of black popular music. Albert King displayed his great personality, playing his guitar with a bluesy sense of urgency. The Staple Singers were at their artistic peak when they recorded for Stax during the late 1960s and early 1970s, turning out records that blended a utopian social vision with rhythmic excitement. The music behind these singers was more varied than in early days, and some of it was recorded outside Memphis, but the spirit of Stax was burning as brightly as ever.

The thing that made Stax go was teamwork; and when artists visited the studio, they could feel it. The halls were always full of people who seemed to be working furiously, dropping in on friends in their offices, or heading down to Studio A to check on the progress of a mixing session. The cooperation between white and black musicians and producers was practically unprecedented. Indeed, it was one of the secrets of the company's across-the-board success.

On August 20, 1972, the Stax label reached a pinnacle of success by representing a major concert, Wattstax, featuring performances by Stax recording artists and the humor of a rising young comedian named Richard Pryor. Known as the "Black Woodstock," Wattstax was hosted by Reverend Jesse Jackson and drew a crowd of over 10,000 attendees, most of them African American. Wattstax was filmed by motion picture director Mel Stuart, and a concert film of the event was released to theaters by Columbia Pictures in February 1973.

The influence of soul music permeates nearly all of today's modern music art forms and has deepened American music history and the Nation's cultural life. Today, we recognize the 50th anniversary of the founding of Stax Records and its role in launching the careers of many legendary soul music artists.

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on Stax and 50 years of soul music that my hometown, Memphis, Tennessee, has provided this Nation. H. Res. 154 recognizes the rich history of Stax, its 50-year celebration.

Last Saturday in Memphis, we started what's called "Seven Days of Soul," honoring 7 days of soul, and while we're honoring 7 days of soul starting last Saturday, the rest of the year is just as good in Memphis. Every day is good in Memphis, and every day's really good on this Earth.

Soul music is a special part of American music, and I wish to quote from *The Commercial Appeal*, which did a special feature on Stax and soul this past week by Mr. Bob Negr. He quotes Peter Guralnick, great rock and roll raconteur, and he says, what soul music is is the story of blacks and whites together. It is the story of the complicated intertwinings of dirt-poor roots and middle-class dreams, aesthetic ambitions and social strivings, the anarchic impulse and the business ethic.

Guralnick, while not a Memphian, has been a great recounter of stories of Memphis music. He's done a lot with Elvis, and he's done a lot with Stax. And Memphis has got the roux that has made music what it's been in America.

At Sun Records, things came together, and Sam Phillips put them together there, and Rufus Thomas, a staple of Stax, recorded at Sun Records. That was a fusion of music, just as Stax and soul music is a fusion of rhythm and blues and gospel music.

Steve Cropper, one of the famous Booker T. and the MGs musicians and song writers, along with Duck Dunn, Booker T. Jones and the late Al Jackson, said, the main reason Stax was so singular and phenomenal was that we had no idea what we were doing. Kind of reminds you of Congress on occasion, like last week, but we had no idea what we were doing. I guess you'd say there was a kind of magic in not knowing, and that made it special.

As Cropper noted, everything that made Stax great was, at its essence, beautifully raw and largely untutored. Certainly, that kind of description makes so many things in America so great.

Mr. Speaker, what made Stax so great was it was a natural energy and it was a coming together of blacks and whites. The House band there was Booker T. and the MGs. Steve Copper and Duck Dunn are Caucasian, and Al Jackson and Booker T. Jones are African American. And they put out the music. They didn't put out white onions, they didn't put out red onions. They didn't put out yellow onions. They put out "Green Onions," and be-

cause of "Green Onions," the world rocks to a Memphis beat and Stax soul.

The Memphis Horns were two gentlemen, Andrew Love and Wayne Jackson, one black and one white. That's the story that Memphis had in music, and it's the story that Memphis and this country need to have to come together and move forward.

□ 1415

Stax is an embodiment of the American dream, the promised land, as Dr. King would call it. I am pleased the House considers this bill today, and welcome the gentleman from Arizona's manager's amendment which recognizes the important role that Memphis played in immortalizing the great genre of soul music at large.

Now at the site of the old Stax headquarters and studio on historic McLemore Avenue is the Stax Museum of American Soul Music. It is the world's only soul music museum. No matter what Detroit might say, Memphis has the world's only soul music museum, and you need to come to Memphis and visit the Stax Museum of American Soul Music. The many exhibits there include award-winning documentary film and an authentic 100-year-old Mississippi Delta church that was home to the gospel roots of soul music, original studio equipment, costumes, artwork and memorabilia intended to preserve the legacy of American soul music and its contributions worldwide.

Stax was founded in 1957, not on a specific day with a cornerstone laid by the masons, but generally in 1957. That's the way soul music was. There is not exactly a date for it. It's just kind of a thing that happened. It was Jim Stewart and his sister, Estelle Axton. Jim Stewart's last name, Stewart starts with S-t, and Ms. Axton's, Ax, together S-t-a-x. Stax Records came together with Jim Stewart and Estelle Axton. They put the Stax in Stax music.

Stax Records brought forth so many hits. Otis Redding, "(Sittin' on) The Dock of the Bay," and I have got to parenthetically relate a personal story. I was a freshman at Vanderbilt University one night when Otis Redding performed in the Bar-Kays. The Bar-Kays, a great instrumental group, "Soul Finger" was their big hit. Ben Cauley, James Alexander are the surviving members.

Two days after they performed at Vanderbilt, their plane crashed. Just as when the Big Bopper's plane crashed, soul music would have crashed. We lost great, great talents, Otis Redding and the Bar-Kays that night.

Fortunately, Mr. Cauley missed the plane and Mr. Alexander wasn't on it. But it was a night I will remember and all students at Vanderbilt will remember as well. We saw their next-to-last concert.

But Otis came to Memphis to do "(Sittin' on) The Dock of the Bay," the Staple Singers, "Respect Yourself,"

Sam & Dave, famed for "Hold On! I'm Comin'," as well as "I'm a Soul Man," Gene Knight's "Mr. Big Stuff," so many instrumentals by Booker T. & the MGs; Eddie Floyd came to Memphis to do "Knock on Wood." Other great musicians performed there, the Mar-Keys and others.

It is fitting this resolution be considered this month of June, which is Black Music Month. Black Music Month recognizes the outstanding contributions African American singers have made to our Nation.

This Friday, June 22, the Memphis Orpheum Theatre will celebrate this occasion with a concert entitled "50 Years of Stax: A Concert to Benefit the Stax Museum of American Soul Music." Artists scheduled to perform at the event include such legendary talents as Isaac Hayes of "Shaft" fame, and one of the nicest human beings you would ever want to meet, and I have had that great fortune; Booker T. & the MGs, Eddie Floyd, William Bell Mavis Staples, the Soul Children and the Reddings will be honoring their father, the late legendary Otis Redding.

I am honored this resolution recognizes their talents, as well as such legendary artists as Aretha Franklin, who was born in Memphis; B.B. King; Albert King, no relation, but just as good at putting hot licks on those guitars; the Memphis Horns, Wayne Jackson & Andrew Love, Sam & Dave, the Mar-Keys; and even though not on Stax Records, Al Green and his legendary producer Willie Mitchell can't not be mentioned for all they did for Memphis music.

David Porter was a great songwriter. He'll be there too in the Stax Days. Stax Records was something special for Memphis and the country. It lives on through the museum, but it also lives on through now the Concord Music Group, which just announced the relaunch of Stax Records as a creative home for present-day soul stars such as Angie Stone, Soulive, Lalah Hathaway and Leon Ware who will be performing as well, and they will be joined along with other heritage artists such as Isaac Hayes to record on this label which has returned to its prominent place in Memphis and hopefully a prominent place in the charts.

It is a great honor and privilege that the House of Representatives would consider this bill today. I am thankful to have the opportunity to sponsor this legislation because of the great impact soul music has had on my life, the lives of my constituents, so many of us here in Congress and so many Americans.

Tomorrow is Juneteenth. Juneteenth is the anniversary of the last free emancipation of slaves. The word got to east Texas that the Emancipation Proclamation had been signed in 1863. It wasn't until 1865, June 19, the news got to Texas and all the slaves were freed. It's appropriate that in Black Music Month, during the celebration of Juneteenth and weekend before last,

Middle Passage Weekend, when we celebrate the people who made their passage, and some were so brave that rather than put themselves into slavery as Jews at Masada in the same way gave up their lives rather than be enslaved that we honor Stax Records.

It's going to be a great night Friday night. We will remember our heritage in Memphis. We will remember our heritage in America. And we have a new future with a recording label, with Stax Records. I urge every one to be soulful, to listen to soul music and ask the House of Representatives to pass H. Res. 154.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend my colleague, Representative COHEN, for introducing this resolution that talks about the impact of Stax Records. Although I am not from Memphis, but Memphis is essentially a part of the Delta, and I grew up in the Mississippi Delta, but in the State of Arkansas. So Memphis was always a part of where we were.

Then, of course, Chicago was the beneficiary of a great migration of African Americans who migrated from Mississippi, from Memphis, Memphis being the largest town in the area. Individuals would oftentimes leave their rural communities and first get to Memphis. Then after they got to Memphis and stayed for 2, 3 years, they would make their way to Saint Louis, or they would make their way to Chicago.

So we have a great affinity for the City of Memphis. It's almost like being home.

But also Stax knew where to find talent, and so they came to Chicago and found people like the Staple Singers, whose friends and associates took them out of the church and put them on a stage and a platform far beyond what they otherwise would have been able to do.

In addition to its music, Stax was also always seriously engaged and involved in what we called, especially during the 1960s and 1970s, the Civil Rights Movement, relative to putting on concerts to benefit events, activities, raise money for marches, demonstrations. So they were more than just purveyors of music. They were purveyors of music, but they were also part of the liberation movement, part of what those of us who grew up during the 1960s and 1970s call "the era of struggle."

So, again, I simply want to commend my colleague, and, of course, one of the Staple Singers, a young lady named Cynthia, used to actually work in the same organization that I worked in, and she was a member of the Staples family. The rest of the group, Pervis and Mavis and Pops, they were part of our community.

So I commend Stax. I also commend my colleague from Tennessee for taking the time to honor their tremendous contributions.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 154, 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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A resolution recognizing the rich and resounding impact 50 years of Memphis-originating soul music has offered to American music history."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA WILDCATS FOR WINNING THE 2007 NCAA DIVISION I SOFTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 475) congratulating the University of Arizona Wildcats for winning the 2007 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Softball Championship.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 475

Whereas, on June 6, 2007, the University of Arizona Wildcats defeated the University of Tennessee Lady Volunteers to win the 2007 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's College World Series Softball Championship, their eighth such title since 1991;

Whereas Wildcats pitcher Taryne Mowatt set a College World Series record for most innings pitched, and was named the Most Valuable Player of the qualifying tournament;

Whereas Wildcats players Kristie Fox, Jenae Leles, and Caitlin Lowe were selected for the all-tournament team;

Whereas the Wildcats, after beginning the 2007 season with a losing record, completed the season with a 50-14-1 record; and

Whereas Wildcats coach Mike Candrea has taken the Wildcats to the College World Series 19 times in the last 20 years, winning eight College World Series titles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the University of Arizona Wildcats on their victory in the National Collegiate Athletic Association 2007 Division I Women's College World Series Softball Championship; and

(2) recognizes and commends the efforts of the University of Arizona Wildcats players, coaches, and support staff in achieving their victory.

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

tleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Arizona Women's Softball Team on their eighth national championship. The Wildcats won their title June 6, 2007, giving them back-to-back championships over the University of Tennessee Lady Volunteers.

The road to the championship was not easy for the Wildcats. The Wildcats climbed out of the loser's bracket turning the tournament to face off in the best of three championship series against the Lady Volunteers of Tennessee. After losing the opener of the series, the Wildcats won the second game 1-0. The final game of the series was the most-viewed women's college game on television and was played in front of a sold-out audience. The game was 0-0 until the fifth inning, when the Wildcats scored five runs. Ms. Mowatt, the pitcher, continued to pitch a no-hitter, leading the Wildcats to their second title in a row.

For those of us that are alumni and have the pleasure of living in the community where the Wildcats Women's Softball Team has brought us great honor and prestige, know that the effort and the victories are due to great team effort. It's about teamwork, but there are individuals that must be acknowledged, and it begins with the head coach, Coach Candrea, who has taken the team to every one of their championship titles, in addition to leading the United States team to a Gold Medal in the 2004 Olympics.

Acknowledgment has to be extended to the pitcher, Ms. Mowatt, who threw 1,035 pitches in eight games in 7 days, setting a new women's college record for pitching 60 innings.

The members of the team that were selected to the all-tournament team due to their performance were the shortstop, Ms. Fox; third basewoman, Ms. Leles; and second basewoman, Ms. Lowe.

In addition to the team and support staff, I would like to recognize the endless support of family, friends and fans who give to the university and support the university throughout the whole season. The victory for U of A Wildcats Women's Softball Team is celebrated throughout my district and by Wildcat alumni across the world.

But I think their victory is more than a championship title. It is a testament of the ability of women and the need and the importance of the continued investment in title IX. The victory

reminds us of that importance every time that a women's team at a collegiate level is as successful as the University of Arizona Wildcats and other teams.

My congratulations to the University of Arizona Women's Softball Team for their great victory, for the honor that they bring the State, and for the honor that they bring women athletics across this Nation.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 475, congratulating the University of Arizona Women's Softball Team for winning the 2007 NCAA Division Women's College World Series Championship.

On June 6 of this year, the University of Arizona Wildcats Women's Softball Team defeated a very strong and successful University of Tennessee Lady Volunteers Team by a score of 5-0 to win the three-game series 2-1 and capture the 2007 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Softball Championship.

This is Arizona's second consecutive title. Much of the team's success is due to its coach, Mike Candrea. Over the last 21 seasons, he has compiled a record of 1,131 victories, only 228 defeats and two ties; however, you have a tie in the softball game. He has won 18 Coach of the Year awards and is an inductee in the National Fastpitch Coaches Association Hall of Fame.

In his career as a Wildcat coach, he has taken the team to the College World Series 19 times and has won eight College World Series titles. During the 2007 season, the Wildcats compiled an impressive record of 50 wins, 14 losses and only 1 tie.

□ 1430

The junior, Taryne Mowatt, the 2007 World Series MVP, set a record for the most pitches thrown in the College World Series by throwing 1,000 pitches in a week, pitching every inning of the tournament for the Wildcats. This season she compiled a record of 42 wins and 12 losses.

The University of Arizona should be recognized as an outstanding academic institution as well. Now in its second century of service to the State, the University of Arizona has become one of the Nation's top 20 public research institutions. It is one of only 62 members in the Association of American Universities, a prestigious organization that recognizes universities with exceptionally strong research and academic programs. With a world-class faculty in fields as diverse as astronomy, plant science, biomedical science, business, law, music and dance, the University of Arizona offers a rewarding educational experience to all of its students.

I extend my congratulations to the University's president, Robert Shelton,

the athletic director, Jim Livengood, head coach Mike Candrea and his staff, all of the hardworking players, the fans and to the University of Arizona. I am happy to join my friend and colleague, Representative GRIJALVA, in honoring this exceptional team and all of its accomplishments and wish all involved continued success.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any other speakers on the subject. And I would like to acknowledge the comments, and I'm very appreciative of the comments of Mr. BISHOP.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I won't take much time. I'll be very brief.

I just wanted to come over here and congratulate my colleague, Congressman GRIJALVA, and especially congratulate his women's softball team from the University of Arizona. They proved, once again, as they have done several times before, that they really have another great team. I think this was probably, what, their seventh national championship or something like that.

This was the first time that my Lady Vols softball team had gone as far as that team did. The University of Tennessee is my alma matter. It's a school of which I am very proud; and it has not only great academics, but it also has a very rich athletic heritage and history. We've been primarily known for our men's football team and our women's basketball, several national championships by both of those programs. But the Lady Vols softball team this year was one of the greatest sports teams in the history of the University of Tennessee. And, in fact, our great pitcher, Monica Abbott, won more games than any pitcher in women's collegiate softball history. And probably no athlete in the history of the University of Tennessee has ever dominated a sport like Monica Abbott.

So once again I want to say congratulations to my Lady Vols, my Tennessee Lady Vols softball team. But I'm here today to especially offer congratulations to a great women's softball team from the University of Arizona. They won another national championship, and it was a well-deserved championship because they had to fight very hard to get it, and I just wanted to come and say congratulations at this time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), and just indicate to him that both teams presented themselves, not only athletically, but as fine sportsmanship, fine athletes and fine universities. And I appreciate his comments.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution may deal with the University of Arizona Wildcats, but it obviously honors all people, all ladies who were involved in softball athletics this year.

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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 475.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR THE PROFOUND PUBLIC SERVICE AND EDUCATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF DONALD JEFFRY HERBERT, FONDLY KNOWN AS "MR. WIZARD"

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 485) expressing appreciation for the profound public service and educational contributions of Donald Jeffrey Herbert, fondly known as "Mr. Wizard".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 485

Whereas many citizens of the United States remember Donald Jeffrey Herbert as "Mr. Wizard" and mourn his passing;

Whereas Don Herbert was born in Waconia, Minnesota and graduated from the La Crosse State Teacher's College in Wisconsin in 1940 where he trained to be a science teacher;

Whereas Don Herbert volunteered for the U.S. Army Air Corps and served our country in the Atlantic theater and earned the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with three oak leaf clusters;

Whereas Don Herbert developed the idea for science programming culminating in "Watch Mr. Wizard", a live television show produced from 1951 to 1964 and honored by a Peabody Award in 1954;

Whereas the National Science Foundation and the American Chemical Society lauded Don Herbert and his show for promoting interest in science and his contributions to science education and has since been recognized by numerous awards;

Whereas an additional educational program, "Mr. Wizard's World", inspired children from 1983 to 1990 on cable television;

Whereas "Mr. Wizard" continued to serve as an ambassador for science education by authoring multiple books and programs, and by traveling to schools and providing classroom demonstrations;

Whereas educational research indicates that young children make decisions about future careers at a very early age and are influenced greatly by positive contacts with science and technology;

Whereas a strong education in science and technology is one of the building blocks of a productive, competitive, and healthy society;

Whereas “Mr. Wizard” encouraged children to duplicate his experiments at home, driving independent inquiry into science with simple household equipment;

Whereas “Mr. Wizard’s” dynamic and energetic science experiments attracted unprecedented numbers of children to educational programming, even those who were disinterested or unmotivated in science;

Whereas Mr. Wizard Science Clubs were started across the United States and had more than 100,000 children enrolled in 5,000 clubs by the mid-1950s; and

Whereas Don Herbert will be remembered as a pioneer of commercial educational programming and instrumental in making science education exciting and approachable for millions of children across the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its appreciation for the profound public service and educational contributions of Donald Jeffrey Herbert;

(2) recognizes the profound impact of higher educational institutions that train teachers;

(3) encourages students to honor the heritage of Don Herbert by exploring our world through science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields; and

(4) tenders its condolences to the family of Don Herbert and thanks them for their strong familial support of him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Donald Jeffrey Herbert and to express appreciation for his great educational contributions.

Donald Herbert was born in Waconia, Minnesota, on July 10, 1917. He graduated from La Crosse State Teachers College in 1940, where he studied to become a science teacher. Before Don Herbert could make an educational contribution, he first served in the United States Army Air Force in World War II. During his service to our country, he earned the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with three oak leaf clusters.

Don Herbert is best known for developing an idea which became “Watch Mr. Wizard,” a live television show which introduced many children to science. This show aired from 1951 to 1964. Don Herbert, who came to be known as Mr. Wizard, also produced another children’s show from 1983 to 1990 titled “Mr. Wizard’s World.”

Mr. Wizard was able to explain seemingly difficult science to children with visually stunning experiments. Mr. Wizard amazed all of us that watched

that show. He could make a Bunsen burner change colors by the elements that he used on there. He could take two colored solutions, pour them into a beaker and it would become clear.

And today, when there is such an emphasis across this country and by this Congress to instill an appreciation and a love for science among our students, and among the children of this country, Mr. Wizard stands as a great example and a wonderful show that did just that, stimulated interest and created appreciation among children for science.

Don Herbert’s television programs inspired generations of children to become knowledgeable in science. These educational television programs earned Don Herbert a Peabody Award in 1954. He also won three Thomas Edison National Mass Media Awards and the Robert Millikan Award from the American Association of Physics Teachers.

Don Herbert realized that an education including science and technology is a necessary component in forming a productive and competitive society. While he passed away on June 12, 2007, his great contributions to advancement of the education in the field of science will continue to have effects for many, many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 485, expressing appreciation for the profound public service and educational contributions of Donald Jeffrey Herbert, fondly known to all of us of my generation as “Mr. Wizard.”

Donald Jeffrey Herbert will be remembered as the host of two popular children’s television shows about science. A general science and English major at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, he showed interest in drama until his career as an actor was interrupted by World War II when he enlisted in the United States Army as a private.

He later joined the United States Air Corps, took pilot training and became a B-24 bomber pilot who flew combat missions with the 15th Air Force, flying out of a base in Italy. As the gentleman from Arizona said, he distinguished himself in combat, winning the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with the three oak leaf clusters.

After the war, Herbert worked at a radio station in Chicago where he acted in children’s programs such as the documentary health series “It’s Your Life.” It was during that time that Herbert formulated the idea of Mr. Wizard and a general science experiments show that utilized the new medium of television. Herbert’s idea was accepted by a Chicago NBC station, and the series “Watch Mr. Wizard” premiered on March 3, 1951. That was even before I was born.

The weekly 30-minute show featured Herbert as Mr. Wizard, with a young assistant who watched while Herbert performed interesting science experiments. The experiments, many of which seemed impossible at first glance, were usually simple enough to be recreated by viewers. The show was very successful, and 547 live episodes were created before it was cancelled in 1965. It was briefly revived by NBC during the 1971–1972 season. In 1953 Herbert won a Peabody Award for his work on this program.

In 1983, Herbert developed “Mr. Wizard’s World,” a faster-paced version of the show that was shown three times a week on the cable channel Nickelodeon. This show ran until 1990, and reruns were shown until 2000, making it the longest-running show on Nickelodeon.

In 1994, Herbert developed another series of 15-minute spots for Nickelodeon called “Teacher to Teacher with Mr. Wizard.” The new show highlighted individual elementary school teachers and their projects and was sponsored by the Daschle Science Foundation.

Mr. Wizard inspired legions of children across the Nation. Kids in every town joined thousands of Mr. Wizard clubs and did some of the same experiments that were seen on television, sometimes even without burning up the house. Many of these young viewers went on to careers in science and all were at least taught the practicalities of science in our daily lives.

On June 12, 2007, Donald Herbert lost his battle with cancer, slightly more than a month shy of his 90th birthday at his home in Bell Canyon, California. For the immeasurable contributions he made in children’s lives and to the field of science, I would ask my colleagues to support this resolution recognizing his life and work.

Mr. Speaker, I’d ask the gentleman from Arizona if he has other speakers on this particular topic. I do have one other I’d like to yield time to.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to someone who really understands what he’s talking about.

I enjoyed Mr. Wizard shows. They were fascinating. I still hated chemistry, but I enjoyed Mr. Wizard. And with that I’d like to yield to the distinguished gentleman and scientist from the State of Michigan, Mr. EHLERS.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And had I been your teacher, you never would have disliked any science course. I would have been delighted to recognize your native ability.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 485, which expresses appreciation for the profound public service and educational contributions of Donald Jeffrey Herbert, who passed away on June 12, 2007.

Many people fondly remember Donald Herbert as Mr. Wizard, and they mourn his passing. He was born in

Waconia, Minnesota, which also happens to be my birth State, and he graduated from the La Crosse State Teachers College in Wisconsin in 1940, where he trained to be a science teacher.

He volunteered for the U.S. Army Air Corps and served our country during World War II in the Atlantic theater and earned the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with three oak leaf clusters.

Mr. Wizard will be remembered as a pioneer of commercial educational programming. He made science education and science exciting and approachable for millions of children across the United States. He developed the idea for science programs on radio and television, culminating in "Watch Mr. Wizard," a live television show produced from 1951 to 1964. Another of his shows, "Mr. Wizard's World," inspired children from 1983 to 1990 on cable television. Incidentally, these were precursors to today's Mr. Wizard equivalent, Bill Nye, the Science Guy, who has developed an outstanding reputation on Saturday morning television for educating children about science.

The National Science Foundation and the American Chemical Society lauded Don Herbert and his show for promoting interest in science and his contributions to science education. He has since been recognized by numerous awards.

For the duration of his life, Mr. Wizard served as an ambassador for science education. Outside of his television shows, he promoted science by offering multiple books and programs and by traveling to schools to provide classroom demonstrations. Not surprisingly, Mr. Wizard's dynamic and energetic science experiments attracted unprecedented numbers of children to educational programming, even those who were initially disinterested or unmotivated in science.

Mr. Wizard taught the magic about science by doing science. In fact, Mr. Wizard encouraged children to duplicate his experiments at home, leading children into independent inquiry into science with simple household equipment.

□ 1445

I might add he was a precursor to what is happening in the classrooms today, because teachers have discovered the best way to teach science is to let students do the science themselves.

I also appreciate what he did in leading children into independent inquiry. I grew up before television, and so I did not have the opportunity to watch him. But I developed my interest in science by doing experiments at home. These were experiments that were outlined in Popular Science Magazine, and that gave me my start in science, just as Mr. Wizard gave many other children their start in science.

Certainly, Mr. Wizard's efforts were very important, and are relevant to legislation currently under consideration by our Congress. Evidence indi-

cates that young children make decisions about future careers at an early age and are influenced greatly by positive contacts with science and technology. Recently passed bipartisan bills have focused on the need to improve science education, promote innovation, and ensure our Nation's competitiveness.

This year I introduced several bills related to science education, including the Science Accountability Act, H.R. 35; the Standards to Improve Educational Achievement for Kids, better known as the SPEAK Act, H.R. 325; and the National Science Education Tax Incentive for Teachers Act, H.R. 36.

Through this resolution the House of Representatives expresses its appreciation for the profound public service and educational contributions of Donald Herbert. Also, we should recognize the major impact of higher educational institutions that train teachers who encourage students to honor the heritage of Don Herbert by exploring our world through science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields.

I offer my condolences to the family of Don Herbert, and we thank them for their strong support of Mr. Wizard's tremendous educational efforts. He has set a path that all of us should follow, and if we are serious about competing with other nations and keeping the jobs on our soil rather than letting them be outsourced, we must follow his example and educate our children in mathematics and science so that we can continue to be ranked number one in the world in the areas of science and mathematics.

Finally, I thank the Members who cosponsored this resolution: Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. HALL, Mr. KUHL, Mr. LAMPSON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. JOHN PETERSON, and Mr. MARK UDALL. Also, I thank the Education and Labor Committee staff for their work on this resolution, especially Chad Miller and Rob Borden, as well as my staff member, Rachel Post, who has contributed invaluable to this.

I urge all Members to vote for this resolution to honor Don Herbert for all his work on science education and to honor his memory by continuing to support science education in the future.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 485.

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.

CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF TITLE IX OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972 AND RECOGNIZING THE NEED TO CONTINUE PURSUING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 406) celebrating the accomplishments of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, also known as the Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act, and recognizing the need to continue pursuing the goal of educational opportunities for women and girls.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 406

Whereas 35 years ago, on June 23, 1972, the Education Amendments of 1972 containing title IX was signed into law by the President;

Whereas Representatives Patsy T. Mink and Edith Green led the successful fight in Congress to pass this legislation;

Whereas title IX prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in the administration of any education program receiving Federal financial assistance;

Whereas remarkable gains have been made to ensure equal opportunity for women and girls under the inspiration and mandate of title IX;

Whereas title IX serves as the non-discrimination principle in education;

Whereas title IX has moved this Nation closer to the fulfillment of access and opportunities for women and girls in all aspects of life;

Whereas title IX has increased educational opportunities for women and girls, resulting in improved graduation rates, increased access to professional schools and nontraditional fields of study, and improved employment opportunities;

Whereas title IX has increased opportunities for women and girls in sports, leading to greater access to competitive sports, and building strong values such as teamwork, leadership, discipline, work ethic, self-sacrifice, pride in accomplishment, and strength of character;

Whereas on October 29, 2002, title IX was named the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act" in recognition of Representative Mink's heroic, visionary, and tireless leadership in developing and winning passage of title IX; and

Whereas 35 years of progress under title IX is widely acknowledged, but because women continue to earn less for work than men with the same educational background; sexual harassment remains pervasive in schools and on college campuses; women and girls face substantial barriers in pursuing high-wage fields such as science, technology, engineering, and math; and women and girls' sports teams do not receive an equal share of resources, including fewer recruiting and scholarship dollars at the college level; and athletic participation opportunities still lag behind those provided for men, there is still much work to be done if the promise of title IX is to be fulfilled: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives celebrates—

(1) the accomplishments of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, also known

as the Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act, in increasing opportunities for women and girls in all facets of education; and

(2) the magnificent accomplishments of women and girls in sports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Thirty-five years ago, a college applicant could be denied admission simply because she was a woman. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 changed that. Led by the late Representative Patsy T. Mink, who had been denied admission to a medical school because of her sex, and Representative Edith Green, Congress established a principle we often take for granted today, the prohibition of sex discrimination in any federally funded educational program.

Title IX requires that "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal assistance."

These 35 words over the last 35 years have had a profound impact, and the results are astounding. More women than ever now attend college, which means more women than ever go on to advanced degrees. In 1972 only 9 percent of law degrees were earned by women. In the mid-1970s, when I attended law school, that number had improved. Women then had made up 15 percent of the graduating class. Today women earn almost half of all law degrees. The story is similar for medical degrees and Ph.D.s.

This new generation of highly educated women has made a substantial impact on society. Expectations have changed. Girls expect to grow up and contribute to our country and the world in any way they want, as doctors, lawyers, CEOs, school principals, consultants, just to name a few careers previously underrepresented by women.

Title IX also literally changed the face of athletic programs and colleges throughout the country. In fact, it is through athletics that title IX's impact has seeped into the public's consciousness. In athletics the change from 1972 to 2007 is astounding. Today,

college athletic opportunities abound for young women. In the past three decades, title IX has led to a 450 percent increase in the rate of female participation in college sports and a more than 900 percent increase in participation at the high school level. And the recent surge in women's professional sports teams could not have happened without the dramatic increase in women playing college sports.

The thousands of women athletes in basketball, volleyball, soccer, and other sports, where we can see them, root for them, and even play on the team with them, have had a huge impact. Young girls today take it for granted that they can play a sport and aspire to athletic scholarships to college. My own niece started playing volleyball in junior high, continued in high school, and is aiming for a volleyball scholarship to attend college. Women in my generation did not even consider this a possibility. Title IX opened the door to higher education for women in many ways, including through athletic scholarships.

These successes, both academic and athletic, are worth celebrating, as are the women who came before us here on the House floor as leaders of the title IX movement. In 2002, after Representative Patsy T. Mink passed away, Chairman GEORGE MILLER introduced a bill that named title IX the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act."

This picture of Patsy hangs in my office. She was my friend and continues to be an inspiration to me. I am proud to represent the congressional district that Patsy represented for so long and so well. I know that if she were here today, she would remind us that our work is not done.

There are many challenges still to be addressed. Women continue to face substantial barriers, especially in high-wage fields such as science, technology, engineering, and math. Women own less than 30 percent of all U.S. firms. Women make up only a third of chief executive officers and less than 20 percent of engineers. Sexual harassment remains pervasive in schools and on college campuses. Women's and girls' sports teams still receive only 33 percent of recruiting dollars and 38 percent of athletic operating dollars.

Title IX is as necessary today as it was in 1972.

I am pleased that over 120 of my colleagues are cosponsors on this resolution, including Speaker PELOSI. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in celebrating title IX's successes and in recognizing the work still to be done in our march towards equal educational opportunities.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Resolution 406 is a resolution honoring the 35th anniversary of title IX of the Education Amendments

of 1972. I would like to recognize my colleague Ms. HIRONO for introducing this resolution. The Education and Labor Committee will continue to celebrate the 35th anniversary of this law with a hearing tomorrow on this subject before the Subcommittee on Higher Education, Lifelong Learning and Competitiveness.

President Nixon signed title IX into law on June 23, 1972. The purpose of title IX was to eliminate discrimination based on gender in the education arena. While title IX applies to all areas of education, it is possibly best known for its role in sports. Thanks to this law, and perhaps more significantly from the growing interest in sports in this country, we have seen a dramatic increase in female athletes.

This law is far from perfect. Institutions continue to struggle with how to comply with title IX, trying to balance the participation rates of men with those of women. We do not want institutions to build up female participation at the expense of men's teams at the schools.

As I stated earlier, title IX is best known for its effect on sports. However, title IX does apply to all areas of education. In a time when we are continually talking about the need to educate America's students in the area of math and science, it is important that we also recognize the increasing numbers of female students pursuing careers in math and science. In 2004 the General Accounting Office issued a report on the participation of women in science. The report found that women's participation in the sciences increased substantially over the past 30 years. However, there is always more that can be done. As Congress looks to reform current programs, we should ensure that the programs being reformed are to encourage all students to enter into the sciences, math, and especially history.

The committee has no stated opposition to this resolution.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah for his remarks in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 406, in celebration of the accomplishments of title IX, the Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act. I would like to thank my friend and colleague from Hawaii, Ms. Mazie Hirono, for bringing this to the House floor this week as we commemorate the 35th anniversary of this landmark legislation.

Title IX has forever changed the landscape of opportunity for women and girls. Since the enactment of title IX, the number of women participating in intercollegiate athletics has increased fivefold. The number of female high school athletes has grown by almost 900 percent. In 1972, just as title

IX was enacted, women earned merely 28 percent of the bachelor's degrees in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, better known as the STEM fields.

□ 1500

Today, women earn 49 percent of the bachelor's degrees in these fields.

On a personal point of privilege, I am proud to say that my four daughters, who are considering STEM fields as their professional careers, are proud to see that we remember Patsy Mink.

Despite these successes, we still have work to do to achieve the promises of full equality and freedom from discrimination that is at the heart of title IX. There are still gaps in support for women's athletics, gaps in participation in various disciplines in the STEM fields, and disparities in career and technical education programs. More critically, there is still much to be done to ensure that our educational institutions are free from sexual harassment.

It was a privilege to have served on the Education Committee with Congresswoman Patsy Mink of Hawaii, the original author of title IX. I joined her on the Committee of Education and also on the House floor to defend title IX and its reauthorization, and I am pleased to say we won.

It is up to us to honor her legacy and maintain the integrity of title IX, which simply states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

As the father of four daughters, I reaffirm my commitment to title IX and the legacy of Patsy Mink today with this vote. I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution, H. Res. 406.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my freshman colleague from Hawaii for bringing this particular resolution. It is appropriate that she honors her predecessor, Congresswoman Mink, who did so much in this Hall. In passing this bill, she did some of the things that were similar to civil rights laws of the 1960s in a continuum, because discrimination, whether it be race or gender or national origin or sexual orientation, is wrong.

There are barriers this country needs to tear down and present a level playing field and an opportunity for all to enjoy the benefits of America. It is what Dr. King did talk about when he looked forward to getting to the Promised Land. That's part of what the Promised Land was, is, and will be. And so I thank the gentlelady for bringing the resolution.

I am going to take an opportunity here to make a mea culpa. Earlier,

when I had to address the House on Stax Records, I forgot a few people. And one of the people I forgot was a woman, Carla Thomas, who did "Gee Whizz," and her father, Rufus Thomas, who did "Walking the Dog." In music, many of the Stax Record people were men, they were the Staple Singers, but Carla Thomas was a great singer. And there are so many fields that have been opened up.

When I looked at the statistics that were made available to me, before title IX only 9 percent of the graduates from medical school were women. In 2004, there were 46 percent. In law, 7 percent had J.D. degrees for women, now 49 percent. When you think about those numbers, and that was just 35 years ago, Mr. Speaker, it's amazing how far we've come from the discrimination that existed at that time because of gender and what Representative Mink and the United States Congress' work did. It shows what can be positive and good about government.

There is a lot of good things that government can do and does do, and people forget that. If it weren't for civil rights pioneers, there would still be segregation. If it weren't for the work of the Congress in the middle 1960s, there would still be discrimination possibly in housing and public employment and other public facilities. And if it weren't for Congresswoman Mink, there would be discrimination against women. There is much good that comes. Forces within society help, but they propel people in government to act and take action that this Congress has seen has made America a greater place.

So it is my honor to stand and support the passage of this resolution that celebrates the 35th anniversary of title IX. It tells us just how far we've come in 35 years, but how just 35 years ago there were these limits. And the fact is, it was only 87 years ago that women got the right to vote. Mr. Speaker, 87 years ago women could not vote in this country, but this Congress, through a passage of a constitutional amendment, passed eventually by Tennessee as the perfect 36th State, gave women the right to vote in this country. So we've come a long way, but we've got a long way to go. And it is an honor to participate in this 35th anniversary.

I thank the gentlelady for giving me the time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity of sharing this time with the gentlelady from Hawaii on this particular bill that was sponsored by the gentlelady from California (Ms. MATSUI).

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the balance of my time, I would just like to clarify that I am the original sponsor of this measure.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues to celebrate the 35th anniversary of title IX of the Higher Education Act, which assured a woman's right to educational

equality. And I thank Congresswoman HIRONO for bringing this resolution to the floor and for her leadership on this issue.

By ending gender discrimination in all education programs, title IX has given women the chance to excel and to take their rightful place as leaders and achievers on campuses across the United States. No longer would young women find their educational options limited by years of engrained discrimination. Thanks to title IX, women can now prepare for their future—whether in the halls of power or corporate boardrooms—in the classrooms and on the playing fields of America's colleges and universities.

Today also gives us the opportunity to honor our former colleague, friend, and champion for women's equality—Congresswoman Patsy Mink. As a member of the Education Committee in 1972, Congresswoman Mink helped craft title IX, and engineer its passage.

The day that the title IX legislation came to the floor, Congresswoman Mink was called away on a family emergency. She knew it would be a close vote. And she was right. That time, the bill was defeated by only a single vote. But Patsy fought on. Through sheer force of will, Congresswoman Mink forced another vote, an uncommon occurrence made possible by a woman of uncommon strength. And that time, women won. Congress passed title IX.

For her determination, the women of America will always owe a debt of gratitude to Congresswoman Patsy Mink.

As a mother and a grandmother, I have seen firsthand the results of title IX. Some are more visible, like the growing number of girls on soccer fields and basketball courts, the women of the WNBA, or the famous victory of Mia Hamm and Team USA in the World Cup.

Equally important, though less tangible, is the message that title IX sends to women and girls: Your education is crucial and your future is limitless.

Young women today believe that they can do anything. And they can.

For our children, we must continue to support this belief by fulfilling and sustaining the promise of title IX.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 406, celebrating the accomplishments of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, also known as the Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act, and recognizing the need to continue pursuing the goal of educational opportunities for women and girls.

Title IX changed the way the United States educates its women and girls. It states that, "No person in the United States, shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." This monumental legislation has had far-reaching effects on the women in this country. Title IX may be best known for its changes in athletics, but the academic world has been significantly changed as well. Since 1981, women have received more bachelor's degrees than men, and since 1986, women have received more master's degrees than men. None of this would have been possible without the hard work of Patsy Mink and Edith Green. Generations of women have and will benefit from the work of these women.

I had the honor of serving with Patsy Mink for 12 years, representing the State of Hawaii

in the U.S. House of Representatives. She strove to ensure equality and fairness for all Americans. Through her work on title IX, she was able to accomplish just that for every American woman. The renaming of title IX to the Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act honors her work and reminds us all of her dedication to equality.

We should take this time to reflect on where we have come from and the progress we have made. Millions of women have access to the education to make their dreams come true, and that access was guaranteed 35 years ago by a woman who believed that we should all be able to better our lives.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 406, a resolution celebrating the accomplishments of Title IX. I would like to thank Congresswoman HIRONO for introducing this legislation addressing what is an important issue for women's equality.

Title IX requires that schools and colleges receiving Federal funds provide female students with athletic opportunities comparable to those of male students.

But as critical as this is, we must all begin to realize that Title IX is about more than civil rights.

For many young athletes, the scholarship opportunities afforded by Title IX might be the only way they can go to college. What is more, female athletes tend to graduate at higher rates, perform better in school, are less likely to use drugs and smoke, and have a more positive body image, more confidence, and better self-esteem than non-athletes.

As a direct result of Title IX, women's participation in intercollegiate sports has skyrocketed, proving that interest follows opportunity. In 1972, about 30,000 women played college sports. Today, that number has increased by more than 450 percent. Similarly, in 1972, about 200,000 girls participated in high school athletics. Today, that number has increased by more than 900 percent.

It would be wrong of me to speak about Title IX without taking time to honor my dear friend and beloved colleague, Patsy Mink. In 1972, Patsy helped to enact Title IX and in honor of her valiant work, Congress renamed Title IX the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act." She struggled for 30 years to protect educational equity for men and women, and if she were with us today, I am certain that she would be proud of our continued fight to promote equality for all young women around the country.

While we celebrate how far we have come, we must also recognize that we still have a way to go. Women remain underrepresented in school sports, with men receiving 1.3 million more high school athletic opportunities and \$148 million more athletic scholarship money each year.

In the face of such realities, I am proud to join my colleagues to support this resolution, a statement of our determination to recommit ourselves to the causes of education, opportunity, and equality in our society.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 406.

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.

DR. FRANCIS TOWNSEND POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1352) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 127 East Locust Street in Fairbury, Illinois, as the "Dr. Francis Townsend Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 1352

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

SECTION 1. DR. FRANCIS TOWNSEND POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 127 East Locust Street in Fairbury, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Dr. Francis Townsend Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Dr. Francis Townsend Post Office Building".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

As a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of S. 1352, which names a postal facility in Fairbury, Illinois, after Dr. Francis Townsend.

S. 1352, which was introduced by Senator RICHARD DURBIN on May 10, 2007, was reported from the Oversight Committee on June 12, 2007 by a voice vote.

Dr. Francis Townsend was born in 1867 into an impoverished Illinois farming family. Shortly after he was born, his family moved to Nebraska, where he graduated from high school and began a varied career. He tried farming and selling in Kansas, land speculation in Los Angeles, and worked as a laborer in Colorado.

In 1899, he enrolled in the Omaha Medical College, and graduated in 1903 at the age of 36. He served as an Army doctor in World War I and during the

Great Depression, and took a job as the assistant director of the City Health Office in Long Beach, California. At the age of 66, Dr. Townsend lost his job and found himself both poor and out of work.

There were millions of elderly people just like him who were barely making ends meet. One day he had a vision of how to help the elderly and the country as a whole. He wrote a letter to a newspaper outlining his "old-aged pension plan for seniors." This plan created a Federal pension of \$200 a month paid to every citizen 60 and older on the condition that the pensioner spend the entire sum within 30 days in order to stimulate the economy. His efforts influenced the passage of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Social Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Illinois, Senator RICHARD DURBIN, for introducing this legislation, and I urge swift passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Fairbury, Illinois' most famous citizens, and that was Dr. Francis Townsend. He was an American physician best known for creating the Townsend Old-age Revolving Pension plan and for spurring social movement that advocated for benefits for the elderly during the 1930s.

Dr. Townsend, the son of a farmer, grew up in Fairbury, Illinois, and attended Omaha Medical College in 1917. Shortly after becoming a physician, he served in the Army Medical Corps during World War I. After leaving the Army, he began a medical practice in Long Beach, California. When this was not successful, he obtained employment as the assistant city health director. Sadly, due to the Great Depression, he lost that job and was forced into retirement.

In 1933, Dr. Townsend witnessed something extremely heartbreaking but not uncommon during the Great Depression when he saw three old ladies searching through trash cans in his back alley for food. This became a watershed moment for the doctor. In response to what he observed, and his inner drive to help others, he decided to become involved in politics. Later that year he created the Townsend Plan, which proposed creating a Federal pension of \$200 a month for every citizen 60 years old and older on the condition that the money would be spent within 30 days in order to stimulate the economy.

By 1934, through his leadership and determination to help the downtrodden, the plan generated a great deal of support and gave rise to the establishment of at least 5,000 "Townsend clubs" nationwide. At the height of popularity, membership in the clubs totaled over 2 million people.

By 1935, an additional 25 million Americans signed petitions to Congress

and the White House supporting the implementation of Dr. Townsend's plan. He became such a national celebrity by this time that he testified before Congress.

Thanks to Dr. Townsend's efforts, his social crusades sparked a national antipoverty movement in 1933 that likely contributed to the expedited passage of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Social Security Act of 1935, one of the major initiatives of the New Deal.

Dr. Townsend was a steadfast leader and original thinker. His efforts to fight poverty during our Nation's worst economic crisis and his exemplary civic activism are an example for us all.

Naming the Fairbury, Illinois, post office after one of its most famous citizens during the sesquicentennial anniversary of Fairbury is a fitting celebration of both Dr. Townsend's contributions to the city and to this important milestone.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would just close by noting that here is an excellent example of a citizen with an idea, an idea that was promulgated into legislation, legislation that all of us, if we live to be 65 or somewhat close to, benefit from. And so I think it is indeed appropriate.

Again, I want to thank Senator DUBIN for introducing this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1352.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1515

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (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.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 155

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 Juneteenth Independence Day as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas for more than 135 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 by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That—

(1) Congress recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation;

(2) Congress 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 better understand the experiences that have shaped the Nation;

(3) the President is urged to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe Juneteenth Independence Day with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs; and

(4) it is the sense of Congress that—

(A) history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and more effectively facing 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.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 142nd anniversary of Juneteenth Independence Day. On June 19, 1865, MG Gordon Granger and Union soldiers arrived in Galveston, Texas, with the news of the Emancipation Proclama-

tion and the end of the Civil War. News of President Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863, did not reach the frontier areas of the United States, especially the Southwest, for almost 2½ years. General Granger's General Order No. 3 on June 19, 1865, is recognized as the day that all slaves in the United States were finally freed.

Juneteenth has become recognized as a State, regional, and national event that honors the freeing of slaves in the United States. As Americans, we must never forget how precious freedom is. Juneteenth is the day that all Americans of all races, creeds and ethnic backgrounds can celebrate freedom and the end of slavery in the United States. Its historical significance should be regarded as a means of understanding the past and more effectively facing the challenges of the future.

As the sponsor of H. Con. Res. 155, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation and urge President Bush to issue a proclamation observing Juneteenth Independence Day with appropriate ceremonies, activities and programs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to imagine a time when national news took months and sometimes years to disseminate throughout the country. Today we get immediate news updates through various outlets. But it was over 2 years after President Lincoln gave the historical Emancipation Proclamation that the slaves of Galveston, Texas, learned that their long-deserved freedom had been won. It was on that date, June 19, 1865, when Union soldiers made their way southwest to spread the joyful news of their Civil War victory.

Every year on June 19, commonly known as Juneteenth Independence Day, African Americans in the Southwest and around the Nation celebrate their emancipation, their culture and the historic significance of the civil rights struggles. It is critical that we educate our children not only of American history and the Civil War, but the tradition of Juneteenth Independence Day. By taking time to celebrate these anniversaries, we honor the richness, diversity and heritage of all races that form our great Nation.

June 19th is a time to acknowledge a period of history that helped shape our Nation and continues to influence our society today. It is with great honor that I support the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 155.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Idaho for his remarks and comments and for his support of this resolution. I also would just note that I attended a Juneteenth celebration in the neighborhood where I live on Saturday, and,

of course, they had speeches, poems, readings and historical proclamations that people did.

To make sure that all Members of the House and of the Senate have an opportunity to participate in an observance, Senator BARACK OBAMA and I are sponsoring an observance on tomorrow in the Gold Room in the House Office Building, and certainly would welcome all to attend.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. MOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H. Con. Res. 155, "Recognizing the Historical Significance of Juneteenth Independence Day."

As someone who has spent more than a quarter of a century serving the people of Maryland's Fifth Congressional District in the House of Representatives, I have developed a profound appreciation for the hard work that goes into creating the laws of our land. However, it is not the passage of legislation or signing ceremonies with the President that I will remember most when my time here is done. Rather, it is seeing the way that our work positively impacts the lives of those we serve out in the real world.

This is why Juneteenth Independence Day holds such special significance for me. Because Juneteenth isn't a celebration of the Emancipation Proclamation itself, it is a commemoration of the day that Abraham Lincoln's historic decree finally accomplished what it was designed to do—abolish slavery in the United States forever.

When the Emancipation Proclamation took effect on January 1, 1863, it ended slavery in the Union states, but did nothing to outlaw the cruel and barbaric practice in the states loyal to the Confederacy. It wasn't until 2½ years later—when Major General Gordon Granger landed at Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War was over, the United States was whole once again, and that all slaves in every part of our nation were now free—that the spirit of abolition was finally fulfilled.

That day was June 19, 1865—and today, we mark the 142nd anniversary of the moment that freedom, equality and the unabated pursuit of happiness were extended to all citizens of the United States, regardless of race, religion or ethnicity.

It gives me great pride to join my colleagues in Congress—as well as Americans from all walks of life—in commemorating our country's oldest celebration of the abolishment of slavery, and in honoring all of the achievements and contributions of African Americans throughout our nation's history.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H. Con. Res. 155, legislation commemorating a monumental day in the history of liberty, Juneteenth Independence Day. Juneteenth marks the events of June 19, 1865, when slaves in Galveston, TX, learned that they were at last free men and women. The slaves of Galveston were the last group of slaves to learn of the end of slavery. Thus, Juneteenth represents the end of slavery in America.

I hope all Americans will take the time to commemorate Juneteenth. Friends of human liberty should celebrate the end of slavery in any country. The end of American slavery is particularly worthy of recognition since there are few more blatant violations of America's

founding principles, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, than slavery. I am particularly pleased to join the recognition of Juneteenth because I have the privilege of representing Galveston.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for introducing this resolution, which I am proud to co-sponsor. I thank the House leadership for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I urge all of my colleagues to honor the end of slavery by voting for H. Con. Res. 155.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 155.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF NATIONAL CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 148) recognizing the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 148

Whereas people of Caribbean heritage are found in every State of the Union;

Whereas emigration from the Caribbean region to the American Colonies began as early as 1619 with the arrival of indentured workers in Jamestown, Virginia;

Whereas during the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, a significant number of slaves from the Caribbean region were brought to the United States;

Whereas since 1820, millions of people have emigrated from the Caribbean region to the United States;

Whereas much like the United States, the countries of the Caribbean faced obstacles of slavery and colonialism and struggled for independence;

Whereas also like the United States, the people of the Caribbean region have diverse racial, cultural, and religious backgrounds;

Whereas the independence movements in many countries in the Caribbean region during the 1960s and the consequential establishment of independent democratic countries in the Caribbean strengthened ties between the region and the United States;

Whereas Alexander Hamilton, a founding father of the United States and the first Secretary of the Treasury, was born in the Caribbean;

Whereas there have been many influential Caribbean-Americans in the history of the United States, including Jean Baptiste Point du Sable, the pioneer settler of Chicago; Claude McKay, a poet of the Harlem Renaissance; James Weldon Johnson, the writer of the Black National Anthem; Shirley Chisholm, the first African-American Congresswoman and first African-American woman candidate for President; and Celia Cruz, the world-renowned queen of Salsa music;

Whereas the many influential Caribbean-Americans in the history of the United States also include Colin Powell, the first African-American Secretary of State; Sidney Poitier, the first African-American actor to receive the Academy Award for best actor in a leading role; Harry Belafonte, a musician, actor, and activist; Marion Jones, an Olympic gold medalist; Roberto Clemente, the first Latino inducted into the baseball hall of fame; and Al Roker, a meteorologist and television personality;

Whereas Caribbean-Americans have played an active role in the civil rights movement and other social and political movements in the United States;

Whereas Caribbean-Americans have contributed greatly to education, fine arts, business, literature, journalism, sports, fashion, politics, government, the military, music, science, technology, and other areas in the United States;

Whereas Caribbean-Americans share their culture through carnivals, festivals, music, dance, film, and literature that enrich the cultural landscape of the United States;

Whereas the countries of the Caribbean are important economic partners of the United States;

Whereas the countries of the Caribbean represent the United States third border;

Whereas the people of the Caribbean region share the hopes and aspirations of the people of the United States for peace and prosperity throughout the Western Hemisphere and the rest of the world;

Whereas in June 2006, President George W. Bush issued a proclamation declaring June National Caribbean-American Heritage Month after the passage of H. Con. Res. 71 in the 109th Congress by both the Senate and the House of Representatives; and

Whereas June is an appropriate month to establish a Caribbean-American Heritage Month: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Caribbean-American Heritage Month;

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe Caribbean-American Heritage Month with appropriate ceremonies, celebrations, and activities; and

(3) affirms that—

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to

join my colleagues in the consideration of H. Con. Res. 148, a bill that recognizes the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

H. Res. 148, which has 53 cosponsors, was introduced by Representative BARBARA LEE of California on May 14, 2007. H. Con. Res. 148 was reported from the Oversight Committee on June 12, 2007, by a voice vote.

National Caribbean-American Heritage Month was established to recognize the historical relationship between people of the Caribbean and the United States of America. Caribbean Americans present a rich diversity of countries, cultures and colloquialisms which are dispersed throughout communities in the United States. Caribbean immigration to the United States reached its peak in the last 5 years, with approximately 6 percent of the more than 7 million immigrants coming from the Caribbean.

Since the founding of the United States, Caribbeans have had a significant role in shaping the conscience of America and are among our great leaders, entrepreneurs and entertainers, including such individuals as Sidney Poitier, Harry Belafonte, Colin Powell, James Weldon Johnson, Shirley Chisholm, Marion Jones, Juan Carlos Finlay, Oscar de la Renta, Malcolm X, Jean Baptiste Point du Sable, the founder of Chicago, Marcus Garvey, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for introducing this legislation and I urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, each year in June, we celebrate our strong relationship with the Caribbean nations and appreciate the value and diversity they bring to the United States. We value National Caribbean-American Heritage Month and encourage people from across the country to join with those of Caribbean-American roots in these celebrations. From as far back as the 17th century, citizens from the Caribbean have immigrated to the U.S. Many were slaves, who faced the same obstacles struggling for equality and independence.

We are a Nation of immigrants, and this bill emphasizes the many contributions of Caribbean immigrants to our society. Over 5 million Americans proudly share the Caribbean heritage in promoting and attending Caribbean-style festivals around the country. These festivals appreciate the rich culture, history and diversity brought forth through the joining of these two nations.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of House Concurrent Resolution 148.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 148.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJOR SCOTT NISELY POST OFFICE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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 Nisely Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2563

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

SECTION 1. MAJOR SCOTT NISELY POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 309 East Linn Street in Marshalltown, Iowa, shall be known and designated as the "Major Scott Nisely Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Major Scott Nisely Post Office".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 2563, which names the postal facility in Marshalltown, Iowa after Major Scott Nisely.

H.R. 2563, which was introduced by Representative TOM LATHAM on June 5, 2007, was reported from the Oversight Committee on June 12, 2007, by voice vote. This measure has the support of the entire Iowa congressional delegation.

Major Scott Nisely was killed in combat near Al Asad, Iraq on September 20, 2006. He served in the Marines as an officer on Active Duty and

as a reservist with the 133rd Infantry Battalion Charlie Company.

He worked 12 years for the U.S. Postal Service in Marshalltown, Iowa. Due to his strong desire to serve his country, he accepted an enlisted rank in order to fill a vacancy in the Iowa Army National Guard. Major Scott had served a tour of duty during Operation Desert Storm as a marine, in addition to Operation Iraqi Freedom as a guardsman. He will be fondly remembered for his patriotism and love of family.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Representative TOM LATHAM, for introducing this legislation, and urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Major Scott Nisely, a father, athlete and musician, made the ultimate sacrifice for his country on the field of battle and deserves the honor of having his name on the post office in Marshalltown, Iowa, where he worked for 12 years.

Scott was born in Syracuse, Nebraska in 1958, and excelled in track and cross country. He attended Doane College on a track scholarship and pursued a degree in biology.

He showed a passion for his country and did not shy away from the duty of serving his Nation. While in college, he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps ROTC, and after completing his Bachelor's degree in 1981, he was commissioned an Infantry Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps.

□ 1530

He rose to the rank of captain and commanded an infantry company during Operation Desert Storm. After his tour in Kuwait and Iraq, he returned to the Reserves, where he was promoted to the rank of major.

Scott continued to serve his community even when out of the military. In 1994 he began working for the U.S. Postal Service in Marshalltown. He participated in his church's music ministry program and was active at the local tae kwon do. Above all, he worked tirelessly to serve others.

Even with such an impressive record of service under his belt, he could not ignore the call of duty. When his country went to war again, he enlisted in the Iowa Army National Guard and accepted the rank of staff sergeant in order to do so. In 2005, he returned to Iraq with C Company of the Iowa National Guard's 133rd battalion.

On September 30, 2006, he was providing security for a convoy in Al Anbar Province, Iraq, when his company came under insurgent small arms fire. He and a fellow member of the Guard were killed.

His decorations include the Combat Infantryman Badge, the Bronze Star Medal, the Oak Leaf Cluster, the Purple Heart, the Army Achievement Medal, and a dozen others.

Let us pay our respect to Major Scott E. Nisely and remember his commitment to serving this Nation by naming the Marshalltown post office in his honor.

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

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

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

First of all, I would like to thank the committee and the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman DAVIS, for moving this piece of legislation as quickly as they have through the committee and for the opportunity to bring this I think most appropriate legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support legislation that I introduced to honor Major Scott E. Nisely of Marshalltown, Iowa, one of America's heroes who was killed in combat on September 30, 2006, while serving our country in Iraq.

Scott Nisely served 22 years in the Marines as an officer on active duty and as a Reservist, retiring with the rank of major. During his time in the Marines, he served as an infantry company commander in Operation Desert Storm. And following his active duty, Scott worked 12 years for the U.S. Postal Service in Marshalltown, Iowa.

Due to Scott's strong desire to serve his country, he accepted an enlisted rank in order to fill a vacancy in the Iowa Army National Guard in 2002.

According to letters I have received from soldiers in Scott's unit, he did not broadcast the fact that he was a former Marine major, but humbly served his fellow soldiers. One officer also said he was a "natural born leader of soldiers."

Scott served with the Iowa National Guard on the Multinational Forces Observer mission in the Sinai, and finally in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Scott's friends, family, coworkers, fellow soldiers and marines attest to the positive and lasting impact he had on their lives. Numerous letters from these individuals were sent to me, and I include them for the RECORD.

Scott's life was a shining example of dedication to service, a strong commitment certainly to his family, his faith, and his country. This legislation will name the post office located at 309 East Linn Street in Marshalltown, Iowa, the Major Scott Nisely Post Office.

I want to thank Scott's co-workers at the Marshalltown post office who initiated this proposal, and I am proud to help them make this timely and appropriate honor a reality. I also want to thank my colleagues from Iowa, LEONARD BOSWELL, STEVE KING, BRUCE BRALEY and DAVE LOEBSACK for their support in moving this legislation forward. I strongly urge all Members to pass H.R. 2563.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
HEADQUARTERS, 1ST BATTALION 133D
INFANTRY,

Al Asad Ab, Iraq, June 8, 2007.

Congressman TOM LATHAM,
Ames, Iowa.

DEAR MR. LATHAM: I am responding to an inquiry to determine if my unit would support the consideration of naming the United States Post Office in Marshalltown, Iowa after one of my soldiers, Scott Nisely.

The bottom line on this is yes, I, and my entire unit fully support this effort, and see this as a fitting tribute to this fallen citizen soldier.

As a Battalion Commander, I have many soldiers that are under my command. I have deployed in the service of our country 3 times since September of 2000. I have been entrusted with some of the finest young people that our State and our Nation have to offer. Let me share with you a little bit about Scott Nisely from my perspective.

Scott joined the Iowa National Guard after completing a full military career in the Marine Corps, retiring from the Marine Corps as a Field Grade Officer. He then joined the National Guard as an enlisted soldier in the rank of a Buck Sergeant, because this was what was offered to him. On my second deployment, and my first with Scott Nisely, I asked him what motivated him to do this; his reply was that he felt he could make a difference in the lives of these young men, and he still felt a strong desire to serve his country in whatever capacity he could. He didn't care about the rank, he didn't care about the job, as long as he was working with young soldiers, and serving our country. To me this was evident during our OEF deployment, and in our current mission in Iraq.

Scott was a man that was respected by all those around him, not because of the words he said, but because of the way that he lived his life and by the example he set for others. We all lost something the day we lost SFC Nisely and SGT Sourivong. We cannot change the events that happened on that day, but we can honor these men, and the sacrifice that they have made. I believe by naming the Marshalltown Post Office in honor of Scott Nisely, we will always have a visible reminder of this sacrifice, and are honoring a great American who lived his life in a manner that we should all strive to pattern. He lived his life with honor and integrity, love for his family, and love for his country.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. CORELL,
*Lieutenant Colonel, Infantry,
Commanding.*

DON DOUGLAS,
Marshalltown, IA, June 12, 2007.

To: Representative TOM LATHAM, R-IA.

I did not know Maj. Scott Nisely. But I am a veteran of the Vietnam era, who served my country in the Navy during the Vietnam era, 1961 to 1966. But my outfit anti subsquadron 25 North Island San Diego, CA served aboard USS Aircraft Carrier, USS Yorktown, CVS-10 off coast of Vietnam a couple of tours to that area. I am also a member of VFW Post 839 Marshalltown a life member, and I support our troops. Like I said I didn't personally know Maj. Nisely. But have heard his wife talk about him at hospice meetings I attend since my wife passed away in Feb. 07. It would be a great tribute to him and his family if legislation could be passed as soon as possible renaming Marshalltown Post Office after him.

Since Maj. Nisely put his life on line serving his country defending freedom and doing

something he believed in this would be the right thing to do to honor him.

Thank you,

DON DOUGLAS.

LETTER FOR THE RECORD, IN SUPPORT OF H.R.
2563 (06/18/07):

I support naming the Marshalltown Post Office after Major Scott Nisely. He is a true American hero. I had the privilege of serving with him in the 1-133 Infantry in Iraq. He was a very dedicated soldier, always caring for his soldiers and everyone around him. I really looked up to him as a man.

He is a soldier that was dedicated to public service, serving our great nation in 2 wars, both in the Marine Corps and the U.S. Army. He also worked as a Postal Worker, which is a hard job for any American. I appreciate the sacrifices that he has made for our country, especially giving the ultimate sacrifice.

I feel that naming the Marshalltown Post Office in his honor is the least we can do to honor this great American. Please name the Marshalltown Post Office to the Major Scott Nisely Post Office. It will be a great memorial of a great American and great Iowan.

FIRST LIEUTENANT KYLE W OBRECHT,
1-133 Infantry, Iowa Army National Guard.

I had the honor of working directly with "SSG" Nisely during our deployment to Iraq. I am sending this message of support from Iraq as we are still in theater performing our mission. As a squad leader and leader of men SSG Nisely always ensured the vehicles in his command were mission ready and that his soldiers were constantly on top of the readiness of their equipment.

As former NCO turned officer, I understood his role and his rank in the troop leading arena. SSG Nisely was one of the best NCOs I have ever had the experience of serving with. The funny part, and oftentimes told, part of his exemplary service is the fact that he was a former Marine Major before becoming a NCO in the Iowa National Guard. Not once did this fact ever come from him. He was always humble and loved serving his country and even more he honored our country by serving his men.

As a field grade officer in any service one trends to wane away from direct troop leading duties. SSG Nisely was a natural born leader of soldiers. I hope I can take this example and use it in my career.

Scott's sacrifice will never be forgotten by me or any soldier he served with in this war on terrorism. I hope the resolution will pass so that all Americans that come to use the facility being recommended for the name change will know that an American hero is honored and forever remembered.

FIRST LIEUTENANT (P)
MARCUS A. SMOOT, OD,
1-133 Infantry, Iowa Army National Guard.

I strongly support naming the Marshalltown Post Office after my friend Major Scott Nisely. This would be a nice reminder to patrons of the post office that Scott dedicated his life to serving the people. He did that through his selfless service in the Marine Corps, the Iowa National Guard, and his civilian career at the postal service. Scott was a great man; this has been a great loss to his family, to the military and to the Marshalltown community. Please support the initiative to name the Marshalltown post office in memory of Major Scott Nisely.

CAPTAIN JEFFREY STAKER,
1-133 Infantry, Iowa Army National Guard.

I strongly endorse the naming of a Post Office in Marshalltown, Iowa after Major Scott Nisely. I knew him from deployments to Sinai, Egypt and Iraq. I had several conversations with him and they were always

pleasant. He was one of the friendliest guys I have ever met—always positive. Scott was a dedicated family man and a fine soldier. This would be a great way to honor him and his family. He deserves it—he was a hero. Thank you for addressing this.

MICHAEL SMITH,
1-133 Infantry, Iowa Army National Guard.

My husband is currently serving in Iraq and was there with Sgt. Nisely. What a hero this man was! I fully support the post office being named after this brave, wonderful man.

MRS. DOUG (BARB) KRAUSE,
Waverly, Iowa.

He was there for his soldiers, always doing something for people.

JOHN FORTUNE,
Specialist, Army National Guard.

I think that this would be a fitting remembrance for a great man and urge you to accept this proposal (H.R. 2563).

SPECIALIST CURTIS OLSON,
134th Brigade Support Battalion, Minnesota
Army National Guard.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2563.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CLEM ROGERS MCSPADDEN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2127

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

SECTION 1. CLEM ROGERS MCSPADDEN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 408 West 6th Street in Chelsea, Oklahoma, shall be known and designated as the "Clem Rogers McSpadden Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Clem Rogers McSpadden Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman

from Idaho (Mr. SALI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2127.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of this bill, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN).

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2127. This bill will designate the Chelsea, Oklahoma, post office as the Clem Rogers McSpadden United States Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to be the author of this bill. Today we have the opportunity to honor not just one of Oklahoma's finest individuals, but in any opinion one of America's finest. As many of you know, Clem McSpadden served as a Member of this body from 1973 until 1975. His colleagues will agree that Clem was a highly respected Member of this Chamber. In fact, Clem was honored with being the first freshman Member ever to be appointed to the Rules Committee. He also helped create the Rural Caucus, which I am a proud member of today.

Those are big shoes to fill for anyone, and that is why it is an honor for me to say I represent a portion of his former congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I am also proud to mention that Clem isn't just known as being a former Member of Congress. As those of us from Oklahoma know, Clem has readily served in all aspects of life, ranging from politics to family to military service to rodeo announcer. If you asked people in Oklahoma about Clem, you will surely be met with warm stories about how he helped them during his time in the State Senate, how they remember him introducing legendary bull rider Freckles Brown, or how he just gave them some good advice.

Very few people, Mr. Speaker, would make such a great role model for us all. For this reason, I am proud to say I know Clem McSpadden and that he is a friend. More importantly, though, I am proud to say I am one of the many Oklahomans that he has had a positive influence on.

Mr. Speaker, Clem is the nephew of Oklahoma's favorite son, Will Rogers. In keeping with the family legacy, Clem, like his uncle, is fully a part of the fabric that makes Oklahomans the people we are today. We are a people who care about our fellow Oklahomans and who pay their dues through hard work. Clem represents these values on a daily basis and has done so his whole life. This, I venture to say, also makes him one of Oklahoma's favorite sons. For this reason, I find it fitting that we

honor an individual like Clem Rogers McSpadden for his selflessness and dedication to our State and country.

Mr. Speaker, in 1974 my father ran for Governor and Clem McSpadden ran for Governor the same year; and even though they were opponents in the election of 1974, they were friends after that election. I am also proud to say that when I was a member of the State legislature in my first term, Clem McSpadden took me aside and mentored me as a member of the legislature. He is a good man and I want to thank him for being a mentor to so many young people. I also want to thank his wife, Donna, for all that she does in the community of Chelsea and the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2127.

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

Mr. Speaker, to most residents of Rogers County, Oklahoma, and rodeo fanatics, the name Clem Rogers McSpadden is well recognized and much appreciated. Known as a "son of Oklahoma," Clem Rogers McSpadden was born into the well-known Rogers family of which his home county is named. His great uncle is none other than the famous Will Rogers. But it is not his historical family background that we are here to speak about today.

We rise to honor the achievements of Clem McSpadden during his life in politics, his military service, community leadership, and successful career in rodeo broadcasting.

Clem McSpadden was raised on his two family ranches, Bushyhead Ranch near Chelsea, Oklahoma, and another in nearby Oologah. During his first year in Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, he left to join the U.S. Navy.

He served during World War II, and upon returning completed his education at Oklahoma A&M with a degree in animal husbandry. While at college, he and some friends formed a rodeo team.

His strong interest in roping began at an early age, and over time he served as general manager for the National Finals Rodeo, the Old Timers Rodeo and the Indian National Finals Rodeo. He has been announcing for over 60 years and estimates he has announced over 1,400 rodeos.

His esteemed career in politics came in 1954 when he was elected to the Oklahoma State senate, where he served until 1972. He went on to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives one term in the 93rd Congress. In 1983, he formed a consulting and lobbying firm McSpadden & Associates, which lobbies the Oklahoma Statehouse on a variety of issues. His powerful presence and influence continue to drive politics of his beloved Oklahoma.

Nowadays, he spends his time more quietly at home on his vast cattle ranch enjoying retirement with his family.

I urge Members to join me, Mr. Speaker, in passing H.R. 2127 to name this post office for Clem Rogers McSpadden.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in the consideration of H.R. 2127, which names a postal facility in Chelsea, Oklahoma, after Clem Rogers McSpadden. H.R. 2127, which was introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Dan Boren, on May 3, 2007, was reported from the Oversight Committee on June 12, 2007, by a voice vote. This measure has the support of the entire Oklahoma congressional delegation.

Clem Rogers McSpadden was born on November 9, 1925, on a ranch near the small town of Bushyhead in Rogers County, Oklahoma. He served in the United States Navy during World War II from 1944 to 1946.

He was first elected to public office in November of 1954 to the Oklahoma State senate. In November of 1972, he was elected to the 93rd Congress and served one term from 1973 to 1975. Mr. McSpadden ran for Governor of Oklahoma in 1974 and lost the Democratic nomination. Presently, Mr. McSpadden is retired and living in Chelsea, Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Representative DAN BOREN, for introducing this legislation and urge its swift passage.

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

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, we have no other speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, to simply close, let me again commend DAN BOREN for his introduction of this legislation.

□ 1545

I guess Representative McSpadden was kind of a chip off the block, and I asked if he could also make people laugh, and Dan said that he could indeed, as well as do any number of other things. So he is indeed a tribute to the Rogers and McSpadden families. I would urge passage of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2127.

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.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR FUEL FOR PEACE AND NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 885) to support the establishment of an international regime for the assured supply of nuclear fuel for peaceful means and to authorize voluntary contributions to the International Atomic Energy Agency to support the establishment of an international nuclear fuel bank, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 885

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “International Nuclear Fuel for Peace and Nonproliferation Act of 2007”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—INTERNATIONAL REGIME FOR THE ASSURED SUPPLY OF NUCLEAR FUEL FOR PEACEFUL MEANS

Sec. 101. Findings.

Sec. 102. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 103. Statements of policy.

Sec. 104. Report.

TITLE II—INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR FUEL BANK

Sec. 201. Voluntary contributions to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Sec. 202. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE I—INTERNATIONAL REGIME FOR THE ASSURED SUPPLY OF NUCLEAR FUEL FOR PEACEFUL MEANS

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since the United States Baruch Plan of 1946, the United States has believed that an increase in the number of countries that possess nuclear weapons and the means to create such weapons makes the world less secure and stable by increasing the chances that nuclear weapons would be used. A world in which nuclear weapons are used again is less secure for all concerned, and could well trigger a global arms race, as more countries will be tempted to arm themselves with nuclear weapons to prevent attacks by countries that possess nuclear weapons.

(2) It is therefore in the general security interest of all countries, and in the vital national security interest of the United States, that the number of countries that possess a nuclear weapons capability necessarily be kept to a minimum and ultimately reduced.

(3) Uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing facilities produce nuclear material that can either be used for peaceful purposes in electricity-generating reactors, or can be used to produce uranium and plutonium for nuclear weapons. As such, these facilities are inherently a proliferation risk, allowing their possessor to be just months away from the production of a nuclear explosive device.

(4) It is also therefore in the general security interest of all countries that the number of countries that operate uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing facilities also be kept to a minimum, consistent with the global demand for nuclear power reactor fuel.

(5) The financing and construction of additional uranium enrichment and spent-fuel

reprocessing facilities in additional states around the world is indefensible on economic grounds alone, given current and future supplies of uranium and existing providers of uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing services to the world market.

(6) The desire to construct uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing facilities by additional countries, therefore, is often based upon considerations other than economic calculations. The possession of such facilities is often elevated to a matter of national pride—a demonstration to the world that the country that possesses this technology has arrived at a level of technological development comparable to that of the United States and other countries with advanced civil nuclear power programs.

(7) Furthermore, the acquisition of uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing facilities can be perceived as a demonstration of the developing world's independence from technological domination by the more developed states. Article IV of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (21 UST 483; commonly referred to as the “Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty” or the “NPT”) recognizes that State Parties have an “inalienable right . . . to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.” However, this is a qualified right conditioned by a State Party acting in conformity with the NPT's obligation for such countries not to acquire, possess, or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices.

(8) It has been long recognized that the proliferation of national uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing facilities would increase the likelihood of the emergence of new nuclear weapon states. Concerned governments, nongovernmental organizations, and individual experts have for decades recognized the need to address this problem through multilateral assurances of the uninterrupted supply of nuclear fuel, the sharing of peaceful application of nuclear energy, an international fuel bank to provide fuel if the fuel supply to a country is disrupted, and even multilateral participation in international uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing facilities, as a means of reducing incentives of countries to develop and construct such facilities themselves.

(9) Until recently, such efforts have produced little more than reports. However, the revelations of a nuclear black-market in uranium enrichment technology and equipment, combined with the attempt by North Korea and Iran to possess such technology and equipment to provide the basis for nuclear weapons programs, have rekindled this debate with a new urgency.

(10) Iran has used the specter of a potentially unreliable international supply of nuclear reactor fuel as a pretext for developing its own uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing capability, which would enable Iran to also produce weapons-grade uranium and plutonium for nuclear weapons.

(11) Several initiatives have been proposed over the last year to address these concerns. The United States has proposed the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP), which envisions a consortium of countries with advanced nuclear capabilities providing nuclear fuel services—fresh fuel and recovery of used fuel—to other countries that agree to employ nuclear energy only for power generation purposes, without possessing national uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing facilities.

(12) The United States also joined France, the Russian Federation, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands on May 31, 2006, in proposing a “Concept for a

Multilateral Mechanism for Reliable Access to Nuclear Fuel” that would facilitate or create new arrangements between suppliers and recipients to provide fuel to countries with good nonproliferation credentials in case of market failure.

(13) Any assurance of the supply of nuclear fuel should meet the condition outlined by President George W. Bush on February 11, 2004, that “The world’s leading nuclear exporters should ensure that states have reliable access at reasonable cost to fuel for civilian reactors, so long as those states renounce enrichment and reprocessing.”

(14) The Russian Federation has proposed that one of its uranium enrichment facilities be placed under international management and oversight, as part of a “Global Nuclear Power Infrastructure” proposal to create international nuclear fuel cycle centers.

(15) In conclusion, the creation of a multilateral system to assure the supply of nuclear reactor fuel at current market prices, under appropriate safeguards and conditions, could reassure countries that are dependent upon or will construct nuclear power reactors that they will have an assured supply of nuclear fuel at current market prices, so long as such countries forgo national uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing facilities and are committed to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

SEC. 102. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the “Concept for a Multilateral Mechanism for Reliable Access to Nuclear Fuel”, proposed by the United States, France, the Russian Federation, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands on May 31, 2006, is welcomed and should be expanded upon at the earliest possible opportunity;

(2) the proposal by the Government of the Russian Federation to bring one of its uranium enrichment facilities under international management and oversight is also a welcome development and should be encouraged by the United States;

(3) the offer by the Nuclear Threat Institute (NTI) of \$50,000,000 in funds to support the creation of an international nuclear fuel bank by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is also welcomed, and the United States and other member states of the IAEA should pledge collectively at least an additional \$100,000,000 in matching funds to fulfill the NTI proposal; and

(4) the governments, organizations, and experts currently engaged in developing the initiatives described in paragraphs (1) through (3) and other initiatives should seek to identify additional incentives to be included in an international regime for the assured supply of nuclear fuel for peaceful means at current market prices, including participation in non-weapons-relevant technology development and fuel leasing to further persuade countries that participation in such a multilateral arrangement far outweighs the temptation and expense of developing national uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing facilities.

SEC. 103. STATEMENTS OF POLICY.

(a) GENERAL STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to support the establishment of an international regime for the assured supply of nuclear fuel for peaceful means under multilateral authority, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(b) ADDITIONAL STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is further the policy of the United States to—

(1) oppose the development of a capability to produce nuclear weapons by any non-nuclear weapon state, within or outside of the NPT;

(2) encourage states party to the NPT to interpret the right to “develop research, pro-

duction and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes,” as described in Article IV of the NPT, as being a qualified right that is conditioned by the overall purpose of the NPT to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons capability, including by refraining from all nuclear cooperation with any state party that has not demonstrated that it is in full compliance with its NPT obligations, as determined by the International Atomic Energy Agency; and

(3) strengthen the Nuclear Suppliers Group guidelines concerning consultation by members regarding violations of supplier and recipient understandings by instituting the practice of a timely and coordinated response by Nuclear Suppliers Group members to all such violations, including termination of nuclear transfers to an involved recipient, that discourage individual Nuclear Suppliers Group members from continuing cooperation with such recipient until such time as a consensus regarding a coordinated response has been achieved.

SEC. 104. REPORT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the activities of the United States to support the establishment of an international regime for the assured supply of nuclear fuel for peaceful means at current market prices under multilateral authority, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency. The report shall include an assessment of the feasibility of establishing an international fuel services center within the United States.

TITLE II—INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR FUEL BANK

SEC. 201. VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY.

(a) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to make voluntary contributions on a grant basis to the International Atomic Energy Agency (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “IAEA”) for the purpose of supporting the establishment of an international nuclear fuel bank to maintain a reserve of low-enriched uranium for reactor fuel to provide to eligible countries in the case of a disruption in the supply of reactor fuel by normal market mechanisms.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Voluntary contributions under subsection (a) may be provided only if the President certifies to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that—

(1) the IAEA has received pledges in a total amount of not less than \$100,000,000 and is in receipt of not less than \$75,000,000 of such pledges for the purpose of supporting the establishment of the international nuclear fuel bank referred to in subsection (a);

(2) the international nuclear fuel bank referred to in subsection (a) will be established within the territory of a non-nuclear weapon state, and will be under the oversight of the IAEA, only if—

(A) the non-nuclear weapon state, among other things—

(i) has a full scope safeguards agreement with the IAEA and an additional protocol for safeguards in force;

(ii) has never been determined by the IAEA Board of Governors to be in noncompliance with its IAEA full scope safeguards agreement and its additional protocol for safeguards; and

(iii) has effective enforceable export controls regarding nuclear and dual-use nuclear technology and other sensitive materials

comparable to those maintained by the United States; and

(B) the Secretary of State has never determined, for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or any other provision of law, that the government of the non-nuclear weapon state has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism;

(3) the international nuclear fuel bank referred to in subsection (a) will provide nuclear reactor fuel to a country only if, at the time of the request for nuclear reactor fuel—

(A) the country is in full compliance with its IAEA safeguards agreement and has an additional protocol for safeguards in force;

(B) in the case of a country that at any time prior to the request for nuclear reactor fuel has been determined to be in noncompliance with its IAEA safeguards agreement, the IAEA Board of Governors determines that the country has taken all necessary actions to satisfy any concerns of the IAEA Director General regarding the activities that led to the prior determination of noncompliance;

(C) the country agrees to use the nuclear reactor fuel in accordance with its IAEA safeguards agreement;

(D) the country has effective and enforceable export controls regarding nuclear and dual-use nuclear technology and other sensitive materials comparable to those maintained by the United States;

(E) the country does not possess uranium enrichment or spent-fuel reprocessing facilities of any scale; and

(F) the government of the country is not a state sponsor of terrorism for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or any other provision of law;

(4) the international nuclear fuel bank referred to in subsection (a) will not contain uranium enrichment or spent-fuel reprocessing facilities; and

(5) the nuclear reactor fuel referred to in paragraph (3) will be provided to a country referred to in such paragraph only at current market prices.

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the requirement of subparagraph (F) of subsection (b)(3) if the President—

(1) determines that it is important to the national security interests of the United States to do so; and

(2) transmits to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that contains the basis of the determination under paragraph (1).

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize voluntary contributions under subsection (a) to support subsidization of the price of nuclear reactor fuel whose supply would be assured by the United States, the IAEA, or any other state or international entity covered by this section.

SEC. 202. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To carry out section 201, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (a) are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2010.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a dramatic step forward in the epic struggle to contain the spread of nuclear arms around the globe. Our bill provides a safe, efficient and collaborative means of getting nuclear fuel to any country that pledges not to develop nuclear arms and delivers on that promise. It will help ensure stability and expose the subterfuge that we know Iran is perpetrating in order to further its nuclear weapons pursuit.

We know full well, Mr. Speaker, that Tehran is actively pursuing a nuclear weapons program. But many are persuaded by Iran's argument that it needs access to a reliable nuclear fuel supply to meet its civilian power needs.

Now, of course we know that Iran's argument is bogus, but Tehran has used the illusory threat of a global breakdown in the supply of nuclear reactor fuel to argue that it must have its own facilities to guarantee that its reactors are forever supplied with fuel. At the moment, Iran is going to have two of these reactors.

We know that the Iranian pretext has been long recognized as a gap in the global nuclear non-proliferation regime. A state can exploit the non-proliferation treaty's recognition of its good standing to develop peaceful uses of the atom and acquire potentially dangerous technology such as uranium enrichment. It could then turn around and use the technology to support a nuclear weapons program.

Our legislation, the International Nuclear Fuel for Peace and Non-proliferation Act, addresses this gap in the nuclear non-proliferation regime and removes Iran's pretext for its so-called peaceful enrichment plan. It does so by promoting the development of an international regime of assured supply of peaceful nuclear power fuel to countries in good standing on their nuclear non-proliferation commitments.

Our legislation, Mr. Speaker, authorizes \$50 million to support the establishment of an international nuclear fuel bank supervised by the International Atomic Energy Agency. This money will match the \$50 million offered by Mr. Warren Buffett to the Sam Nunn Nuclear Threat Initiative.

The Sam Nunn program support is crucial to the realization of this initiative, but so is the political will of coun-

tries around the globe capable of cooperating in such a regime. So after this bill's passage today, I intend to work with key nations to establish the international nuclear fuel bank.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that our Secretary of State, Dr. Condoleezza Rice, and our former distinguished colleague Senator Sam Nunn, who has perhaps done more to advance the cause of nuclear non-proliferation than anyone else, have fully embraced this bill, and the administration is on record supporting it.

Ours is a broadly supported, bipartisan bill. It would not have come to fruition without the enthusiastic support of my good friend, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, our colleague ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. It was approved by our committee unanimously, a rare phenomenon in this era of divisive partisanship.

It is imperative that we keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of Iran and provide a source of peaceful nuclear fuel to all countries that are currently flirting with nuclear development programs. I, therefore, urge all of my colleagues to support this most important measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, it's a joy to bring another truly bipartisan bill to the floor, thanks to the very able and skilled leadership of Chairman LANTOS of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

This bill, as amended, Mr. Speaker, is a version of the original introduced by our esteemed Chairman LANTOS and contains several new and important provisions that I would like to explain today.

The first of these addresses the supposed right of all countries to manufacture their own nuclear fuel through enrichment or repossessing.

The central problem of this assertion, Mr. Speaker, is that there's very little difference, as we know, in the technology that is used for civilian or for military purposes. So countries such as Iran, which are undoubtedly trying to acquire nuclear weapons, can innocently claim to be establishing a legitimate civilian nuclear program, a claim which can be virtually impossible for the outside world to disprove. For this reason, the acquisition of a similar capability by more and more countries, for whatever reason, means that the technology and the infrastructure needed to manufacture nuclear weapons will expand as well.

The continued spread of this deadly capacity poses an existential threat to the United States and, indeed, the entire world. We cannot allow this to continue. Unfortunately, efforts to stop this growing danger are undermined by a common but erroneous interpretation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, or NPT, specifically

article IV, which some assert gives every signatory country an absolute right to enrich and to reprocess.

It is both surprising and disappointing that many of the most ardent opponents of continued proliferation throughout the globe are also strong advocates of this supposed unrestricted right. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the treaty clearly states that the right to nuclear technology is conditioned by articles I and II, which are aimed at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, including the capacity to manufacture them.

As such, it is the responsibility of countries seeking this capability to go beyond mere assertion and adopt measures that will conclusively demonstrate that it can be used only for peaceful purposes. It should not be the responsibility of the rest of the world to prove that the opposite is true. Iran has taught us the deadly foolishness of that approach.

I believe that it is profoundly wrong to hold the security of American people hostage to this flawed interpretation. Therefore, we have a responsibility to the people whom we represent to openly state the truth, that the NPT does not grant to all signatories an absolute right to enrich and reprocess. And the U.S. must work with our allies and others, as Mr. LANTOS has pointed out, to ensure that this position becomes an integral element in the global non-proliferation effort.

A second set of changes to the original legislation places conditions on any country seeking to host a nuclear fuel bank, as well as on states that wish to receive fuel from the bank. The most important of these conditions, Mr. Speaker, is that state sponsors of terrorism would be prohibited from hosting a nuclear fuel bank and also from receiving fuel from it. This provision is essential to ensure that terrorist states, such as Iran, especially in their nuclear programs, do not benefit from the establishment of such a bank.

A further provision mandates that both host and recipient states have an effective and enforceable export control program regarding nuclear and dual-use technology comparable to that of the United States.

In addition, there is a stipulation that countries seeking assistance from a fuel bank cannot possess enrichment and reprocessing facilities.

A final set of changes, Mr. Speaker, would ensure that any fuel made available by the bank would be at the current market price, thereby sparing U.S. taxpayers from the open-ended burden of subsidizing the nuclear programs of other countries.

With the inclusion of these measures, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor Mr. LANTOS' legislation, and I believe that it will prove to be a significant addition to the global non-proliferation effort.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of our time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 885, 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.

□ 1600

CALLING ON UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL TO CHARGE IRANIAN PRESIDENT WITH CERTAIN VIOLATIONS BECAUSE OF HIS CALLS FOR DESTRUCTION OF ISRAEL

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) calling on the United Nations Security Council to charge Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad with violating the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and the United Nations Charter because of his calls for the destruction of the State of Israel, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 21

Whereas the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (commonly referred to as the "Genocide Convention") defines genocide as, among other things, the act of killing members of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, the targeted group, and it also prohibits conspiracy to commit genocide, as well as "direct and public incitement to commit genocide";

Whereas Article 4 of the Genocide Convention provides that individuals committing any of the listed genocidal crimes shall be punished "whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals";

Whereas 133 Member States of the United Nations have ratified the Genocide Convention and thereby pledged to prosecute those individuals who violate its criteria for incitement to commit genocide, as well as those individuals who commit genocide directly;

Whereas 62 years ago the United Nations was founded in the wake of the Holocaust, the Nazi genocide carried out during World War II that resulted in the slaughter of 6 million Jews in Europe, in order to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and uphold and protect the "dignity and worth of the human person";

Whereas Article 2, Section 4, of the United Nations Charter, to which Iran has agreed as a Member State of the United Nations, requires all Member States of the United Nations to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against

the territorial integrity or political independence of any state";

Whereas on October 26, 2005, at the World Without Zionism Conference in Tehran, Iran, Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad called for Israel to be "wiped off the map", described Israel as "a disgraceful blot [on] the face of the Islamic world", and declared that "[a]nybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation's fury";

Whereas on December 12, 2006, Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad addressed a conference in Tehran questioning the historical veracity of the Holocaust and said that Israel would "soon be wiped out";

Whereas on December 15, 2000, Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamene'i stated to thousands of Muslim worshippers in Tehran that "Iran's stance has always been clear on this ugly phenomenon (Israel). We have repeatedly said that this cancerous tumor of a state should be removed from the region";

Whereas other Iranian leaders have made similar statements and the Government of Iran has displayed inflammatory symbols that express similar intent;

Whereas on December 14, 2006, incoming United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon said that Iran's calls for Israel's destruction and its dismissal of the Holocaust are "unacceptable", and expressed concern about the regional and global security implications of Tehran's nuclear program;

Whereas on August 3, 2006, in a speech during an emergency meeting of Muslim leaders, Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad stated that the Middle East would be better off "without the existence of the Zionist regime", called Israel an "illegitimate regime" with "no legal basis for its existence", and accused the United States of using Israel as a proxy to control the region and its oil resources;

Whereas Iran funds, trains, and openly supports terrorist groups, including Hamas, Hezbollah, and Islamic Jihad among many others, all of which have murdered Americans, Israelis, and non-Israeli Jews and are determined to destroy Israel;

Whereas on December 14, 2001, former leader of Iran and current leader of Iran's influential Expediency Council Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani threatened Israel with destruction by nuclear attack, saying, "[i]f one day, the Islamic world is also equipped with weapons like those that Israel possesses now, then the imperialists' strategy will reach a standstill because the use of even one nuclear bomb inside Israel will destroy everything [in Israel], while it will merely harm the Islamic world";

Whereas Iran has aggressively pursued a clandestine effort to arm itself with nuclear weapons; and

Whereas the longstanding policy of the Iranian regime is aimed at destroying the democratic State of Israel, a vital United States ally and longstanding friend, which is confirmed by statements such as those made by Iranian leader Ahmadinejad, Supreme Leader Khamene'i, and Expediency Council leader Rafsanjani, demonstrating the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) condemns, in the strongest terms, Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's offensive remarks, contemptible statements, and reprehensible policies aimed at the destruction of the State of Israel;

(2) calls on the United Nations Security Council to take up charges against Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad for violating the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and Article 2, Section 4, of the United Nations Charter;

(3) further calls on the United Nations Security Council and all Member States of the United Nations to consider stronger measures to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons, which would be both a dangerous violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and a potential means to the end of carrying out Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's threats against Israel; and

(4) reaffirms the unwavering strategic partnership and close friendship between the United States and Israel and reasserts the steadfast commitment of the United States to defend the right of Israel to exist as a free and democratic state.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Every Member of Congress is disturbed by the offensive comments that regularly emanate from the mouth of the Iranian President. His pledge to wipe Israel off the map and his denial of the Holocaust have shocked the civilized world.

I am among those who feel it is no longer enough simply to shake our heads disapprovingly and go about our business. Context is everything.

We are talking about a Jewish majority nation, Israel, whose very existence is threatened by another nation developing a nuclear bomb. Less than three-quarters of a century ago, Hitler and Nazi Germany wiped out more than a third of the world's Jewish population. We cannot stand by and watch if the Iranian President has similar designs.

When Ahmadinejad says that Israel is a legitimate regime with no basis for its existence, our sense of justice tells us we cannot simply ignore it. When he describes Israel as "a disgraceful blot [on] the face of the Islamic world" and declares that "anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation's fury," we can't, as people of conscience, dismiss these words as mere rhetoric.

That is the premise of this resolution. This resolution urges us not to shrug, but to take action. It calls on the United Nations Security Council to charge Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad with Article 2, section 4, of the United Nations Charter, which requires all member states of the United Nations to refrain in their international relations from the threat

or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. Even more poignantly, it calls for the Security Council to charge Ahmadinejad with violating the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which forbids direct and public incitement of genocide.

I strongly endorse the premise of this resolution, that we should take seriously Ahmadinejad's venomous rhetoric and respond in a serious fashion that will demonstrate our fortitude in stopping him. With this measure, we also set an example by serving notice to other bigoted world leaders that we will not tolerate racism and thinly veiled threats.

We should be more than happy to set aside any notion of prosecuting President Ahmadinejad under the Genocide Convention were the President to renounce his previous positions on the Holocaust and on Israel. In the absence of such apologies, however, the administration should initiate action that would result in the prosecution of President Ahmadinejad for crimes under the genocide convention and to do so without delay.

I strongly support this resolution. I urge all my colleagues to do likewise to send a message to Iran.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 21, which denounces the Iranian regime, its belligerent rhetoric and behavior, and urges the international community to hold it accountable and prevent it from achieving its horrific goals.

As the U.S. and our allies attempt to prevent the radical Islamic regime in Iran from developing nuclear capabilities, we should reflect on that regime's vision of the future. While most people desire to live in a world of freedom, of liberty, of prosperity and of peace, Iran's rulers actively seek a world of oppression, of destruction, of war, a world without Israel and without a United States of America.

The Iranian leader Ahmadinejad frequently pushes for Israel's destruction, saying that this sovereign state should be wiped off the map, calling it a disgraceful blot on the face of the Islamic world, as Ambassador Watson pointed out, and proclaiming that anybody who recognized Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic Nation's fury.

On June 3, Ahmadinejad stated, "With God's help, the countdown button for the destruction of [Israel] has been pushed." When Ahmadinejad calls for the destruction of the Jewish state, let us be clear, he is calling for the genocide of Jews. That is why he has continued to cast doubt on the veracity of the Holocaust, calling it a "myth."

His despicable comments cheapen the suffering of millions of Jews, desecrate their memory and pave the way for an-

other Holocaust to occur at the hands of Tehran. The Iranian leader does not threaten Jews and Israel, he explicitly threatens our very own existence.

In October of 2005, he asked, "Is it possible for us to witness a world without America and Zionism. . . . You had best know that this slogan and this goal are attainable, and, surely, can be achieved."

Mr. Speaker, his words and actions do not merely reflect his own views or those of a few powerless extremists. Iran's Supreme Leader, for example, said, "This cancerous tumor of a state should be removed from the region."

Rafsanjani, the former Iranian leader who continues to hold significant influence, and who some mistakenly call a moderate, has threatened Israel with destruction by nuclear weapons, saying that the use of even one nuclear bomb inside Israel will destroy everything, while it will merely harm the Islamic world.

These are no idle threats, those are not just mere words and rhetoric. Iran continues to sponsor terrorist groups like Hamas and Hezbollah who have murdered scores of Israelis, they have murdered Americans as well, as well as Jews who live outside of Israel, and they have violated Israel's territory, and they continue to hold Israeli soldiers hostage.

The existence of our Nation and Israel are not subject to compromise and the lives of Americans and Israelis are not negotiable.

Indeed, in the wake of the Holocaust, the United Nations was founded to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to protect the dignity and the worth of every person. The words and deeds of Ahmadinejad and his cohorts violate Article 2, section 4 of the U.N. Charter, which require all U.N. member states to "refrain . . . from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state."

Their implicit demands for the death of Jews violates the Genocide Convention, which states that those who commit or incite genocide shall be punished, whether they are rulers, government officials or private citizens.

This resolution, offered by my friend and distinguished colleague, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. KIRK of Illinois, calls for the U.N. Security Council to charge Ahmadinejad with violating those binding documents and for the Council to consider stronger measures to prevent Iran from obtaining the nuclear weapons that it could use to threaten and to attack Israel and the world.

Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to adopt this very serious resolution and reaffirm our resolve to end the Iranian threat.

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 16 min-

utes left. The gentlewoman from Florida has 15 minutes left.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the author of the concurrent resolution, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from California, who was also a former Ambassador to the Federated States of Micronesia. Thank you for your leadership on this issue and on so many other issues.

To my dear friend, the ranking member of the International Relations Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), thank you for your strong support for this resolution and for countless other measures of importance to the world as well as to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 21, a resolution that I was proud to author, along with Congressman MARK KIRK from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, what do you do when you see injustice? What do you do when you see injustice? Well, as I told my children, you only have two choices when you see injustice. You do nothing, you walk away in the face of genocide, or someone else's torment or unjust, unfair treatment, do nothing, wear blinders like most of the world, or you do something, do something in the face of injustice.

Here we have the President of a sovereign nation, a Member of the U.N., Ahmadinejad from Iran, who says that a fellow nation in the world, a member of the U.N., the state of Israel, should be wiped off the face of the Earth, the people killed. Not only is that a violation of the U.N. Charter, which, not surprisingly, says one cannot, as a member nation, advocate the death and destruction of another member nation, it also violates the Geneva Convention rules against incitement to genocide.

Lest one think that Mr. Ahmadinejad, a twisted, backward, lunatic, be some nonthreatening individual crazy man who happens to talk about the death of millions of innocent people, this is the head of a nation, a sovereign nation with oil wealth and an army and with a stated goal of acquiring nuclear weapons to use to carry out his homicidal, genocidal, lunatic delusions of wiping out the State of Israel.

So we must take his threats seriously. Just as so many say in the history of the 20th century as we review it, we should have taken Hitler's threats more seriously and not just disregarded him as some lunatic who couldn't do anything about his threats.

So we have asked the United Nations, we are asking them through this resolution to enforce its own rules against the incitement of the destruction of a member nation of the U.N..

What is happening at the U.N.? Today you have Indonesia, unbelievably, standing in the way of a simple

resolution, simple statement of condemnation against Ahmadinejad's genocidal statement to destroy Israel.

Why would Indonesia not support the rules of the United Nations? Why would not they not even stand silent, they are stopping the U.N. from announcing its resolution against Ahmadinejad's genocidal statements.

Why would Indonesia do that? Whatever the reason, my friends, it's wrong.

Unless Indonesia understands clearly that it will pay a price in world opinion and in economic matters and in political relations with the rest of the world, perhaps it won't move. But let Indonesia know that this United States House of Representatives, these Representatives of the 320 million American people, know what is wrong and what is right.

□ 1615

It is wrong to call for the death and destruction of a nation. It is wrong to call for the genocide of a people, and it is wrong for any other nation to stand in the way of justice, and we won't forget who helped us stop injustice and who prevented us from calling for the trial of Ahmadinejad before the international criminal court and sanctions upon Iran at the U.N.

Why is it important for the United States House of Representatives to speak? Because we will not be silent in the face of this lunatic madman who threatens us and threatens our allies.

By the way, if you read the history of the United States of America, we've been standing up for Israel since its founding. And in our founding, in the 1700s, if you read the history of all of our founders, they supported a Jewish homeland in Palestine. From the 1700s in America up until today, long before the Holocaust of the mid-20th century, back in the 1700s, Americans believed that the Jews should be returned to their homeland. And now this lunatic in Iran wants to wipe out this nation.

And Israel is not just a sentimental favorite. Israel happens to be America's number one strategic military, economic ally in the entire Middle East. People say, well, you know Iraq, and we won't get into that debacle at the moment, what it's costing us in troops and our military, 150,000 troops. If the state of Israel did not exist with its powerful, pro-Western military, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, tolerating all peoples in the region, how many more troops would we have to have in the Middle East if Israel didn't exist? Another 100,000, 200,000 Americans? We don't have to.

Our ally, the state of Israel, is there for America, as it has been ever since its founding: military, intelligence, economic.

So for so many reasons, legal, moral, military, national security for the United States, we cannot let this madman Ahmadinejad threaten America's greatest ally, the only Western democracy in the entire Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I urge Indonesia to do what is right and join with us.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. ROTHMAN for a very eloquent statement stating the purpose of this resolution.

And with that, I'd like to yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of our Middle East Subcommittee, Mr. PENCE of Indiana.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding and for her extraordinary leadership on that area of the world about which I have some responsibilities as the ranking Republican on the Middle East Subcommittee.

And like the gentledady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), I too wish to congratulate the principal author of H. Con. Res. 21. There is no greater or more eloquent advocate for that precious relationship between the free peoples of the United States of America and Israel than Congressman STEVE ROTHMAN of New Jersey. And I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this measure and would echo the gentledady's remarks about the force and eloquence of his presentation. And I will not seek to emulate that today, nor compete with it.

But I will take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to reflect on the importance of this resolution and the facts and the wisdom underpinning the need for Congress to be heard on the issue of calling on the United Nations Security Council to charge Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad with violating the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and the U.N. charter because of his calls for the destruction of the state of Israel.

The United Nations, in a very real sense, was formed when history failed. History and the international institutions on the planet failed to prevent barbaric action by fascist Nazi and Axis powers against the free world. And in every sense, genocide, the genocide that we saw perpetrated by the Germans against indigenous Jewish people and other ethnic populations, the genocide perpetrated by certain Japanese forces on mainland China, was part and parcel of the reason for the formation of the United Nations. And therefore the United Nations charter and the aforementioned Treaty on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide are all tied up one with another.

And so for this Congress, as the legislature of that nation which sits on the Security Council, to call on the United Nations to live up to its historic commitment to prevent and confront genocide is, as we say in Indiana, not a stretch. This is at the very essence of what the United Nations was created to do, and the need for action by the United Nations Security Council when one considers the facts in this case truly speak for themselves. And let me lay those facts out.

The 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of

Genocide, commonly known as the Genocide Convention, defines genocide as, among other things, "the act of killing members of a national, ethnic, racial or religious group with the intent to destroy in whole or in part the targeted group."

Now, let's see if some of the statements by the leadership of the nation of Iran against the people of Israel qualify as calling upon the act of killing members of a national, ethnic, racial or religious group with the intent to destroy in whole or in part that group.

Also, the Genocide Convention bans the conspiracy or incitement to commit genocide and states that violators shall be punished "whether constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals."

133 member states of the U.N. have ratified the Genocide Convention, including Iran.

Article II, section 4 of the U.N. charter, also to which Iran has agreed, requires all member states of the United Nations "to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state."

Now, let's get to the facts because that's what the U.N. requires, that's what the treaty requires, that's what the Genocide Convention requires, that's what the U.N. charter requires.

Well, let's start with October 26, 2005. Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad called for Israel to be "wiped off the map," and described Israel as a "disgraceful blot on the face of the Islamic world," and declared that "anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation's fury."

12 December 2006, that same leader, Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, addressed a Holocaust Denial Conference in Tehran and said that Israel would "soon be wiped out."

15 December 2000, Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamene'i stated that "Iran's stance has always been clear on this ugly phenomenon" referring to Israel as the ugly phenomenon. He went on to say, "We have repeatedly said that this cancerous tumor of a state should be removed from the region."

Iran, as we know, has aggressively pursued a clandestine effort to arm itself with nuclear weapons. Iran funds, trains and supports terrorist groups, including Hamas and Hezbollah, which have murdered Americans, Israelis and non-Israeli Jews, and seeks to destroy Israel.

14 December 2001, the President of Iran's Expediency Council and former leader of Iran, Ali Rafsanjani, threatened Israel with nuclear destruction saying, and I quote, "if one day the Islamic world is also equipped with weapons like those that Israel now possesses, then the imperialist strategy will reach a standstill because the use of even one nuclear bomb inside Israel will destroy everything, while it will merely harm the Islamic world."

Men and women, these are comments made by the leaders of a sovereign nation that is in a headlong pursuit to obtain nuclear weapons, and has, by international consensus, already obtained missile technology that could deliver such weapons within the theater of the Middle East.

History teaches no truth more clearly than this: nations should take tyrants at their word. For the United States of America to fail to call on the institution of the United Nations to take the tyrants in Iran at their word would be a grievous historical error and one for which future generations of Americans like those injured soldiers that I toured through the Capitol earlier this afternoon will likely have to pay.

This resolution, authored by Mr. ROTHMAN from New Jersey and Mr. KIRK from Illinois, strongly condemns Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's offensive remarks, contemptible statements, and reprehensible policies directed at the destruction of Israel; calls on the United Nation's Security Council to take up charges against Ahmadinejad for violating the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and article II, section 4 of the United Nations charter.

It also calls on the Security Council and all member states of the United Nations to consider stronger measures to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons, which would both be in violation of nuclear non-proliferation treaties and give them the potential to eliminate Israel.

And it reaffirms, of course, the unwavering strategic partnership and close friendship between the United States and Israel, and reasserts the steadfast commitment of the United States to defend the right of Israel to exist as a free and democratic and Jewish state.

The time for this resolution has come. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN) for his bold leadership, and I pledge my strong support and urge all of my colleagues to make this strong and deafening statement that this Congress and this Nation will take tyrants at their word, and we will call on the United Nations today to live up to their charter.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield the balance of our time to Ambassador Watson. And I thank Mr. PENCE for his eloquent statement.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I will yield then the rest of my time to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. DENNIS KUCINICH.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATSON) and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

And I want to begin by stating that the sponsor of this resolution, Mr. ROTHMAN, is a person of great heart and compassion, someone who I admire and am proud to serve with in this Con-

gress. His dedication to peace and to justice is something that is admirable. I share his dedication to the survival and the security of the State of Israel.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to include a New York Times translation of the text of President Ahmadinejad's speech, a translation by the Middle East Media Research Institute of his speech, articles relating to an analysis of the speech, and the words that were used by Virginia Tilley of Johannesburg, South Africa and by Erash Narsi written on the 18th of January 2007.

□ 1630

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire, is the gentleman inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by Ahmadinejad?

Mr. KUCINICH. If the gentlewoman will yield, as part of this debate, that is correct.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I was just asking if you are putting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by Ahmadinejad.

Mr. KUCINICH. Yes. The text from the New York Times, a translation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is calling Ahmadinejad's comments akin to genocide, calling for the destruction of the State of Israel, and calling for the wiping out of millions of people because they are Jews. And I object to having this person's words be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the record of the United States of America, of the people's House, and I object.

With all due respect to the gentleman, he may object to the resolution and speak against it, but I object to having Ahmadinejad's speech being inserted into the RECORD at the same time that the gentleman is speaking against this resolution.

So I do object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this insertion, which is from the New York Times, printed in a newspaper of general circulation, is to be able to clarify that the quotes that are cited in the resolution are either mistranslated or out of context, and I think that should be something that would be of interest.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would further yield, I understand if that is what you would like to use to make the connection.

Mr. KUCINICH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, this is not my translation. This is a translation from the New York Times Tehran Bureau of this speech, and that is what I wanted to submit in the RECORD, because this debate, even if unintentional, could be used as still another cause for a U.S.

attack on Iran, and because the International Atomic Energy Agency has not established that Iran is developing nuclear weapons and because we went to war against Iraq on the basis of misinformation, disinformation, and because I stand for peaceful resolution of all international disputes in the Middle East, in the region, and because I do share the concern that Israel would be in peril, which is why I did the research. I did the research. That is the basis of my wanting to submit a translation.

Now, there is an old saying "much is lost in translation," and if there is so much riding on this resolution, it would appear to me that the prudent approach to take would be to read a translation from Farsi to English. And I have two such translations to offer this Congress if anyone is interested.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. Of course, I will yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. ROTHMAN. My friend, you referred to a translation of a speech. The offenses of Ahmadinejad are many. And three separate remarks on three separate occasions calling for the destruction of the state of Israel, does the gentleman have translations of each of those three separate remarks calling for the genocidal destruction of the state of Israel?

Mr. KUCINICH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I have pretty thorough translations that I would like to proceed to speak to.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Do you have them, of all three?

Mr. KUCINICH. I am going to proceed specifically with the comments, if I may. Everything that I have relates to this resolution, my good friend. And I am going to proceed now, and then I will yield again, certainly. I just want to make sure we can continue this.

I want to proceed with quotes from this resolution. I am just going to stay very closely to this resolution because this is what we are debating, a resolution before the House that calls on the Security Council to charge Iranian President Ahmadinejad with violating the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and the United Nations Charter because of his calls for the destruction of the State of Israel, something that I obviously would find abhorrent and repugnant if he said that. And I started to do research on this, and I am just calling it to your attention.

With respect to the quote that he said that Israel should be wiped off the map, that is what the quote was, I have seen, from translations in the New York Times and the Middle East Research Institute that this speech that Ahmadinejad gave on October 26, 2005, does not call for Israel to be wiped off the map.

Now, H. Con. Res. 21 states that he has called for Israel to be wiped off the map. But according to the Middle East Research Institute, it is more correctly

translated as “eliminated from the pages of history.” And when taken in full context, here is what the quote says: “This regime that is occupying Qods,” or Jerusalem, “must be eliminated from the pages of history.” He is talking about the regime.

Now, H. Con. Resolution 21 accuses President Ahmadinejad of saying that Israel, and these are awful quotes if he said it, it is horrible, that Israel is a “disgraceful blot on the face of the Islamic world.” However, the New York Times translates this section of the speech as saying, “Our dear Imam targeted the heart of the world oppressor in his struggle, meaning the occupying regime. I have no doubt that the new wave that has started in Palestine, and we witness it in the Islamic world too, will eliminate this disgraceful stain from the Islamic world.”

Now, I object to anyone’s putting the word “disgraceful” in connection with Israel. However, he did not say, he wasn’t talking about the people of Israel, the nation, he was talking about the regime.

Here again is the quote that is included in this resolution: “Anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation’s fury.”

Look, I recognize Israel and I am not interested in that kind of condemnation. But H. Con. Res. 21 accuses President Ahmadinejad of declaring that anybody who recognized Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nations’ fury. However, in two separate translations, it is clear that Ahmadinejad is referring to the Israeli regime.

The New York Times translation: “Anyone who recognizes this regime because of the pressure of the world oppressor, or because of naivete or selfishness, will be eternally disgraced and will burn in the fury of the Islamic nations.”

The Middle East Media Research Institute translation reads: If someone is under the pressure of hegemonic power,” the West, “and understands that something is wrong, or he is naive, or he is an egotist and his hedonism leads him to recognize the Zionist regime, he should know that he will burn in the fire of Islamic Ummah,” nation . . .

So what he is calling for is regime change, according to these translations. According to these translations, he is calling for regime change. He is not calling for the destruction of Israel. Now, I am just going on the basis of a New York Times translation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I will yield to my friend.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman aware that it is standard usage in the Government of Iran and in many of the Arab regimes that since they will not say the word “Israel,” they refer to Israel as the Zionist entity or the Zionist regime so that when they say the “Zionist regime,” they are not necessarily calling for regime

change? When they say the “Zionist regime” or the “Zionist entity” must be abolished, they are usually referring to the country of Israel?

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, to respond to my friend, if that is what he meant, then we have cause for great concern. However, in one of the articles I wanted to submit so that Congress could see it, it says, and I quote, “What did Ahmadinejad actually say? To quote his exact words in Farsi,” and then they give the quote, “that passage will mean nothing to most people but one word might ring a bell: ‘regime.’ It is the word ‘regime’ pronounced just like the English word with an extra e-h sound at the end. Ahmadinejad did not refer to Israel the country or Israel the land mass but the Israeli regime. That is a vastly significant distinction as one cannot wipe a regime off the map.”

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I would be glad to have my friend respond and also for Mr. ROTHMAN to respond.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I will respond again. It proves nothing because the fact is that if you are just looking at etymology, it may make sense. But if you look at usage in the Middle East, the Arab and Iranian people who wish the State of Israel eliminated have, since 1947 or 1948, referred to Israel either as the “Zionist regime” or the “Zionist entity.” And you can look back at the rhetoric of 1967 when they lined up the troops and they said all the Jews will be killed. They talked about the Zionist regime or the Zionist entity being eliminated. They weren’t talking about regime change; they were talking about genocide.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. Yes.

Mr. ROTHMAN. First of all, a lot of these statements occurred in the capital of Iran during the World Without Zionism Conference. Zionism is a historic movement of returning the Jews to their Biblical homeland where they were expelled for thousands of years. So when they have a conference for a world without Zionism and in that conference say that the Zionist regime will be wiped off the map, one could reasonably understand that there would be no more Zionism, no Jewish state, because that is what Zionism is, no Jewish state in the Middle East. By the way, the Middle East, which is a sea of Islamic regimes. A sea of Islamic regimes. Israel’s offense is having the nerve to exist as a non-Islamic regime.

But I ask the gentleman for translations of the other matters that came before the U.N. Namely, on December 12 of 2006, during a conference in Iran denying the Holocaust, Ahmadinejad said Israel would soon be wiped out. Not the Labor Government of Israel or the Likud Government of Israel, but Israel would be wiped out. And then again just a few weeks ago on Sunday, June 2, Ahmadinejad said the world

would soon see the destruction of Israel. And I say to my friend from Ohio, I know you have the best intentions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 3 minutes to be divided equally between Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHMAN and myself, and I would yield to Mr. ROTHMAN, then Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, then I will close.

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

Hearing none, we will have 3 additional minutes of debate, divided equally between the gentleman from Ohio and the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for asking for this time.

I want to be clear about my objection of putting Ahmadinejad’s statements in the RECORD. Mr. KUCINICH has an opportunity, as a Member of this House, to clear up the record, as he has pointed out in his statements, and put in those remarks on his own. I would hate to have Ahmadinejad’s statements be included as a part of the record in this part of the debate where we are saying that he is a despot. He is a person who denies the Holocaust existence, who has called for Israel’s destruction, and to be mincing about with words and translations, I know the gentleman from Ohio’s motives are clear. He is not saying that he is calling for Israel’s destruction, but I think that any interpretation of Ahmadinejad’s words and deeds would clearly say that that is Ahmadinejad’s motives.

□ 1645

So I would not like his statements to be made a part of the record in this part of the discussion, but he, as a Member of Congress, is free to clear the record, as he points out, and put Ahmadinejad’s words on his own time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield my remaining time to Mr. ROTHMAN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida has previously expired.

Mr. ROTHMAN. I thank the Speaker, the gentlewoman from Florida, and the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman from Ohio actually has the time.

Mr. KUCINICH. What I had said in my unanimous consent was Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. ROTHMAN, then I was going to be last. That was the UC.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair interpreted the gentleman’s request such that he would have 1½ minutes and the gentlewoman from Florida would have 1½ minutes. That is the order of the House.

Mr. KUCINICH. Then I yield 30 seconds to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is afraid that because at an anti-Zionism "World without Zionism" conference, Ahmadinejad said, "Wipe Israel off the map." We are quibbling over whether he said on another occasion, wipe the Israel regime, Zionist regime off the map and on a third occasion said, the world would soon see the destruction of Israel. The gentleman thinks there is ambiguity there.

This is a regime in Iran sending troops and equipment, killing our soldiers in Iraq, building nuclear weapons, threatening to kill our number one ally, the State of Israel, and he doesn't want the U.N. to look into it to condemn them? I think the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. KUCINICH. If, in fact, that's what he said, then of course the U.N. should look into it. But I think we should look into whether or not he said that. And again, I offered to submit, but was denied a unanimous consent, the text of his speech, and a translation by Nazila Fathi in the New York Times Tehran Bureau of the speech. This is from the New York Times. And they certainly have never been accused of any kind of propaganda against Israel.

So I would say that it is important for us to look at this. And I don't think it is an unreasonable request that we should look at exactly what this person said so we will know what the appropriate course of action is to take.

I stand for peace. I stood before this Congress and challenged the war against Iraq when very few people were willing to do that because I questioned whether or not Iraq did have weapons of mass destruction. I am questioning whether or not this person is trying to destroy Israel. If he is, then I certainly support my friend's concerns.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of today's resolution which calls for the United Nations to take action to uphold one of its most important conventions—the Convention of Genocide. With the violence of the Holocaust just a few years behind them, the members of the United Nations in 1948 established a convention to prevent such atrocities from ever happening again.

There is much talk at the UN about preventing war and genocide but unfortunately there is little action. The Iranian President has called for a UN member nation to be "wiped off the map." Do we have any doubt that the UN would sanction the Israeli Prime Minister if the positions were reversed?

The Iranian president and the Ayatollahs' supreme wish is the destruction of Israel and all her people. They have not tried to mask this goal—they doubt the holocaust of the past and make plans for a holocaust of the future.

Ahmadinejad has even gone as far as speculating that the collateral damage of attacking Israel with nuclear weapons would be worth the cost to the Muslim world. For a regime that is developing nuclear capabilities, these are truly dangerous words. In the 1930's fas-

cist dictators made bold claims of impending violence and we ignored them to our own peril.

The world should not ignore these words of aggression. Today, we call on UN member nations to call out Ahmadinejad, to condemn these statements, and to work together to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 21, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. 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.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JACOB BIRNBAUM

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 137) honoring the life and six decades of public service of Jacob Birnbaum and especially his commitment freeing Soviet Jews from religious, cultural, and communal extinction, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 137

Whereas Jacob Birnbaum was born on December 10, 1926, and December 10 is International Human Rights Day;

Whereas Birnbaum performed relief work with victims of Nazi and Soviet totalitarianism from 1946 through 1951, then worked with the disintegrating Jewish communities of North Africa in the mid-1950s and early 1960s;

Whereas, in 1964, Birnbaum moved to New York and founded the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry (SSSJ) on April 27 of that year;

Whereas four days later Birnbaum organized approximately 1,000 students who marched for four hours in front of the Mission to the United Nations of the Soviet Union on May 1, 1964, to begin the direct action public struggle for Soviet Jewry;

Whereas the SSSJ utilized nonviolent methods, including marches, rallies, publication of extensive educational materials, and meetings with government officials, to organize and activate students to take direct action in the cause of freeing Soviet Jews trapped behind the Iron Curtain, utilizing the slogan "Let My People Go";

Whereas, on April 4, 1965, Birnbaum organized the Jericho March, in which students encircled the Soviet Mission and sounded shofars from all around the building and proceeded to rally at the United Nations;

Whereas, on April 12, 1965, petitions were presented at the United Nations's Isaiah Wall;

Whereas Birnbaum organized a Jericho Ride to Washington, DC, on May 20, 1965, where he and the first SSSJ chairman Rabbi Shlomo Riskin met with senior Soviet diplomat Anatoly Myshkov, and thereafter the

students circled the Embassy of the Soviet Union to the sound of shofars, then moved on to the Department of State for a vigorous discussion, and finally arrived in Lafayette Park in front of the White House for a rally addressed by Members of Congress and the reading of an Appeal to Conscience;

Whereas Birnbaum and his student steering committee organized approximately thirty events in SSSJ's first two years to awaken the Jewish community in New York and beyond to the plight of Soviet Jews;

Whereas Birnbaum's important New York marches and rallies in the 1960s were the instrumental precursors of the great Solidarity events of the 1970s organized by the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry under the direction of Malcolm Hoenlein, the founding director;

Whereas Birnbaum has testified before committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Helsinki Commission;

Whereas Birnbaum advocated utilizing economic leverage at a Congressional hearing as early as May 1965;

Whereas Birnbaum worked closely in the early 1970s with Senator Henry Jackson, who introduced legislation linking United States trade benefits and capital flow to the Soviet Union with increased Soviet emigration;

Whereas Birnbaum was one of the most persistent of those individuals who fought for passage of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to allow Soviet Jews and other East European Jews to escape oppression and religious, cultural, and communal extinction in the Soviet bloc;

Whereas Birnbaum conducted a number of campaigns with Presidents and Congress for the protection of Soviet Jewish underground self-education groups and organized a delegation of the Synagogue Council of America to meet with the Deputy Secretary of State in 1985;

Whereas Birnbaum received the Prophet in Our Time Award in 1974 on the tenth anniversary of the SSSJ;

Whereas Birnbaum received the Yeshiva University Community Service Award in 1988 and the Freedom Award in 2004 from the Manhattan Beach Jewish Center;

Whereas Birnbaum was honored in 2004 by the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations on the 40th anniversary of the initiation of the Soviet Jewry movement;

Whereas during the 1990s Birnbaum was engaged in a number of interventions in the former Soviet republics of Central Asia, especially Uzbekistan; and

Whereas Birnbaum continues to assist institutions for the Jewish education of former Soviet Jews as part of his "Let My People Know" campaign: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors the life and six decades of public service of Jacob Birnbaum and especially his commitment to freeing Soviet Jews from religious, cultural, and communal extinction.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would first like to commend our distinguished colleague, Mr. NADLER of New York, for introducing this resolution. The resolution before the House honors one man, but it also honors all that he symbolizes in the name of human rights and freedom of worship.

Before the Holocaust, the Jewish population of the Soviet Union numbered 5 million. After the war, only 2 million remained. The pain of these Holocaust survivors was compounded. They became the targets of a ruthless and systematic campaign to strip them of their communal rights and Jewish identity.

This resolution pays tribute to a remarkable man who stood up for these victims of brutality. Jacob Birnbaum launched an effort, which turned into a groundswell, to protest the Soviet Union's abhorrent efforts to extinguish the religious, cultural and communal identity of the Jewish people.

His movement began in 1964 as a humble yet bold student group organized to march on the Soviet Union to the United Nations. Over the years, the group conducted rallies in New York and Washington, circulated petitions, and used every possible means to keep world attention on the plight of the Soviet Jews. This social activism snowballed into the solidarity marches of the 1970s that gathered millions of individuals to fight for the cause.

Birnbaum also worked with the authors of the historic Jackson-Vanik amendment to help free Soviet Jews looking to emigrate. In this way, he helped to elevate the movement so that the U.S. Federal Government had to pay attention and to act. But his dogged and determined work continued, even as the Soviet bloc crumbled and anti-Semitism flared in incidents across the region. Mr. Birnbaum continues to work with educational institutions for former Jews as part of the "Let My People Know" campaign.

Through the years, Jacob Birnbaum has received numerous honors for his services to mankind. He deserves this further accolade on behalf of a grateful Congress for engaging so energetically in a cause that we have long supported, helping to free Soviet Jews from oppression and to help them thrive.

To Jews in Russia and the former Soviet Republic, the name Jacob Birnbaum refers not only to one dedicated man but to the very cause of freedom itself.

I support this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Mr. NADLER's resolution, House Resolution 137, honoring the life and public service of Jacob Birnbaum and especially his commitment to freeing Soviet Jews from religious, cultural and communal extinction.

For decades, Mr. Birnbaum has been at the forefront of the nonviolent struggle for Soviet Jewry, establishing the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry, and organizing marches, rallies and publication of educational materials aimed at freeing Jews trapped in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Birnbaum worked closely with Members of the United States Congress, testified at congressional hearings and consistently pushed for the United States to use our economic leverage against the Soviet Union to pressure that country so they could allow Soviet Jews and other East European Jews to escape the oppression of a religious and cultural nature in the Soviet Union. Throughout the decades, Mr. Birnbaum's persistence and commitment to human rights and religious freedom have been invaluable in freeing Soviet Jews and preserving their religious and cultural heritage.

Mr. Birnbaum's commitment to this cause has not diminished to this day. He continues to help Jewish educational institutions and former Soviet Jews even today. And Mr. NADLER's resolution before us honors Mr. Birnbaum and his years of public service. I urge Members to support this important resolution.

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlelady for her support, and I thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for her support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 137, a resolution to honor the life and six decades of public service of Jacob Birnbaum, known more familiarly as Jacob Birnbaum, especially his commitment freeing Soviet Jews from religious, cultural and communal extinction.

It is fitting that Jacob Birnbaum was born on December 10, which is also International Human Rights Day. This past December, Mr. Birnbaum celebrated his 80th birthday. It is time for this body to honor the life and work, the 60 years of public service of this remarkable human rights activist. I am very proud to call him a fellow New Yorker.

Jacob Birnbaum was born in Germany, and during World War II, his family fled the Nazis and settled in the United Kingdom. Throughout the war, the Birnbaum family knew the plight of Jews, especially their own relatives, under the Nazis. His personal experience with the horrors of evil sparked the activism of Jacob Birnbaum.

Beginning in 1946, following the end of the war, 19-year-old Jacob Birnbaum

devoted several years to providing relief for younger survivors of the Nazi and Soviet totalitarian systems. Through his work with young Polish Jews who managed to leave the USSR after the war, he became familiar with the iniquities of the Soviet system. These earlier experiences fueled his later passion to mobilize American Jewry in the drive to rescue Jews from oppression in the Soviet Union.

In the mid 1950s and early 1960s, he became involved in assisting people from the disintegrating Jewish communities of North Africa caught up in the struggles of the host countries for independence from France and in the persecution of the Jews of North Africa after the independence of Israel.

His activism did not end then. After traveling to the United States, he decided to create a national student organization to activate the grass roots of the American Jewish community. Settling in New York, in 1964, he set up his first student committee. Then he concentrated on building a student core at Yeshiva University. Mr. Birnbaum named the new organization the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry, known familiarly as the SSSJ.

Finally, he called a national founding meeting at Columbia University on April 27, 1964, followed by a large student demonstration 4 days later on the Soviet holiday May Day in front of the Soviet United Nations Mission. The authoritative Center for Jewish History has listed the demonstration as the beginning of the public struggle for the freedom of Soviet Jews.

Many consider this action as the reason to consider Mr. Birnbaum the father of the movement to liberate Soviet Jewry. Indeed, the evidence supports this notion. Throughout the rest of the 1960s, under his direction, the Student Struggle continued working full time in response to the oppression of Soviet Jews.

As we know, the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia led to the imprisonment of Soviet Jews behind the Iron Curtain. Jewish culture, Jewish religion and Jewish communal life were forcibly extinguished under the Soviet regime, which also indulged in numerous anti-Semitic actions.

Even after Stalin's death, the Soviet kingdom of fear abated only slightly. The Cold War effectively continued to cut off the Jews of Russia and Eastern Europe from their fellow Jews in the West, and almost all expressions of Jewish religion and culture continued to be prohibited.

Nevertheless, expressions of outrage began to accumulate in the early 1960s, with a few pioneers leading the way. Shortly after the initial organizing by Jacob Birnbaum, the major Jewish organizations met in Washington, D.C., and established the American Conference on Soviet Jewry. The SSSJ that Mr. Birnbaum had established functioned as its handbook said, to mobilize a tidal wave of public opinion.

After the mass arrests of young Jewish dissidents on June 15, 1970, and the

death sentences handed down to them in the Leningrad trial of December 1970, the National Conference on Soviet Jewry was created.

□ 1700

The Greater New York Conference, under the direction of the then young activist Malcolm Hoenlein, initiated the profoundly important Solidarity Day marches, modeled after Jacob Birnbaum's Jericho, Redemption, and Exodus marches and rallies of the 1960s. Mr. Hoenlein is now the Executive Vice Chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations. Of great significance was the creation in 1970 of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews, a coalition of non-established regional groups, under the chairmanship of Dr. Louis Rosenblum, with whom Jacob Birnbaum worked for many years.

Mr. Hoenlein has publicly stated that he considers Mr. Birnbaum "the father of the Soviet Jewry movement." Similar statements have been made by other major public figures such as Dr. Meir Rosenne, who worked closely with Mr. Birnbaum in the early formative period of 1964 to 1967. Dr. Rosenne later became Israel's Ambassador to France and then to the United States. Sir Martin Gilbert, the official British historian of Winston Churchill and his times, has made a similar statement.

In May, 1965, Mr. Birnbaum was the first person to testify before a congressional committee on the importance of utilizing economic leverage on the Kremlin to secure the liberation of Soviet Jews. When the late Senator Henry Jackson initiated the legislation which finally resulted in the passage of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment in 1974, Mr. Birnbaum worked closely with the director of Senator Jackson's office, Dorothy Fosdick, and, of course, with his other aide, Richard Perle, who played a major role in the initiation and development of the legislation.

The idea of placing economic pressure on Communist states to increase emigration played a key role in softening up the Kremlin regimes to make possible the Soviet Jewry demand of "Let My People Go." For the first time, there was legislation to put teeth into the previous congressional humanitarian resolutions.

From 1976 to 1986, Jacob Birnbaum conducted annual Most Favored Nation campaigns, based on Jackson-Vanik, to pressure various countries, including Romania, to increase emigration and to release prisoners. He testified annually before both Senate and House Committees.

In the latter 1970s, Mr. Birnbaum enlarged his Soviet Jewry strategy. He expanded the slogan "Let My People Go" by adding "Let My People Know." Let them know their heritage. The Kremlin had pulverized Jewish religious, cultural and community life, and, in the 1960s, the Soviet Jewish resistance underground began to generate Jewish self-education, cultural,

religious and Hebrew-speaking groups in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Birnbaum conducted numerous campaigns for their protection, enlisting the aid of many Christian religious denominations. These efforts reached a high point when he organized and led a delegation of the Synagogue Council of America to meet with the Deputy Secretary of State and the Department's Human Rights Director, Warren Zimmerman, in September 1985.

Mr. Birnbaum's vision was partially realized with Malcolm Hoenlein's Solidarity Rallies in New York, and, finally, by the great national rally in Washington on December 7, 1987, on the eve of President Gorbachev's meeting with President Reagan.

Finally, in 1990, the Kremlin conceded to all the pressure and permitted a mass emigration, which has now totaled more than 2 million people, about 1 million to Israel and 1 million elsewhere, mostly to the United States. This was no small accomplishment. And many people played a role in making it happen.

In addition to the courageous work of Mr. Birnbaum, tribute ought to be paid to the many pioneers and the other national organizations which fought so strenuously for the liberation of Soviet Jews:

Morris Abram, U.S. Human Rights Commissioner; Dr. Moshe Deeter, the scholar whose research fueled the early movement; former Justice Arthur Goldberg; the distinguished theologian, Rabbi Dr. Abraham J. Heschel; Senator Jacob Javits; NASA scientist Dr. Louis Rosenblum of the Cleveland Committee on Soviet Anti-Semitism; and Elie Wiesel, whose book, "The Jews of Silence" was so influential.

Many organizations also played an important role, and I will name them in my extended remarks.

Following the collapse of the Soviet regime, Mr. Birnbaum spent a substantial part of the 1990s in combating anti-Semitic manifestations in former Soviet Central Asia, mostly in Uzbekistan, intervening through the State Department and enlisting Malcolm Hoenlein's aid in engaging the Uzbek Ambassador in Washington.

In his 81st year, Mr. Birnbaum continues to support groups engaged in the Jewish education of former Soviet Jews and their children. His dedication to his beliefs remains as strong as ever.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives ought to honor the life and six decades of public service of Jacob Birnbaum and especially his successful commitment to freeing Soviet Jews from religious, cultural, and communal extinction. He is a true hero.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for moving this resolution quickly through his committee. I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) for managing the consideration of this resolution today,

and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership on this.

Again, I urge all my colleagues to join me in passing this resolution to honor this work of this unique hero of this century.

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

Ms. WATSON. 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 137, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING ON GOVERNMENT OF UGANDA AND LORD'S RESISTANCE ARMY TO RECOMMIT TO POLITICAL SOLUTION IN NORTHERN UGANDA

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 80) calling on the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda and to recommence vital peace talks, and urging immediate and substantial support for the ongoing peace process from the United States and the international community, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 80

Whereas for over two decades, the Government of Uganda has been engaged in an armed conflict with the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) that has resulted in up to 200,000 deaths from violence and disease and the displacement of more than 1,600,000 civilians from eastern and northern Uganda;

Whereas former United Nations Undersecretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator Jan Egeland called the crisis in northern Uganda "the biggest forgotten, neglected humanitarian emergency in the world today";

Whereas Joseph Kony, the leader of the LRA, and several of his associates have been indicted by the International Criminal Court for war crimes and crimes against humanity, including rape, murder, enslavement, sexual enslavement, and the forced recruitment of an estimated 66,000 children;

Whereas the LRA is a severe and repeat violator of human rights and has continued to attack civilians and humanitarian aid workers despite a succession of ceasefire agreements;

Whereas the Secretary of State has labeled the LRA "vicious and cult-like" and designates it as a terrorist organization under the Immigration and Nationality Act;

Whereas the 2006 Department of State report on the human rights record of the Government of Uganda found that "security

forces committed unlawful killings . . . and were responsible for deaths as a result of torture" along with other "serious problems", including repression of political opposition, official impunity, and violence against women and children;

Whereas in the 2004 Northern Uganda Crisis Response Act (Public Law 108-283; 118 Stat. 912), Congress declared its support for a peaceful resolution of the conflict in northern and eastern Uganda and called for the United States and the international community to assist in rehabilitation, reconstruction, and demobilization efforts;

Whereas the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement, which was mediated by the Government of Southern Sudan and signed by representatives of the Government of Uganda and the LRA on August 20, 2006, and extended on November 1, 2006, requires both parties to cease all hostile military and media offensives and asks the Sudan People's Liberation Army to facilitate the safe assembly of LRA fighters in designated areas for the duration of the peace talks;

Whereas the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement expired on February 28, 2007, without ever having been fully implemented, and though the parties resumed peace talks on April 26, 2007, and signed a preliminary agreement on May 2, 2007, they have not yet arrived at a sustainable negotiated settlement and observers remain concerned that hostilities between rebel and government forces could resume;

Whereas a return to civil war would yield disastrous results for the people of northern Uganda and for regional stability, while peace in Uganda will bolster the fragile Comprehensive Peace Agreement in Sudan and de-escalate tensions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and

Whereas continuing violence and instability obstruct the delivery of humanitarian assistance to the people of northern Uganda and impede national and regional trade, development and democratization efforts, and counter-terrorism initiatives: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) disapproves of the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) leadership's inconsistent commitment to resolving the conflict in Uganda peacefully;

(2) urges the LRA and the Government of Uganda to engage in good-faith negotiations to pursue a political solution to this conflict;

(3) encourages all parties in the region to immediately cease human rights violations and address, within the context of a broader national reconciliation process in Uganda, issues of accountability and impunity for those crimes against humanity already committed;

(4) urges leaders on both sides of the conflict in Uganda to renounce any intentions and halt any preparations to resume violence and to ensure that this message is clearly conveyed to armed elements under their control; and

(5) calls on the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the heads of other similar governmental agencies and nongovernmental organizations within the international community to continue to augment efforts to alleviate the humanitarian crisis in northern Uganda and to support a peaceful resolution to this crisis by publicly and forcefully reiterating the preceding demands.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. HANK JOHNSON, for sponsoring this important and timely resolution on the nightmarish conflict in northern Uganda.

Two decades of horrific battle between the Lord's Resistance Army and the Ugandan government have taken up to 200,000 lives and displaced nearly 2 million civilians from their homes. But the human tragedy in Uganda cannot be simply represented by numbers and statistics. It is about the daily pain and terror of victims and their families.

Like other rebel forces that have fought the tragic civil wars of Africa, the Lord's Resistance Army built its ranks with child soldiers, both girls and boys, and used vicious and unspeakable methods to alienate these children from their families and their villages. Time and again, Uganda child victims have been forced to commit unthinkable acts, to kill their parents and other relatives before being abducted themselves.

Over two decades of war, more than 30,000 children have been kidnapped and faced a horrible fate, becoming absorbed into the LRA. Meanwhile, tens of thousands of terrified children leave their home villages each evening at dusk and walk to distant towns to avoid being kidnapped by the LRA and pressed into service. They are known in Uganda as the "night commuters."

Mr. Speaker, every parent in the United States labors to reassure their young children that they are safe at home when sleeping in their own beds. The greatest crime of the Lord's Resistance Army is to take even this basic right away from children and families of northern Uganda.

While the LRA is responsible for the overwhelming majority of violence and abuse of children and their families, the government of Uganda also has been cited time and again for human rights violations. In August of last year, South Sudan's President brokered a cessation of hostilities agreement between the government and the rebel forces, but the accord broke down and only last month did the 10-month effort resume.

I believe the Uganda people deserve both peace and justice. It is incumbent upon the international community to

work with Uganda people, particularly the people of northern Uganda, along with the International Criminal Court and the Ugandan judiciary, to make sure both a lasting peace and real justice are achieved.

The healing and the recovery of the Uganda people, particularly the children, from this tragic war, requires that we make their personal peace the priority right now. It is the only path to lasting stability for northern Uganda. That is why I urge the passage of this legislation, to put Uganda on a path to peace once again.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 80, which calls on the government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army, the LRA, to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda by engaging in good faith negotiations, and it urges support for the ongoing peace process from the United States and the international community.

As my good friend from California, Ambassador Watson, has pointed out, since 1986, northern Uganda has been embroiled in a vicious conflict which pits the forces of Uganda President Museveni against the rebel Lord's Resistance Army, LRA, of Joseph Kony. Kony claims to hold mystical powers and asserts that he has been guided by God to protect the Acholi people of northern Uganda who have been marginalized by Museveni's government. However, it is the Acholi themselves who have suffered disproportionately at the hands of the LRA.

The LRA, which has been designated as a terrorist group subject to the State Department Terrorist Exclusion List, moves in small, well-coordinated groups from bases in southern Sudan and more recently in eastern Congo. They hold no clear political agenda and make no attempt to hold territory, but they mutilate, torture, murder, rape and loot with impunity.

The LRA has abducted more than 20,000 people, mostly children, Mr. Speaker, to work as laborers, soldiers and sex slaves. Children are forced to the front lines, and those who do manage to escape from the LRA find it difficult, if not impossible, to return to their villages after having been forced to commit atrocities in front of their families.

One of the most visible signs of the collective trauma suffered by the people of northern Uganda was pointed out by Ambassador Watson, and this is the "night commuter" phenomenon. At the peak of the conflict, over 20,000 children would walk up to 15 kilometers from their village to the relative safety of the towns each and every night. They would spend the night under grossly overcrowded tents, sleeping on concrete floors, before getting up at dawn to make the return journey to

their villages. It was not for food, nor for the promise of social services that drew these children to these towns, but it was fear of abduction by the LRA.

While security conditions in northern Uganda have improved and the number of “night commuters” has decreased over the past years, roughly 90 percent, 90 percent, Mr. Speaker, of the local population remains homeless.

□ 1715

These 1.4 million people have been forced from their homes and herded by the Government of Uganda into camps for internally displaced persons. Despite attempts to “decongest,” the conditions in these camps are abysmal.

A health survey conducted by the Ugandan Ministry of Health in 2005 asserts that up to 1,000 people have died in the camps each week due to treatable illnesses such as diarrhea and malaria. The HIV/AIDS rate in the camps is more than double the national average. Sexual violence and domestic violence against women has increased dramatically, and the IDPs complain that camp life has all but destroyed the social fabric of the region.

For its own part, the Ugandan Government has failed in its efforts to defeat the LRA militarily, and to provide adequate protection for the citizens of northern Uganda. Instead, the government has embraced a highly questionable three-pronged approach towards resolving the conflict, and this includes: number one, pursuing a military campaign against the LRA; two, supporting indictments by the International Criminal Court, the ICC, against the LRA’s top leaders; while, three, participating in peace talks while offering amnesty to LRA rebels.

It should come as no surprise that these mutually incompatible efforts have complicated matters and have failed to yield lasting results. Ill-timed military campaigns have undermined numerous mediation efforts, and the ICC indictments have led the LRA to question the sincerity of the amnesty deal offered by the government leaders.

Further, both the Government of Sudan and the LRA have routinely violated the agreement that is called the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement which has now expired without ever having been fully implemented. These actions have prompted skeptics to warn that both sides may be using the pretext of talks to rearm and replenish their forces.

If this is in fact the case, both the LRA and the Ugandan Government should be reminded of the fact that a military solution has alluded them for over 20 years. It is unlikely that a military solution will be any more viable now.

Thankfully, peace talks between the Government of Uganda and the LRA have resumed in Juba, Southern Sudan, and appear to be gaining momentum. Despite numerous challenges, not the least of which is the fact that delegations allegedly representing the

two parties have questionable credibility, the Juba process is being hailed as the best chance yet to ending the conflict by political means.

H. Con. Res. 80 serves as an expression of support for this political dialogue. It expresses disapproval of the LRA leadership and its inconsistent commitment to resolving the conflict and it urges both the LRA and the Government of Uganda to engage in good-faith negotiations. It encourages all parties to immediately stop human rights violations and address the issues of accountability, and it calls on both the LRA and the Government of Uganda to renounce any intentions and halt any preparations to resume this violence.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the resolution calls on the State Department, on the United States Agency for International Development, and other similar government and nongovernment organizations within the international community to continue and to augment efforts to alleviate the humanitarian crisis in northern Uganda and to support a peaceful resolution to this humanitarian crisis.

According to the U.N. Office of Humanitarian Affairs, the conflict of northern Uganda is characterized by a level of cruelty seldom seen, and few conflicts rival it for its sheer brutality.

Despite all of this, Mr. Speaker, it remains one of the most overlooked humanitarian and human rights crises in the world today. H. Con. Res. 80 seeks to shed some well-deserved attention on the crisis in northern Uganda. It affirms the resolve of this Congress that the victims of this atrocious conflict shall not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for bringing this important resolution to the floor. I urge support by all of our Members.

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California and also the honorable gentlewoman from Florida for their support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 80, a resolution that I introduced which calls on the Government of Uganda and the Lord’s Resistance Army, or the LRA, to recommit to a political solution to the conflict now raging in northern Uganda, and to recommence and sustain vital peace talks.

It also urges immediate and substantial support for the ongoing peace process from the United States and the international community.

When it comes to international affairs, Mr. Speaker, the Congress is somewhat limited in the action that it can take to address issues of concern. As we all know, it is primarily and rightfully a function of the executive branch. However, we do have the right

and the ability to use this platform to focus attention on human suffering around the globe, if only for a moment.

So now is our moment to put a spotlight on the situation in northern Uganda. The situation has been explained by both the gentlewoman from California and the gentlewoman from Florida so I will not duplicate what they have said.

My sincere hope is that H. Con. Res. 80 will help bring peace to the ravaged region of northern Uganda. Specifically, this bill calls on the Government of Uganda and the LRA to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda and to sustain the vital peace talks that are now ongoing. It also urges immediate and substantial support for the ongoing peace process from the United States and the international community.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy in Darfur rightfully has been receiving a great deal of attention as of late, but to the southeast of that region, another tragedy has been developing for nearly two decades. More than 200,000 Ugandans have died from the violence and disease brought about by the conflict between the Ugandan Government and the LRA.

Almost 2 million people have been displaced from their homes and villages, having been forced to flee the violence. What is particularly disgusting about this conflict is the forced recruitment of children by the LRA. As many as 38,000 children have been abducted. The boys are turned into killing machines and the girls into sex slaves.

Former U.N. Under Secretary General Jan Egeland has called the crisis in northern Uganda “the biggest forgotten, neglected humanitarian emergency in the world today.”

Today, with the passage of H. Con. Res. 80, I hope to take a small step toward changing this unfortunate truth, and I respectfully ask that my colleagues support the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, having personally visited Uganda in April 2006, I chaired a hearing on the endangered children of northern Uganda for the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations. We heard from a number of witnesses and we raised it and continue to raise it with the administration.

But one of our witnesses was a particularly noteworthy person, Grace Akallo. Grace is, or was, a child soldier, an abducted young girl, who was totally mistreated by the Lord’s Resistance Army. She was turned into a child soldier. And just a couple of days ago, announced her new book called “Child Soldier” which makes chilling reading for anybody who wants to know what really goes on in northern Uganda, and how crazed Joseph Kony

and his people are; and how, as the distinguished gentleman said just a moment ago, they turn girls into sex slaves and killers and the young men into killing machines. It is a terrible, horrible indictment on how low the individual can sink to.

And Joseph Kony, as we all know, has been indicted by the International Criminal Court for serious crimes against humanity. And, regrettably, this killing continues to go on.

I urge Members to read the book. It is an awakening not just on how she suffered, but also how a person when surrounded by people who love her and give her the kind of support that any individual like herself needs to get, how they can come back, the resiliency of the human spirit. She is a soft-spoken, poised, gentle, lovely young woman who has a great future, but she has been through a nightmare. We ought to keep her and her friends in our prayers.

She also pointed out just last week in a meeting that we had announcing her book that she cries out and prays every day for her friends, many of whom she does not know what happened to them. They are still there, she thinks. They may be dead. But she has no idea. I think that puts additional impetus on us to do more, to save these children, this lost generation.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 20 years as many as 1.5 million persons, an estimated 90 percent of the population of the Acholi area in northern Uganda have been forced into internally displaced camps as a result of the violence between the Lord's Resistance Army and the Government of Uganda. Nearly half of these internally displaced persons are children under the age of 15, people like Grace Akallo.

One quarter of the children in northern Uganda over 10 years of age have lost one or more parents. About a quarter of a million children receive no education at all. The fact that 60 percent of the schools in northern Uganda no longer function is directly attributable to the war. I point out that those that do function do so in a very meager way.

Because of the war in the north, Uganda has developed a lost generation that has grown up in dire circumstances with fear and deprivation as their constant companions. Nearly half of the children in one town are stunted from malnutrition. They are likely to never recover.

The latest 2006 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices summarized in a chilling fashion the horror that has been perpetrated on the people of northern Uganda, particularly by the head of the Lord's Resistance Army, Joseph Kony. It states that "at the height of the war, the LRA, led by Joseph Kony, committed serious abuses and atrocities, including abduction, rape and the killing of civilians. The LRA used children as soldiers, held children and others in slave-like conditions, and subjected female captives to

rape and other forms of severe sexual exploitation."

This resolution tries to put additional focus, additional girth, behind the effort to finally find a negotiated solution to this ongoing killing fields, and we all hope and pray this will have at least a happier ending than thus far.

Again, I urge Members to read the book by Grace Akallo, "Girl Soldier."

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 80, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution calling on the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda by engaging in good-faith negotiations, and urging immediate and substantial support for the ongoing peace process from the United States and the international community."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTING KILLINGS OF DOZENS OF INDEPENDENT JOURNALISTS IN RUSSIA AND CALLING ON RUSSIAN PRESIDENT TO AUTHORIZE COOPERATION WITH OUTSIDE INVESTIGATORS

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 151) noting the disturbing pattern of killings of dozens of independent journalists in Russia over the last decade, and calling on Russian President Vladimir Putin to authorize cooperation with outside investigators in solving those murders, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 151

Whereas Paul Klebnikov, the editor of the Russian version of Forbes Magazine, who was investigating suspect business dealings and corruption cases in Russia, was shot to death in Moscow on July 9, 2004;

Whereas Mr. Klebnikov's murder remains unsolved;

Whereas Anna Politkovskaya, an acclaimed Russian journalist and human rights activist who wrote numerous articles critical of Russia's prosecution of the war in Chechnya, of human rights abuses by the Russian government and of Russian President Vladimir Putin was shot to death in Moscow on October 7, 2006;

Whereas Ms. Politkovskaya's murder remains unsolved;

Whereas Ivan Safronov, a military affairs reporter for the Russian newspaper

"Kommersant" who wrote articles criticizing the failure of Russian military programs and who was planning to report on potential Russian arms sales to Middle Eastern countries, including to state sponsors of terrorism Iran and Syria, died in mysterious circumstances, falling five stories from a window in the stairwell of his apartment building in Moscow on March 2, 2007;

Whereas, Russian prosecutors subsequently suggested that Mr. Safronov may have committed suicide, although he left no suicide note and the circumstances surrounding his death raised unanswered questions;

Whereas the cause of Mr. Safronov's death remains undetermined;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, twenty-one reporters have been murdered in Russia since March 2000 and many of those murders remain unsolved;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, Russia was one of the six most dangerous countries for journalists to work in during 2006;

Whereas a number of those reporters who were murdered had reported on alleged corruption, malfeasance and other controversies at the federal, provincial and local levels of government in Russia;

Whereas a number of those murdered had reported on alleged human rights abuses by the Russian Government;

Whereas a number of those murdered had reported on the Russian government's conduct of the war in Chechnya, which has involved numerous allegations of gross human rights violations and corruption;

Whereas, if journalists are killed or silenced through undue pressure with impunity, a vibrant and participatory civil society sector cannot emerge and democratic developments are stalled; and

Whereas, according to the President of the International News Safety Institute, "murder has become the easiest, cheapest and most effective way of silencing troublesome reporting, and the more the killers get away with it the more the spiral of death is forced upwards": Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recalls the essential role that transparency and the free flow of information play in creating and preserving democratic institutions and civil society in any country;

(2) recognizes the vital contribution made by independent journalists in Russia in bringing transparency and a free flow of information to readers after decades of Communist censorship and repression;

(3) notes the disturbing trend of murders of independent journalists in Russia over the last decade;

(4) encourages the President of the United States to formally offer Russian President Vladimir Putin and other officials of the Russian Government United States Government law enforcement investigative assistance to help identify and bring to justice those responsible for the many unsolved murders of journalists in Russia during the past decade; and

(5) urges President Putin to seek out competent, outside law enforcement assistance in the investigation of the unsolved murders of numerous independent journalists in Russia.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1730

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would like to commend our distinguished colleague Mr. CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey for introducing this important resolution that emphasizes the vital necessity of free speech in a democratic state. Often people consider freedom of speech as just icing on the cake of a society that treats its citizenry well. It's a nice touch but not the most essential component.

But let me be clear, freedom of the press is not just a bourgeois middle class concern. It is not just an American concern. It is the essential component of democracy, as much as in Russia as anywhere else.

Freedom of the press sharpens the tools of democracy and holds a government's feet to the fire. It is the only real way to inform the people about their own country and mobilizing them around crucial issues.

Nowhere is this more important than in Russia, where nascent independent press formed in the early 1990s had suddenly dissipated under fear of government reprisal. It is no mistake that this decline has been accompanied by a simultaneous acquiescence of democratic opposition in the country.

The threat to reporters writing about government decisions and engaging in investigative journalism is immediate and real. It has reached the point that journalists in Russia that dare to criticize the government are constantly looking over their shoulders in fear.

According to Reporters Without Borders, 21 reporters have been murdered under mysterious circumstances since Putin took office in March of 2000. Almost all of those mysteries remain unsolved because the Putin government refuses to investigate fully and honestly.

In the case that has led to perhaps the greatest outcry, Anna Politkovskaya was shot to death in the elevator bank of her apartment building in Moscow. She and her family had feared for her life ever since she emerged as an acclaimed journalist and human rights activist. She wrote numerous articles critical of Kremlin human rights abuses and misdeeds in Chechnya, and she paid the highest price for it.

Paul Klebnikov, the editor of the Russian version of Forbes magazine, investigated suspect business dealings and was subsequently shot to death in Moscow.

Ivan Safronov, a military affairs reporter who criticized the failure of Russian military programs, died in mysterious circumstances after falling five stories from a window in his apartment building.

These three deaths, as well as the tragic loss of many of their brave colleagues, remain unresolved. It appears that the Russian government, which is led by a former KGB colonel, somehow no longer knows how to investigate such crimes. I find that awfully curious.

We cannot allow this repression, this silencing of an independent media, to continue, especially in a country with a nascent democracy and starved for objective information.

There was a fleeting moment in Russia in the early 1990s when an independent media flourished and new publications cropped up overnight. Now, the brave critical journalists who remain cower in fear.

So I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, which highlights the disturbing trend of these suspicious deaths in Russia. It stresses the importance of a free flow of information to a democratic society, and praises the courageous men and women who seek to bring transparency to the Russian people after so many years of Communist secrecy.

Finally, it calls on President Putin to seek outside help in investigating these unsolved crimes and on the United States Government to formally offer such assistance.

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

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

I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 151, introduced by my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

As the gentlewoman from California has pointed out, Mr. Speaker, this important resolution deals with a strange and quite troubling pattern of the killing of independent journalists in Russia over the past decade. We have different estimates, but one places the number of murdered reporters at 21 over the past 7 years, that estimate coming from the esteemed organization, Reporters Without Borders. Another estimate from the International News Safety Institute puts the number at close to 90 reporters killed in Russia over the past 11 years.

Now what is truly strange is that most of these murders remain unsolved. Many of the murdered journalists have made it their personal cause to investigate corruption and the abuse of power at all levels of the Russian government.

Perhaps many of our colleagues will recall how just a few weeks ago a brave Russian reporter was shot in the head on a street in Moscow. She had written articles criticizing the Russian government for its human rights abuses. Her murder remains unsolved.

Perhaps our colleagues will recall the more recent death of a reporter who died in March of this year, as the gentlewoman pointed out, falling five stories from a window in the stairway of his apartment building. He was a military affairs reporter who had criticized the Russian Government in his articles, and he had been planning to publish a report on the arms sales of Russia to the state sponsors of terror, Iran and Syria.

All of these seekers of truth did not deserve to die for their journalistic efforts. Bringing to justice the murderers of these reporters does deserve the strongest possible support of their government, their police, their prosecutors, and yet it appears to be strangely absent.

Mr. Speaker, a free and democratic society requires freedom of the press, freedom of the media and respect for the safety of those who at times risk their lives to uncover the truth. Russia will not be a free and democratic society until that is the case in their country.

We can and we should ask the Russian government to stand up in defense of its independent media and the safety of its reporters, but the unwillingness of the Russian government to solve so many of these murders and the successful efforts of the Kremlin to use state-owned or influenced companies to buy up and censor the Russian media shows that our voices may be falling on willingly deaf ears.

Nevertheless, that is what we should do. We should call on the Russian government to respect human rights and the rule of law by investigating these crimes with vigor and with sincerity. And that is the message, Mr. Speaker, of the resolution before us.

This resolution also calls on our President to specifically offer our assistance to help the Russian government investigate those crimes.

We should also ask the Russian president to seek out and accept competent outside law enforcement assistance to investigate these crimes, and this resolution calls for that.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we recognize the tremendous contributions made by independent journalists in Russia, most especially those who suffer a bitter death as an unjust reward for their efforts. It is critical that we condemn in the strongest possible form the brutal murders of those who died trying to bring accurate and honest information to the Russian people about what is happening in their country.

I urge my colleagues to support Mr. SMITH's resolution to honor these intrepid reporters whose murders cry out for justice.

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

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

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

the author of this resolution, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding, and I want to thank Ambassador WATSON for being one of the co-sponsors of this resolution, as well as all of those who join us today in making this collective statement to the Russians that there needs to be significant change, a reform, as to how they treat journalists.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 151, a resolution which calls upon Russian President Putin to seek outside law enforcement assistance in investigating the unsolved murders of dozens of Russian journalists over the past decade. We also encourage President Bush to formally offer President Putin law enforcement assistance from the United States.

Most observers think, Mr. Speaker, that some Russian officials have ordered or at least connived at these murders since most of the murdered journalists were investigating government corruption or involvement in human rights abuses. There is good reason to think that people in high places are still protecting the murderers.

Mr. Speaker, Russia holds the second worst position in the world in the number of journalists killed in the last 10 years, according to the International News Safety Institute. Reporters Without Borders counts 21 murdered journalists since March of 2000. This is a conservative number. It does not include the death under extremely suspicious circumstances of Ivan Safronov. It does include the murders of Paul Klebnikov and Anna Politkovskaya.

Mr. Speaker, any Member can do this, do a Google search, put in Russian journalists and murders, and you come up with one headline after another and one news story after another, usually in the Western press, of individuals being killed.

On June 15, there was a headline, "Russian Journalist Attacked in Moscow"; May of 2005, "Radio Journalist Badly Beaten Up"; April 21, "Russian Reporters Get Beaten Despite Wearing Special Jackets"; April 20, "Russian Activists Skeptical About Special Clothing For Journalists At Protests," they've got to wear special clothing, protective gear, to protect them from the police; April 9, "Television Journalist Found Dead"; April 9, again, "Critical Television Journalist Fears For His Life"; "Photo Journalist Beaten, Injured", on April 5; "Journalist Assaulted During Demonstration"; and the list goes on and on and on. Sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I see a pattern, and I think other Members do as well.

Let me just say a brief word about the three journalists that all three of us are mentioning today, also delineated in the resolution, whose deaths are sadly illustrative of so many others.

Paul Klebnikov was the editor of the Russian edition of Forbes Magazine. In July 2004, he was shot to death in Moscow while investigating suspect business dealings and corruption cases.

Anna Politkovskaya was an award-winning Russian journalist and human rights activist. She wrote many articles criticizing Russian atrocities committed during the war in Chechnya. In October 2006, she was shot to death in Moscow.

Ivan Savronov reported for the Russian newspaper, Kommersant. He wrote articles criticizing the failure of Russian military programs and was planning to report on potential Russian arms sales to Iran and Syria, state sponsors of terrorism. In March of 2007, he died under suspicious circumstances, as has been recounted by both of my colleagues. He fell five stories from a window in the stairwell of his Moscow apartment building. That was no accident, Mr. Speaker. That was a murder.

None of these cases have been solved, and very few of the less famous cases have been even looked at in a meaningful way.

Many of my colleagues in this House have other concerns about human rights problems in Russia. Xenophobic violence continues throughout the Russian Federation.

□ 1745

People continue to disappear in Chechnya. Local officials still discriminate against non-Orthodox religion, and the rule of just law remains shaky. Of course we all care about these. But I would point out to you that a situation in which journalists can be killed with impunity is a human rights problem of a different order.

It is a human rights problem that mitigates the resolution of other human rights problems. When journalists investigating a corruption case or a human rights abuse can be killed without their killers being brought to justice, or without a convincing effort being made to do so, this intimidates and has a chilling effect on other journalists. It marks off the borders of what others know they must not investigate.

As a result, the Russian press cannot properly fulfill its function of holding officials to account. This is exactly what the killers intend.

I raised this issue recently at a hearing of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. I was glad when Daniel Freed, Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, acknowledged the nature of the problem and said, "attacks on journalists, including the brutal and still unsolved murders of Paul Klebnikov and Anna Politkovskaya, among others, chill and deter the fourth estate."

Mr. Speaker, journalists fulfill an essential role in every society, and none more than those who uncover the theft of a country's assets by its elected officials or commit human rights outrages

in its name. Journalists who do this at risk of their lives fully deserve to be called heroes. Make no mistake about it. These journalists knew what they were risking as they wrote and wrote and used the power of the pen to expose.

We owe it to them to raise our voice to bring the killers to justice. Mr. Putin, sadly, does not seem to be making any serious efforts to do so. Unfortunately, we have the situation as it exists today in Russia.

Only when journalists can work without fear of intimidation and death will we be able to say that we have a truly democratic Russian Government. Russian journalists, they are the watch dogs, just as they are in this country and every other country.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the great conscience of Russia, said in his Nobel Peace Prize speech in 1970, "Any man who has once proclaimed violence as his method is inevitably forced to take the lie as his principle."

My resolution addresses the violence of the murder of independent journalists, and the lie in the claim that their murders have been seriously investigated. Solzhenitsyn said of Communist Russia, in our country, the lie has become not just a moral category, but a killer of the state. We have to ask ourselves and ask Mr. Putin, was this terrible statement also true of post-Communist Russia?

I think we send a clear message today, and I hope Members in a bipartisan way will support this.

Finally, I just want to thank Mark Milosch and Mark Gauge for their work in helping to put this resolution together.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 151, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING OVER 200 YEARS OF SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 233) recognizing over 200 years of sovereignty of the Principality of Liechtenstein, and expressing support for efforts by the United States to continue to strengthen its relationship with that country, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 233

Whereas in 1806, Napoleon dissolved the Holy Roman Empire and Liechtenstein became a sovereign country;

Whereas Liechtenstein is nestled between Switzerland and Austria in the Upper Rhine valley of the European Alps, and is one of only two doubly landlocked countries in the world;

Whereas Liechtenstein has approximately 35,000 inhabitants, primarily Roman Catholics of German ethnicity;

Whereas Liechtenstein maintains a strong system of checks and balances between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government;

Whereas Liechtenstein is a constitutional hereditary monarchy, whose powers were expanded through a popular referendum in March 2004 in which 64 percent of citizens approved a new constitution;

Whereas the parliament of Liechtenstein, the "Landtag", consists of 25 representatives elected for four year terms by proportional representation in two multi-seat constituencies, 10 representing the lowland area and 15 representing the highland area;

Whereas after World War II, on the basis of Liechtenstein's advantageous corporate tax laws and its Customs Union with Switzerland, an industrial upswing transformed Liechtenstein from a poor agricultural state to a modern society;

Whereas despite its small geographic area and limited natural resources, Liechtenstein has a prosperous, highly industrialized, free-enterprise economy with manufacturing as its leading economic sector, complemented by a robust financial sector;

Whereas Liechtenstein has been a member of the European Economic Area since May 1995 and is working to harmonize its economic policies more closely with the European Union;

Whereas Liechtenstein companies have a considerable manufacturing, sales and service presence in the United States, which has resulted in the creation of over 4500 jobs;

Whereas since 1999, the United States has been the most important export market for members of the Liechtenstein Chamber of Commerce and Industry, totaling \$521,000,000 in 2005;

Whereas the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty between the United States and the Principality of Liechtenstein, which entered into force in August of 2003, has resulted in an enhanced pursuit of criminals and terrorists;

Whereas in cooperation with the United States-led coalition after the fall of Saddam Hussein in 2003, Liechtenstein froze assets of the former Iraqi regime, which resulted, among other things, in the return of a Falcon Jet 50 to the Iraqi people;

Whereas in collaboration with experts from the United States, the Liechtenstein Institute on Self-Determination at Princeton University seeks to raise awareness about issues pertaining to self-determination, self-governance and sovereignty through teaching, research and publications;

Whereas Liechtenstein abolished its military in 1868 and has exercised neutrality in its foreign affairs; and

Whereas Liechtenstein is an active member in international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes over 200 years of sovereignty of the Principality of Liechtenstein; and

(2) expresses its support for efforts by the United States to continue to strengthen its relationship with that country.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I would first like to commend our distinguished colleague, Mr. CLIFF STEARNS of Florida, for introducing this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today in strong support for this measure, which recognizes over 200 years of sovereignty of Liechtenstein and supports efforts by the United States to strengthen and further its relationships with this country. Liechtenstein may be small in size, but it is big in stature.

Just square 62 miles and nestled in the heart of Europe between Switzerland and Austria, it boasts 35,000 inhabitants, a strong democratic government and a constitutional hereditary monarchy. Its mountain landscapes have made it renowned as one of the most beautiful countries in Europe. The country punches well above its weight in its contributions to the global banking and financial sectors.

In just the last 60 years, it has developed from a mainly agrarian society to one of the most highly industrialized countries in the world. Indeed, its economic growth should serve as the model for the potential of all small countries. It has become a strong economic partner for the United States, which has been the largest export market for Liechtenstein over the past 10 years.

In addition, Liechtenstein-based companies have created over 4,500 jobs in the United States, mainly in manufacturing, sales and service. Given the celebration last year of Liechtenstein's 200 years of sovereignty, it is fitting that the House pass this resolution to pay tribute to the country's democratic tradition and prosperity.

Furthermore, in recognition of the important partnership between the United States and Liechtenstein in the areas of politics, economics and security, this resolution calls on the United States to strengthen and further its relationship with Liechtenstein.

I strongly support this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to rise in support of House Resolution 233 authored by my good friend from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) that recognizes the more than 200 years of sovereignty of Liechtenstein. With the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire 200 years ago, Liechtenstein became an independent state.

Since then, it has evolved as both a constitutional monarchy and a parliamentary democracy. With a population of only about 34,000 people, we cannot expect Liechtenstein to take a leading role in international affairs, but it is an important ally in the cause of supporting and promoting democracy and, despite its small size, it has an importance for the United States that exceeds its geographical reach.

Exports are a major factor in the success of Liechtenstein's economy, and that outward-looking approach to commerce with the rest of the world has made it an important economic partner for the United States, creating almost 5,000 jobs here in the United States and achieving over half a billion dollars in exports to the American market in the year 2005 alone.

At home, in Europe, while it is not a member of the European Union, Liechtenstein is very closely aligned with the economic policies of that important organization and works to harmonize its economic policy very closely with it.

In the international arena, this small nation participates as a full partner in the United Nations, as well as in various critical international forums such as the World Trade Organization and the International Court of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote for this resolution by Mr. STEARNS of Florida, which expresses our support for a continued strengthening of our relationships with Liechtenstein.

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

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the author of this resolution, Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

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

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my distinguished ranking member and my good friend from Florida and also the chairwoman of the subcommittee. I appreciate your words that you said earlier, and I think you succinctly outlined why this resolution is so important, and I compliment you on your speech.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, if you heard the word "Liechtenstein," and you didn't know anything about this resolution, and you were out on the street and you were talking to people,

and you said to them, what does the word Liechtenstein mean to you, there would probably be a number of things they would say. But I'll bet you one of the things they would say is it sounds like a word of integrity. It sounds like a word of idealism. It sounds like a word of responsibility, and it sounds like a word of charm.

I have been there. It's a very charming country, it's a very responsible country, it's an independent country, and it's a country that represents idealism, much as the gentle lady from California has talked about when she mentioned that this country had been very responsible.

As mentioned, it's 34,000 people. It's a small nation, and accomplishes far more as mentioned earlier in social, political and financial influence than its small size would indicate. Nestled between Switzerland and Austria in the European Alps, Liechtenstein has established a stable and growing democracy, the type of government that we can all be proud of.

For over 200 years it has maintained a constitutional monarchy with a vibrant Parliament that employs a strong system, and this is what we believe in in a republic system of government checks and balances. Along with myself and other colleagues, we have had the privilege of visiting Liechtenstein. On several occasions I was introduced to its fascinating history and the people and its commitment to freedom during the last centuries.

The Liechtenstein family of Austria was given the rights to the land in 1713, and the area gained the status of an independent principality of the Holy Roman Empire in 1719 under the name Liechtenstein. When, in 1806, Napoleon defeated the Holy Roman Empire, the conquered Emperor made Liechtenstein a sovereign country.

Now, my colleagues, unfortunately, the people of Liechtenstein were not granted the full rights and liberties that come with this sovereignty. As under Napoleon, the French occupied the country for the next several years. However, in 1815, within the new German Confederation, Liechtenstein regained its full independence.

This country has a long history of diplomacy and peaceful relationships with its neighbors. In 1868, after the Confederation dissolved, Liechtenstein disbanded its army of 80 men and declared its permanent neutrality which, amazingly, was respected throughout both World War I and World War II. That is a feat of diplomacy.

In 1989, Prince Hans Adam II succeeded his father to the throne. Then 10 years ago, Prince Adam accomplished a diplomatic feat by settling a 60-year long dispute with Russia over the Liechtenstein's family archives, which had been confiscated during the Soviet occupation of Vienna in 1945 and later moved all to Russia, more specifically, to Moscow.

After World War II, Liechtenstein became increasingly important as a fi-

ancial center. In 1978, this country became a member of the Council of Europe and joined the European Free Trade Association, the EFTA, in 1991. Liechtenstein has been a member of the European Economic Area since May of 1995, and is continuing to work to harmonize its economic policies more closely with the European Union every day.

One of Liechtenstein's most industrious resources is its people. It invested much effort in education, and this is something we can all be proud of and respect, they boast a literacy rate of 100 percent.

□ 1800

The United States and Liechtenstein have enjoyed a positive relationship for many, many years. In 2002, Liechtenstein and the U.S. signed a mutual legal assistance treaty which focused largely on jointly combating money laundering and other illegal banking activities. In addition, from the beginning of the global war on terror, this country took the initiative and has been a valuable and proactive partner in tracking down the finances of international terrorist groups.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the dangerous world we live in today. In the years following the dreadful attack of September 11, we have been honored by the support and compassion of our friends around the world. We appreciate that.

While it is necessary and just to condemn countries for the threat they pose, I believe it is equally important and vital to honor countries for the support that they provide to us. Liechtenstein is one of those countries whose contribution should be recognized. For these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to take a closer look at the unique nation of Liechtenstein and join with me this afternoon in honoring this wonderful country. And my hat's off to them, and I urge passage of the resolution.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the tiny principality of Liechtenstein has survived and thrived as an independent and sovereign nation for over 200 years, ever since Napoleon dissolved the Holy Roman Empire in 1806. And I rise today in support of a resolution commemorating their independence and their friendship toward the United States.

Like my home state of Texas, Liechtenstein has worked hard to diversify its economy, keeping its important agricultural markets intact while embracing the industrial and financial services sectors, clearly for its immeasurable good.

Small in territory, Liechtenstein boasts an unemployment rate of only 1.3 percent and some of the lowest tax rates in Europe. Every day, the country's population swells to double its normal size, as citizens from the surrounding countries of Austria, Switzerland and Germany join the hardworking natives at work. And those that live and work in Liechtenstein enjoy one of the highest standards of living in the world.

Liechtenstein is also, of course, a great friend to the United States and to democracy.

I have invited the Ambassador of Liechtenstein, Ms. Fristche, to visit my district and observe for herself the pride Texans have in their own country and of course, the unique balance of our own economy—the rice fields planted right up against the oil refineries.

I hope she takes me up on the offer.

That's just the way it is.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the sovereign nation of Liechtenstein is home to 34,000 people and is the size of Washington, DC. Yet this tiny nation accomplishes far more in social, political and financial influence than its size would indicate. Nestled between Switzerland and Austria in the European Alps, Liechtenstein has established a stable and growing democratic government. For over 200 years it has maintained a constitutional monarchy with a vibrant parliament that employs a strong system of checks and balances.

I, along with many of my colleagues, have had the privilege of visiting Liechtenstein on several occasions, and I was intrigued by its fascinating history and the people's commitment to freedom that has lasted for centuries. The Liechtenstein family of Austria were given the rights to the land in 1713, and the area gained the status of an independent principality of the Holy Roman Empire in 1719 under the name Liechtenstein. When, in 1806, Napoleon defeated the Holy Roman Empire, the conquered Emperor made Liechtenstein a sovereign country. Unfortunately, the people of Liechtenstein were not granted the full rights and liberties that come with sovereignty, as under Napoleon, the French occupied the country for the next few years. However, in 1815 within the new German Confederation, Liechtenstein regained its full independence.

Liechtenstein has a long history in diplomacy and peaceful relations with their neighbors. In 1868, after the Confederation dissolved, Liechtenstein disbanded its army of 80 men and declared its permanent neutrality, which amazingly was respected through both world wars. In 1989, Prince Hans Adam II succeeded his father to the throne. Ten years ago, Prince Adam accomplished a diplomatic feat by settling a 60-year-long dispute with Russia over the Liechtenstein family's archives, which had been confiscated during the Soviet occupation of Vienna in 1945 and later moved to Moscow.

After World War II, Liechtenstein became increasingly important as a financial center. In 1978, Liechtenstein became a member of the Council of Europe and joined the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) in 1991. Liechtenstein has been a member of the European Economic Area since May 1995 and is continuing to work to harmonize its economic policies more closely with the European Union. One of Liechtenstein's most industrious resources is its people. Liechtenstein has invested much effort in education, and now boasts a literacy rate of 100 percent.

The United States and Liechtenstein have enjoyed a positive relationship for many years. In 2002, Liechtenstein and the U.S. signed a mutual legal assistance treaty, which focused largely on jointly combating money laundering and other illegal banking activities. In addition, from the beginning of the global war on terror, Liechtenstein took the initiative and has been a valuable and proactive partner in tracking down the finances of international terrorist groups.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the dangerous world we live in. In the years following

the dreadful attacks of September 11, we have been honored by the support and compassion of our friends around the world. While it is necessary and just to condemn countries for the threat they pose, I believe it is equally vital to honor countries for the support they provide. Liechtenstein is one of these countries whose contribution should be recognized. For these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to take a closer look at the unique nation of Liechtenstein and join me in honoring their great accomplishments.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. STEARNS from Florida for offering the resolution before us. I hope our colleagues support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 233, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. STEARNS. 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.

SBA ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS ACT OF 2007

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2359) to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2359

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 “SBA Entrepreneurial Development Programs Act of 2007”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—REVISIONS TO SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

Sec. 101. Small Business Development Centers operational changes.

TITLE II—GRANT INITIATIVES

Sec. 201. Capital Access Initiative.

Sec. 202. Disaster Recovery Program.

Sec. 203. Innovation and Competitiveness Services to Manufacturers Initiative.

Sec. 204. Mature Entrepreneurs Assistance Program.

Sec. 205. Small Business Sustainability Initiative.

Sec. 206. Grants to small business development centers to provide assistance in securing affordable health insurance.

Sec. 207. National regulatory assistance.

Sec. 208. Report.

TITLE III—SCORE

Sec. 301. Repeal of Active Corporation of Executives.

Sec. 302. Increasing the proportion of SCORE volunteers from socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

Sec. 303. Benchmark reporting.

TITLE I—REVISIONS TO SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

SEC. 101. SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS OPERATIONAL CHANGES.

(a) ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 21(a)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the proviso, by inserting before “institution” the following: “accredited”;

(2) in the sentence beginning “The Administration shall”, by inserting before “institutions” the following: “accredited”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “As used in this paragraph, the term ‘accredited institution of higher education’ means an institution that is accredited as described in section 101(a)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)(5)).”

(b) PROGRAM NEGOTIATIONS.—Section 21(a)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(3)) is amended, in the matter before subparagraph (A), by inserting before “agreed” the following: “mutually”.

(c) CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS.—Section 21(a)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(3)(A)) is amended by inserting after “uniform negotiated” the following: “mutually agreed to”.

(d) NO SBA INTERFERENCE IN SBDC HIRING.—Section 21(c)(2)(A) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting after “full-time staff” the following: “, the hiring of which is carried out by the center without interference from, and without influence by, any officer or employee of the Administration.”

(e) CONTENT OF CONSULTATIONS COVERED BY PRIVACY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 21(a)(7)(A) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(7)(A)) is amended by inserting after “under this section” the following: “, or the content of any consultation with such an individual or small business concern.”

(f) REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO USE AUTHORIZED AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 21(a)(4)(C)(v) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(4)(C)(v)) is amended by amending subclause (I) to read as follows:

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts made available in any fiscal year to carry out this section, not more than \$500,000 may be used by the Administration to pay expenses enumerated in subparagraphs (B) through (D) of section 20(a)(1).”

(g) NO CAP ON NON-MATCHING PORTABILITY GRANTS IN THE EVENT OF A DISASTER.—Section 21(a)(4)(C)(viii) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(4)(C)(viii)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “However, in the event of a disaster, the dollar limitation in the preceding sentence does not apply.”

(h) DEFINITION OF SBDC.—Section 21(a) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section, a Small Business Development Center is—

“(A) the entity selected by the Administrator to receive funds pursuant to the funding formula set forth in paragraph (4); or

“(B) the site at which the services specified by this section are delivered.”

(i) LIMITATION ON DISTRIBUTION TO SBDCs.—Section 21(b) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 648(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) LIMITATION ON DISTRIBUTION TO SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this paragraph, the Administrator shall not distribute funds to a Small Business Development

Center if the State in which the Small Business Development Center is located is served by more than one Small Business Development Center. For purposes of this limitation, the term Small Business Development Center shall have the meaning set forth in subsection (a)(8).

“(B) UNAVAILABILITY EXCEPTION.—The Administrator may distribute funds to two Small Business Development Centers, as that term is defined in subsection (a)(8)(A), if no applicant has applied to serve the entire State. Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the Administrator is prohibited from distributing funds to more than two Small Business Development Centers.

“(C) GRANDFATHER CLAUSE.—The limitations in this paragraph shall not apply for any State in which more than one Small Business Development Center received funding prior to January 1, 2007.”

(j) REPORTING OF BROADBAND SERVICE PURCHASES.—Section 21(c) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) REPORTING OF BROADBAND SERVICE PURCHASES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to policies adopted by the Administrator, Small Business Development Centers shall report information to the Administrator by nine-digit zip code—

“(i) whether the individual seeking counseling purchases broadband service at the address reported to the Small Business Development Center;

“(ii) if the reported address is different than the business address, whether broadband service is purchased at the business address; and

“(iii) if broadband service is not purchased at the addresses set forth in clauses (i) and (ii).

“(B) REPORTING.—The Administrator shall aggregate data by nine-digit zip code reporting such information to the Federal Communications Commission and the National Telecommunication and Information Administration.”

TITLE II—GRANT INITIATIVES

SEC. 201. CAPITAL ACCESS INITIATIVE.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) CAPITAL ACCESS INITIATIVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A lead Small Business Development Center may apply for an additional grant to carry out a capital access initiative program.

“(2) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—Under a program under paragraph (1), the Center shall—

“(A) provide capital education by creating a model template to assist individuals in preparing for a broad range of capital offerings;

“(B) assess company potential by conducting company assessments, which shall include, at a minimum, risk analysis and mapping of best capital opportunities;

“(C) prepare individuals to request capital by advising on the various aspects of such a request, including the business plan, the financials, the projections, the presentation, and the approach;

“(D) provide education on the rules of access engagement, organizations involved and available, and approaches that maximize successful requests; and

“(E) deliver ongoing assistance once capital is secured.

“(3) SUPPORT.—In carrying out this subsection, the Administrator shall obtain support from national associations and from organizations such as regional development groups and ‘angel’ groups founded by Small Business Development Centers.

“(4) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Each grant under this subsection shall be for at least \$100,000.

“(5) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—No applicant may receive more than \$300,000 in grants under this subsection in a fiscal year.

“(6) FUNDING.—Subject to amounts approved in advance in appropriations Acts and separate from amounts approved to carry out section 21(a)(1), the Administrator may make grants or enter into cooperative agreements to carry out this subsection.”.

SEC. 202. DISASTER RECOVERY PROGRAM.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) DISASTER RECOVERY PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A lead Small Business Development Center may apply for an additional grant to carry out a disaster recovery program.

“(2) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—Under a program under paragraph (1), the Center shall—
“(A) serve, in partnership with the Administration’s disaster center response teams, as a locally based resource for first responders by—

“(i) rotating personnel into a disaster area for immediate response on the ground, processing applications, developing an evaluating recovery business models, and distributing accurate information; and

“(ii) providing continued interaction, over time, with businesses that are recovering from a disaster;

“(B) participate in ongoing national disaster training;

“(C) develop specific State-level disaster response plans; and

“(D) form a network with other Centers to serve as a platform for sharing disaster expertise, training, and human resources.

“(3) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Each grant under this subsection shall be for at least \$50,000.

“(4) FUNDING.—Subject to amounts approved in advance in appropriations Acts and separate from amounts approved to carry out section 21(a)(1), the Administrator may make grants or enter into cooperative agreements to carry out this subsection.”.

SEC. 203. INNOVATION AND COMPETITIVENESS SERVICES TO MANUFACTURERS INITIATIVE.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(p) INNOVATION AND COMPETITIVENESS SERVICES TO MANUFACTURERS INITIATIVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A lead Small Business Development Center may apply for an additional grant to carry out an innovation and competitiveness services to manufacturers initiative program.

“(2) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—Under a program under paragraph (1), the Center shall—

“(A) participate in national training institutes to provide training to all programs of the Center to assist those programs to qualify for technology accreditation designation;

“(B) develop, disseminate, and regularly update best practices ‘toolkits’ that include best practices for resources, training programs, consultative approaches, and support services;

“(C) recruit and engage significant local assets and resources (such as colleges, universities, economic development organizations, and trade associations) in each State;

“(D) launch nationally a locally based but common themed marketing program, targeted at small manufacturers;

“(E) undertake aggressive outreach to increase the levels of innovation and competitiveness, focusing on business advisement and training for manufacturers;

“(F) provide ongoing professional development to personnel of the Center and of other resource partners; and

“(G) develop and report performance, using common evaluation metrics and outcome measurements.

“(3) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Each grant under this subsection shall be for at least \$150,000.

“(4) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—A grant under this subsection may not exceed \$500,000.

“(5) FUNDING.—Subject to amounts approved in advance in appropriations Acts and separate from amounts approved to carry out section 21(a)(1), the Administrator may make grants or enter into cooperative agreements to carry out this subsection.”.

SEC. 204. MATURE ENTREPRENEURS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(q) MATURE ENTREPRENEURS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A lead Small Business Development Center may apply for an additional grant to carry out a mature entrepreneurs assistance program.

“(2) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—Under a program under paragraph (1), the Center shall—

“(A) provide advisors and training resources to assist business owners in recognizing and developing transition plans, including by—

“(i) providing training and educational screening processes on the potential benefits and hazards of self-employment; and

“(ii) developing courses, consulting processes, and highly targeted resource materials, and deploying them throughout the Small Business Development Center network;

“(B) link business owners with additional resource service providers to prepare businesses for transition, including by increasing partnership opportunities, particularly with the Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE);

“(C) identify business opportunities for those interested in acquiring businesses;

“(D) help individuals identify and acquire financing for acquisition; and

“(E) provide continuing support once transition has occurred.

“(3) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Each grant under this subsection shall be for at least \$175,000.

“(4) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—A grant under this subsection may not exceed \$350,000.

“(5) FUNDING.—Subject to amounts approved in advance in appropriations Acts and separate from amounts approved to carry out section 21(a)(1), the Administrator may make grants or enter into cooperative agreements to carry out this subsection.”.

SEC. 205. SMALL BUSINESS SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVE.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(r) SMALL BUSINESS SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A lead Small Business Development Center may apply for an additional grant to carry out a small business sustainability initiative program.

“(2) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—Under a program under paragraph (1), the Center shall—

“(A) provide necessary support to smaller and medium-sized businesses to—

“(i) evaluate energy efficiency and green building opportunities;

“(ii) understand the cost benefits of energy efficiency and green building opportunities;

“(iii) secure financing to achieve energy efficiency or to construct green buildings; and

“(iv) empower management to implement energy efficiency projects;

“(B) assist entrepreneurs with clean technology development and technology commercialization through—

“(i) technology assessment;

“(ii) intellectual property;

“(iii) Small Business Innovation Research submissions;

“(iv) strategic alliances;

“(v) business model development; and

“(vi) preparation for investors; and

“(C) help small business improve environmental performance by shifting to less hazardous materials and reducing waste and emissions at the source, including by providing assistance for businesses to adapt the materials they use, the processes they operate, and the products and services they produce.

“(3) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Each grant under this subsection shall be for at least \$150,000.

“(4) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—A grant under this subsection may not exceed \$300,000.

“(5) FUNDING.—Subject to amounts approved in advance in appropriations Acts and separate from amounts approved to carry out section 21(a)(1), the Administrator may make grants or enter into cooperative agreements to carry out this subsection.”.

SEC. 206. GRANTS TO SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE IN SECURING AFFORDABLE HEALTH INSURANCE.

(a) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration (hereafter in this section referred to as the Administrator) may award a grant under this section to a lead small business development center (as described under section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648)).

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—A recipient of a grant under this section shall use the grant only for the purpose of providing to the owner of a small business concern assistance in identifying and securing affordable health insurance for their business and employees. A recipient of such a grant shall identify Federal, State, and local initiatives designed to assist small businesses and provide such education information to small business concerns seeking assistance on obtaining health insurance. A recipient of such a grant shall also work with health insurance providers in the area to identify premiums charged on health insurance for small business. A recipient of such a grant shall also attempt to negotiate lower health insurance premiums for small business concerns that seek the assistance of the recipient.

(c) MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNT.—A grant under this section may not be in an amount less than \$200,000.

(d) APPLICATION.—Each applicant for a grant under this section shall submit to the Administrator an application in such form as the Administrator may require. The application shall include information regarding the applicant’s goals and objectives for helping address entrepreneur’s concerns with health insurance costs.

(e) REPORT TO ADMINISTRATOR.—As a condition of receiving a grant under this section, the Administrator shall require the recipient of a grant to submit to the Administrator, not later than 18 months after the date on which the grant is received, a report describing how the grant funds were used.

(f) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS.—The Administrator may enter into a cooperative agreement or contract with the recipient of a grant under this section to provide additional assistance that furthers the purposes of this section.

(g) APPLICABILITY OF GRANT REQUIREMENTS.—An applicant for a grant under this section shall comply with all of the requirements applicable to a grantee under section 21 of the Small Business Act, except that the matching funds requirements of such section shall not apply.

(h) EVALUATION OF PROGRAM.—Not later than March 31, 2009, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report that contains an

evaluation of the grant program under this section.

(i) FUNDING.—Subject to amounts approved in advance in appropriations Acts and separate from amounts approved to carry out section 21(a)(1), the Administrator may make grants or enter into cooperative agreements to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 207. NATIONAL REGULATORY ASSISTANCE.

The Small Business Act is amended by inserting after section 21 (15 U.S.C. 648) the following:

“SEC. 21A. SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY ASSISTANCE.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) ASSOCIATION.—The term ‘Association’ means the association recognized by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration under section 21(a)(3)(A).

“(2) PARTICIPATING SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—The term ‘participating Small Business Development Center’ means a Small Business Development Center participating in the program.

“(3) PROGRAM.—The term ‘program’ means the regulatory assistance program established under this section.

“(4) REGULATORY COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE.—The term ‘regulatory compliance assistance’ means assistance provided by a Small Business Development Center to a small business concern to enable the concern to comply with Federal regulatory requirements.

“(5) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—The term ‘Small Business Development Center’ means a lead Small Business Development Center described in section 21.

“(6) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

“(b) AUTHORITY.—In accordance with this section, the Administrator shall establish a program to provide regulatory compliance assistance to small business concerns through selected Small Business Development Centers, the Association of Small Business Development Centers, and Federal compliance partnership programs.

“(c) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program, the Administrator shall enter into arrangements with selected Small Business Development Centers under which such Centers shall provide—

“(A) access to information and resources, including current Federal and State non-punitive compliance and technical assistance programs similar to those established under section 507 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7661f);

“(B) training and educational activities;

“(C) confidential, free-of-charge, one-on-one, in-depth counseling to the owners and operators of small business concerns regarding compliance with Federal and State regulations, as long as such counseling is not considered to be the practice of law in a State in which a Small Business Development Center is located or in which such counseling is conducted;

“(D) technical assistance;

“(E) referrals to experts and other providers of compliance assistance who meet such standards for educational, technical, and professional competency as are established by the Administrator; and

“(F) access to the Internet and training on Internet use, including the use of the Internet website established by the Administrator under subsection (d)(1)(C).

“(2) REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each selected Small Business Development Center shall transmit

to the Administrator a quarterly report that includes—

“(i) a summary of the regulatory compliance assistance provided by the center under the program; and

“(ii) any data and information obtained by the center from a Federal agency regarding regulatory compliance that the agency intends to be disseminated to small business concerns.

“(B) ELECTRONIC FORM.—Each report required under subparagraph (A) shall be transmitted in electronic form.

“(C) INTERIM REPORTS.—A participating Small Business Development Center may transmit to the Administrator such interim reports as the Center considers appropriate.

“(D) LIMITATION ON DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall not require a Small Business Development Center to disclose the name or address of any small business concern that received or is receiving assistance under the program, except that the Administrator shall require such a disclosure if ordered to do so by a court in any civil or criminal action.

“(d) DATA REPOSITORY AND CLEARINGHOUSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program, the Administrator shall—

“(A) act as the repository of and clearinghouse for data and information submitted by Small Business Development Centers;

“(B) submit to the President, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives an annual report that includes—

“(i) a description of the types of assistance provided by participating Small Business Development Centers under the program;

“(ii) data regarding the number of small business concerns that contacted participating Small Business Development Centers regarding assistance under the program;

“(iii) data regarding the number of small business concerns assisted by participating Small Business Development Centers under the program;

“(iv) data and information regarding outreach activities conducted by participating Small Business Development Centers under the program, including any activities conducted in partnership with Federal agencies;

“(v) data and information regarding each case known to the Administrator in which one or more Small Business Development Centers offered conflicting advice or information regarding compliance with a Federal or State regulation to one or more small business concerns;

“(vi) any recommendations for improvements in the regulation of small business concerns; and

“(vii) a list of regulations identified by the Administrator, after consultation with the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Administration, who shall review such list, and the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman, as being most burdensome to small business concerns, and recommendations to reduce or eliminate the burdens of such regulations; and

“(C) establish an Internet website that—

“(i) provides access to Federal, State, academic, and industry association Internet websites containing industry-specific regulatory compliance information that the Administrator deems potentially useful to small businesses attempting to comply with Federal regulations; and

“(ii) arranges such Internet websites in industry-specific categories.

“(e) REVIEW OF BURDENSOME REGULATIONS AND PETITION FOR AGENCY REVIEW.—

“(1) TRANSMISSION OF LIST OF REGULATIONS TO CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY.—The Administrator shall transmit to the Chief

Counsel for Advocacy of the Administration a copy of the list of regulations submitted under subsection (d)(1)(B) as part of the annual report required by that subsection.

“(2) REVIEW OF LIST OF REGULATIONS.—The Chief Counsel for Advocacy shall review the list of regulations transmitted under paragraph (1) and identify any regulation that—

“(A) is eligible for review in accordance with section 610 of title 5, United States Code;

“(B) has a significant impact on a substantial number of small business concerns that is substantially different from the impact indicated in the final regulatory flexibility analysis for that regulation, as published with the final regulation in the Federal Register; or

“(C) has a significant impact on a substantial number of small business concerns and for which no final regulatory flexibility analysis was ever performed.

“(3) NOTIFICATION AND AGENCY REVIEW.—With respect to any regulation identified under paragraph (2) the Chief Counsel for Advocacy shall—

“(A) notify the appropriate Federal rule-making agency and the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management of the identification of such rule or regulation; and

“(B) request the review of such regulation—

“(i) in accordance with section 610 of title 5, United States Code; or

“(ii) for any impact it has on small business concerns.

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Chief Counsel for Advocacy shall publish an annual report containing a list of any regulation identified under paragraph (2) and the disposition by the appropriate agency.

“(f) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A Small Business Development Center shall be eligible to receive assistance under the program only if the center is certified under section 21(k)(2).

“(2) WAIVER.—With respect to a Small Business Development Center seeking assistance under the program, the Administrator may waive the certification requirement set forth in paragraph (1) if the Administrator determines that the center is making a good faith effort to obtain such certification.

“(g) SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING STATE PROGRAMS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—In consultation with the Association and giving substantial weight to the Association’s recommendations, the Administrator shall select the Small Business Development Center programs of 2 States from each of the following groups of States to participate in the program:

“(A) Group 1: Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Vermont, and Rhode Island.

“(B) Group 2: New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

“(C) Group 3: Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and Delaware.

“(D) Group 4: Georgia, Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

“(E) Group 5: Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

“(F) Group 6: Texas, New Mexico, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana.

“(G) Group 7: Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas.

“(H) Group 8: Colorado, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Utah.

“(I) Group 9: California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, and Arizona.

“(J) Group 10: Washington, Alaska, Idaho, and Oregon.

“(2) DEADLINE FOR INITIAL SELECTIONS.—The Administrator shall make selections under paragraph (1) not later than 60 days after promulgation of regulations under subsection (k).

“(3) ADDITIONAL SELECTIONS.—Not earlier than the date 3 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator may select Small Business Development Center programs of States in addition to those selected under paragraph (1). The Administrator shall consider the effect on the programs selected under paragraph (1) before selecting additional programs under this paragraph.

“(4) COORDINATION TO AVOID DUPLICATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS.—In selecting programs under this subsection, the Administrator shall give a preference to Small Business Development Center programs that have a plan for consulting with Federal and State agencies to ensure that any assistance provided under this section is not duplicated by an existing Federal or State program.

“(h) MATCHING NOT REQUIRED.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 21(a)(4) shall not apply to assistance made available under the program.

“(i) DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State program selected to receive a grant under subsection (g) in a fiscal year shall be eligible to receive a grant in an amount not to exceed the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the amount made available for grants under this section for the fiscal year; and

“(B) the ratio that the population of the State bears to the population of all the States with programs selected to receive grants under subsection (g) for the fiscal year.

“(2) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—The minimum amount that a State program selected to receive a grant under subsection (g) shall be eligible to receive under this section for any fiscal year shall be \$200,000. The Administrator shall reduce the amount described in paragraph (1) as appropriate to carry out the purposes of this paragraph and subsection (j)(2).

“(j) EVALUATION AND REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the establishment of the program, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an evaluation of the program and shall transmit to the Administrator, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the evaluation along with any recommendations as to whether the program, with or without modification, should be extended to include the participation of all Small Business Development Centers.

“(k) PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.—After providing notice and an opportunity for comment and after consulting with the Association (but not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section), the Administrator shall promulgate final regulations to carry out this section, including regulations that establish—

“(1) priorities for the types of assistance to be provided under the program;

“(2) standards relating to educational, technical, and support services to be provided by participating Small Business Development Centers;

“(3) standards relating to any national service delivery and support function to be provided by the Association under the program;

“(4) standards relating to any work plan that the Administrator may require a participating Small Business Development Center to develop; and

“(5) standards relating to the educational, technical, and professional competency of any expert or other assistance provider to whom a small business concern may be referred for compliance assistance under the program.

“(1) FUNDING.—Subject to amounts approved in advance in appropriations Acts and separate from amounts approved to carry out section 21(a)(1), the Administrator may make grants or enter into cooperative agreements to carry out this section.”.

SEC. 208. REPORT.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall submit to Congress a report evaluating the effectiveness of the new Small Business Development Center programs added by the amendments made by this title.

TITLE III—SCORE

SEC. 301. REPEAL OF ACTIVE CORPORATION OF EXECUTIVES.

Section 8(b)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)(B)) is amended by striking “and an Active Corps of Executive (ACE)”.

SEC. 302. INCREASING THE PROPORTION OF SCORE VOLUNTEERS FROM SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED BACKGROUNDS.

Section 8(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) The Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE) established under subparagraph (B) shall carry out a plan to increase the proportion of mentors who are from socially or economically disadvantaged backgrounds. SCORE shall, on an annual basis, report to the Administrator on the implementation of this subparagraph.”.

SEC. 303. BENCHMARK REPORTING.

Section 8(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)), as amended by section 202, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(I) The Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE) established under subparagraph (B) shall, in consultation with the Administrator, establish benchmarks for use in evaluating the performance of its activities and the performance of its volunteers. The benchmarks shall include benchmarks relating to the demographic characteristics and the geographic characteristics of persons assisted by SCORE, benchmarks relating to the hours spent mentoring by volunteers, and benchmarks relating to the performance of the persons assisted by SCORE. SCORE shall, on an annual basis, report to the Administrator on the extent to which the benchmarks established under this subparagraph are being attained.”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, small businesses play a critical role in our economy. As the leading job creators and generators of nearly half of private sector gross domestic product, their impact is felt throughout the country.

Today, entrepreneurs are confronted with intense competition from foreign and corporate counterparts. They must continually update their products and processes, as well as adapt to change quickly.

Traditionally, the SBA's entrepreneurial development programs were created to provide direction and assistance to small business owners, helping them remain competitive and armed with the tools to maintain successful ventures. While providing critical assistance, these programs were created many years ago to address general business development issues faced by typical small businesses of the time.

There is no question the needs of entrepreneurs change as the environment does. The challenges facing entrepreneurs today are different from those even 5 years ago. SBA's entrepreneurial development programs must evolve to provide small businesses with the ability to deal with the economic conditions of today.

The Small Business Entrepreneurial Development Programs Act of 2007 introduced by Congressman SESTAK not only modernizes this program to adjust the current concerns of small businesses but also enhances them. Today, the leading issues for small firms are the rising health and energy costs and complying with regulations. This legislation will help small business owners identify and secure affordable health care. With less than half of small business owners providing health care, the need for legislation that helps alleviate this is clear.

Considering the current price of gasoline, there's no question why the number one concern for entrepreneurs is the cost of energy. Gasoline is more than \$3 a gallon. This price represents a 28 percent increase over a period of just 2 months ago and a 52 percent increase since the end of January. Due to small businesses' limited resources, as production costs are driven up, they become less competitive with their counterparts.

While the costs of energy and health care have risen, so has the regulatory burden for small businesses. In 2006, just seven major rules added over \$3.7 billion to the overall regulatory costs. That does not even account for the thousands of other regulations that were added last year. Small firms today require affordable access to information and counseling to address these new rules.

H.R. 2359, with its increased capacities, ensures that the SBDCs located in communities across the Nation have the ability to assist entrepreneurs in facing these challenges. For this reason, the SBA Entrepreneurial Development Act of 2007 has the support of the National Federation of Independent

Businesses. They are not only supporting but will key vote this legislation. By tailoring SBA's economic development programs to the economic demands and changing composition of small businesses, they will better promote business development this our communities.

H.R. 2359 will make sure small firms remain a driving force in our economy. I urge support of this 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.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the request to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2359, the SBA Entrepreneurial Development Programs Act of 2007.

I would like to thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for working in a cooperative and bipartisan manner to bring this bill to the floor. This bill makes modest yet necessary changes in the core entrepreneurial technical assistance programs of the SBA, the Small Business Development Center Program.

Small business development centers, on a relatively modest appropriation, provide free training sessions which last at least 1 hour and free individual one-on-one counseling. The centers met a total of 700,000 individual business owners and prospective owners in fiscal year 2007.

Changes are necessary to clarify the statutory mandate and ensure that small business development centers are appropriately responding to the new challenges facing America's entrepreneurs. These alterations are reflected in title I of the bill.

Even though the program is more than 25 years old, there is no definition of the term "small business development center," which substantially adds to the confusion interpreting the statutory language. I would like to thank the chairwoman for including the definition in the term.

Another key change demonstrates the need to update the mission of the small business development centers as technology and business practices change. Broadband access is no longer a luxury for many, if not most, small businesses; yet the only reliable data on broadband access in America comes from providers that make the reports to the Federal Communications Commission.

Congressman FORTENBERRY, the ranking member of the Committee's Subcommittee on Rural and Urban Entrepreneurship, had the idea that rather than relying on these providers, a more accurate picture might come from actually asking individuals whether they had access to broadband services. Mr. FORTENBERRY thought it would make sense to have the center survey their clients when they come in the door on the availability of broadband service. The survey might prove a valuable addition to supplement the existing data from broadband

providers. And without appropriate information on broadband access and penetration, it is impossible to develop policies that ensure small businesses will have affordable access to broadband.

Title II also includes a mechanism to increase the capacity of small business development centers to offer regulatory compliance assistance to small businesses disproportionately affected by erroneous regulatory burdens. It is an idea supported by the House in the previous four Congresses and by the National Federation of Independent Business. I would like to thank the chairwoman and Mr. SESTAK for including this critical assistance to small business owners.

Ultimately, H.R. 2359 is designed to help small businesses get the advice and assistance they need to continue their ever-increasing importance in maintaining America's prime place in the global economy.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I recognize Mr. SESTAK, the sponsor of the legislation, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the distinguished chairwoman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support a piece of legislation to enhance two critical Small Business Administration entrepreneurial development programs, the Small Business Development Centers and the Service Corps for Retired Executives.

Serving as the Representative in a district that has been historically driven economically by vibrant local small businesses, I greatly appreciate and support the entrepreneurial development assistance that the SBA provides.

We know that entrepreneurial development programs work. Businesses who receive SBA entrepreneurial assistance are twice as likely to succeed. And for every Federal dollar spent on entrepreneurial development, \$7 are generated in increased tax revenue.

But in the past 3 years, due to changes in our ever-changing globalizing economy, my district has lost 607 small businesses and one out of five manufacturing establishments. This is a trend that I am committed to reversing through fostering entrepreneurial development and creating the right set of conditions to help businesses flourish, stay and be attracted to my district, and I believe that supporting effective small business entrepreneurial development programs is a key part of that strategy.

In 1980, Congress established the SBDC program to foster economic development by providing management, technical and research assistance to current and prospective small businesses. As you know, SBDCs provide services which include assisting small businesses with financial, marketing, production, organizational, engineering

and technical problems and feasibility studies.

SBDCs serve Americans with a desire to start their own venture but who lack the technical expertise associated with starting and running a successful business, and in the past decades, SBDCs have provided assistance to millions of entrepreneurs across America.

The SBDC program also represents the effective and efficient use of allocated Federal moneys through public/private collaboration. To that end, SBDCs are funded by matching moneys provided by State legislatures, foundations, State and local chambers of commerce, public and private universities, vocational and technical schools and community colleges. In fact, sponsors' contributions have been increasingly exceeding the minimum 50 percent matching share, signifying greater participation among such groups and institutions.

This is why I feel especially fortunate to have several Small Business Development Sub-Centers located at local universities, such as Widener University and the University of Pennsylvania, which provide critical business resources and technical assistance to small businesses in and around my district.

I would like to stress that the core SBDC program has been extremely effective, but there are certain operational improvements that can be implemented to increase the flexibility of SBDCs.

To that end, changes proposed in this legislation will ensure the quality of grant recipients to host SBDCs; help SBDCs maintain their autonomy from undue SBA interference; protect the confidentiality of SBDC clients; ensure that taxpayer dollars are being spent as efficiently as possible by not using SBDC funds except for the sole purpose of business development; and allowing exemptions to the current cap on non-matching portability grants in the event of federally designated natural or human caused disasters.

□ 1815

In addition to these operational changes, it is important to strengthen the SBDC core program, which successfully navigates entrepreneurs in managing their business, by establishing specific grant programs that will allow SBDCs to tailor their services.

For instance, the Capital Access Initiative would establish grants to assist entrepreneurs in processing loan applications and obtaining private equity. An Innovation and Competitiveness Initiative would establish grants to allow SBDCs to become technology centers, to help market technologies and advanced projects to manufacturers. A disaster recovery program would establish grants to allow SBDCs to assist and coordinate the Federal response for small business disaster victims.

The older entrepreneurial assistance program will target older Americans

interested in transitioning to become business owners, while the Small Business Sustainability Initiative will promote the development and implementation of energy-efficient and clean energy improvements and technology. And an Affordable Health Care Initiative will help small business owners provide affordable health care insurance options to their employees, as the chairwoman mentioned.

As I also spoke about, a second program which this legislation will address is SCORE, which provides entrepreneurs with free counseling assistance by former executives. SCORE provides a valuable service to small businesses, and I believe it will be even stronger with a provision to actively recruit volunteer mentors who will then provide a greater reflection of the social and economic diversity of those who will utilize SBA services, such as women and underrepresented minorities.

I urge all my colleagues to support this important bill, which will greatly enhance the business development resources available to America's small business owners and aspiring entrepreneurs.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to my good friend Mr. LATHAM.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding me time, and I congratulate the committee and the chairman for bringing this piece of legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2359, the Small Business Administration Entrepreneurial Development Programs Act.

I am especially pleased that the Small Business Committee included legislation that I introduced earlier this Congress, H.R. 731, the National Small Business Regulatory Assistance Act, into this broad legislative package. This National Small Business Regulatory Assistance Act utilizes one of SBA's most effective programs, the Small Business Development Center program. Generally the SBDCs support small businesses with financial, management, and marketing activities. My legislation, included in section 207 of H.R. 2359, creates a pilot program through the SBDCs that will provide free confidential counseling on regulatory compliance and help small businesses gain access to regulatory information and resources.

The research done by the Small Business Administration demonstrates that small businesses with less than 20 employees pay more than \$7,600 per employee to comply with Federal regulations each year, while large firms pay 45 percent less per employee. Adjusted for inflation, the annual cost of Federal regulations faced by America's small businesses in 2004 was over \$875 billion.

The fact of the matter is many small business owners have neither the time

nor the expertise to sort through hundreds of pages of regulations in the Federal Register. Small business owners often learn of their failure to comply with Federal regulations or even that new Federal regulations have been imposed only after a penalty has been assessed. The current system denies small businesses access to regulatory compliance assistance and further weakens the opportunity for America's small businesses to compete with larger firms both domestically and internationally.

The Small Business Regulatory Assistance Act represents a win-win for America's small businesses. Not only will the SBDCs help small business owners understand what they must do to comply with Federal regulations but also how they may do so in a most cost-effective manner.

Again, I would like to thank the committee for including this legislation in the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the overall bill.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today's entrepreneurs are facing countless challenges. SBA's entrepreneurial development programs must be modernized to provide small businesses with the ability to deal with the economic conditions of today.

Mr. SESTAK's legislation, the SBA Entrepreneurial Development Programs Act of 2007, makes much-needed updates to the agency's programs so that they are better able to assist entrepreneurs and enable small firms to remain a driving force in our economy.

H.R. 2359 has the support of the NFIB, who, in addition to supporting it, has made it one of their key votes for the 110th Congress.

Again I want to thank Mr. SESTAK and also Mr. CHABOT, the ranking minority member, for working in a bipartisan manner to move this legislation and other bills that will be moved today. I want to thank the staff that worked on this bill. From the majority staff, Michael Day, Adam Minehardt, Nicole Witenstein; from Representative SESTAK's staff, Clarence Tong; and from the minority staff, Barry Pineles.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2359.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2359, the SBA Entrepreneurial Development Programs Act of 2007. I commend our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK) for sponsoring this legislation. I also commend our colleague from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), Chairwoman of the Committee on Small Business, and the members of the Committee on Small Business for their initiatives to strengthen America's small businesses and for bringing to the House chamber today four important bills aimed at improving programs and services administered by the U.S. Small Business Administration.

H.R. 2359 would reauthorize certain entrepreneurial development programs and aid small businesses across our country in receiving enhanced assistance from Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs). H.R. 2359 would also expand the services available

through SBDCs to include assistance aimed to help businesses prepare for and respond to economic disruptions caused by natural and manmade disasters, regulatory burdens, and increased costs. By ensuring that the SBDC core programs remain robust and authorizing new programs that are designed specifically to meet evolving needs of small business owners and operators, this bill will help SBDCs sustain a reputation as trusted and valued sources of technical assistance for our country's entrepreneurs.

This legislation would further make important changes to the Small Business Administration Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE) Program. These changes will help ensure that SBA clients from socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds can benefit from advice, counseling and mentoring from executives from similar, disadvantaged backgrounds. This bill would require the SBA to increase its efforts to recruit such executives to participate in the SCORE Program.

The SBDC and SCORE programs have been remarkably successful. This bill will help ensure that those excellent programs are as responsive as possible to the evolving needs of our country's small businesses. I urge my colleagues' support for this bill.

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

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. 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 gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2359.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. 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.

SBA VETERANS' PROGRAMS ACT OF 2007

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2366) to reauthorize the veterans entrepreneurial development programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2366

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 "SBA Veterans' Programs Act of 2007".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—OFFICE OF VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 101. Office of Veterans Business Development.

TITLE II—VETERANS ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES

Sec. 201. Veterans Assistance and Services program.

TITLE III—EXPANDING VETERANS BUSINESS OUTREACH CENTERS

Sec. 301. Increasing the number of outreach centers.

Sec. 302. Independent study on gaps in availability of outreach centers.

TITLE I—OFFICE OF VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 101. OFFICE OF VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT.

Section 32 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) PARTICIPATION IN TAP WORKSHOPS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Associate Administrator shall increase veteran outreach by ensuring that Veteran Business Outreach Centers regularly participate, on a nationwide basis, in the workshops of the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Labor.

“(2) PRESENTATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), a Center may provide grants to eligible entities located in Transition Assistance Program locations to make presentations on the opportunities available from the Administration for recently separating veterans. Each such presentation must include, at a minimum, the entrepreneurial and business training resources available from the Administration.

“(3) REPORTS.—The Associate Administrator shall submit to Congress progress reports on the implementation of this subsection.

“(d) WOMEN VETERANS BUSINESS TRAINING RESOURCE PROGRAM.—The Associate Administrator shall establish a Women Veterans Business Training Resource Program. The program shall—

“(1) compile information on resources available to women veterans for business training, including resources for—

“(A) vocational and technical education;

“(B) general business skills, such as marketing and accounting; and

“(C) business assistance programs targeted to women veterans; and

“(2) disseminate the information through Veteran Business Outreach Centers and women’s business centers.”.

TITLE II—VETERANS ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES

SEC. 201. VETERANS ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) VETERANS ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A Small Business Development Center may apply for an additional grant to carry out a veterans assistance and services program.

“(2) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—Under a program under paragraph (1), the Center shall—

“(A) create a marketing campaign to promote awareness and education of the services of the Center that are available to veterans, and to target the campaign toward veterans, disabled veterans, military units, Federal agencies, and veterans organizations;

“(B) use technology-assisted online counseling and distance learning technology to overcome the impediments to entrepreneurship faced by veterans and members of the Armed Forces; and

“(C) increase coordination among organizations that assist veterans, including by es-

tablishing virtual integration of service providers and offerings for a one-stop point of contact for veterans who are entrepreneurs or small business owners.

“(3) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Each grant under this subsection shall be for at least \$75,000.

“(4) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—A grant under this subsection may not exceed \$250,000.

“(5) FUNDING.—Subject to amounts approved in advance in appropriations Acts, the Administration may make grants or enter into cooperative agreements to carry out the provisions of this subsection.”.

TITLE III—EXPANDING VETERANS BUSINESS OUTREACH CENTERS

SEC. 301. INCREASING THE NUMBER OF OUTREACH CENTERS.

The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall use the authority in section 8(b)(17) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 647(b)) to ensure that the number of Veterans Business Outreach Centers throughout the United States increases—

(1) by at least 2, for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009; and

(2) by the number that the Administrator considers appropriate, based on existing need, for each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 302. INDEPENDENT STUDY ON GAPS IN AVAILABILITY OF OUTREACH CENTERS.

The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall sponsor an independent study on gaps in the availability of Veterans Business Outreach Centers across the United States. The purpose of the study shall be to identify the gaps that do exist so as to inform decisions on funding and on the allocation and coordination of resources. Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

There is no question our Nation’s veterans have made great sacrifices for this country. Many traveled long distances, spent lengthy amounts of time away from their families, and have been in harm’s way to ensure our safety.

To date, more than 135,000 troops have come home from Iraq and Afghanistan. These men and women are increasingly turning toward small business ownership. Congressman BUCHANAN’s legislation, the Small Business Administration Veterans Programs Act of 2007, ensures that service men and women will not only have the opportunity to pursue entrepreneurship but to succeed at starting their own firms.

While many have the American dream of owning a business, veterans face unique challenges when working to start or maintain their firms. For this sector of the population to be successful in their small business endeavors, there needs to be assistance available in local communities. They cannot be expected to return home knowing all of the necessary and available tools to start a business. Outreach efforts to these aspiring entrepreneurs need to be increased and information must be accessible. The Small Business Administration Veterans Programs Act of 2007 makes these resources available.

Service men and women contributing to economic growth is not a new trend. After World War II, the GI bill provided the opportunity of a college education to this Nation’s veterans. By 1956 there were 7.8 million World War II veterans that had participated in an education or training program. The impact that that single piece of legislation had on this Nation’s economy was great.

Much like ensuring the right to a college education, as the GI bill did, H.R. 2366 expands business ownership. It provides specific assistance for aspiring business owners. Starting a business after leaving military service provides an opportunity for returning veterans to not only begin a new career but to secure their livelihood. Enabling this to be a viable option for some of the most dedicated individuals in our country spurs economic development in local economies, demonstrates our commitment to their aspirations of entrepreneurship, and represents true patriotism.

I strongly urge support of this 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.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the request to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2366, the SBA Veterans Programs Act of 2007. I would like to thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for working in a cooperative, bipartisan manner to bring this bill, authored by Mr. BUCHANAN, a freshman member of the committee, to the House floor.

No one can debate the sacrifice that America’s veterans have made and continue to make in defense of our country. While the repayment of that debt may never occur, we can certainly provide them with the needed assistance to prosper in civilian life. H.R. 2366 is a modest contribution to repaying the debt and helping them make a smooth transition into civilian life.

The bill recognizes that veterans learn a variety of critical skills. Recruitment advertisements for the armed services highlight the various technical skills that they can obtain through the military. These skills clearly are valued in civilian companies. In addition, the military inculcates its members with other important skills such as leadership, decision-

making, teamwork, and the drive to win. All of these are critical to success as a small business owner.

The military does not teach its members how to take these skills and transfer them to starting a business. They require additional training to understand the key components of operating their own business without first having to serve a sort of "apprenticeship" working with others.

In 1999 Congress recognized that more services should be directed to help the 25 million veterans start and grow their small businesses. Those efforts succeeded because a number of small businesses owned by veterans have grown to 14 percent of all small businesses.

Despite this success more must be done to assist our veterans in the start-up and operation of their businesses. Outreach must improve to ensure that veterans wishing to start their own businesses will have the training and advice needed to transfer their skills to entrepreneurship.

The technical advice and assistance are not limited to veterans leaving the service. Reservists who operate their own small businesses have their own unique set of operational problems associated with their call-up to duty. They may not know how long their call-up will last, and they may need assistance in ensuring that they have in place a plan to operate their businesses while they are on Active Duty.

□ 1830

H.R. 2366 represents an effort to expand the focus of the SBA entrepreneurial assistance programs to our veterans. Of most significant importance is the need to create more Veteran Business Outreach Centers. These centers operate as cooperative agreements between the Small Business Administration and the non-profit entities. These centers provide entrepreneurial development services, such as business training, counseling, mentoring and referrals. They also conduct entrepreneurial business development workshops focusing on self-development and self-employment. Counseling services may range from development of business plans to identifying government procurement opportunities.

There are only four Veteran Business Outreach Centers. To serve our military men and women, more are obviously needed, and title III requires the establishment of two more centers in each of the next two fiscal years.

Another important element of the bill is the recognition of the changing nature of the military with a greater involvement of women. Title I of the bill requires the administrator to establish within the Office of Veterans Business Development a program to provide assistance to women veterans. Given the rapid expansion and success of women-owned businesses, it makes sense to ensure that the needs of women veterans are met when they seek to start and operate small businesses.

Our fighting men and women are the best in the world. Let us help them become the best entrepreneurs in the world by enacting H.R. 2366.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2366.

By now, every American should know who our Greatest Generation is. Our Greatest Generation was made up of the returning heroes of the Second World War. This generation was responsible for one of the greatest periods of economic growth in our Nation's history, leading to the creation of the lone superpower which now has become the world's leader in almost every conceivable category. But it is because we empowered our returning veterans with educational, business and social opportunities which helped create an environment in which success was attainable for those who wanted it. The Greatest Generation went on to become small business owners and operators, driving the very engine which is critical for the sustained economic growth of our Nation.

We are now witnessing the emergence of another great generation, a generation of volunteer warriors who have sacrificed so much in defense of our Nation's interest. We would be negligent if we did not grant to this generation the same opportunities to succeed as we have done with past generations. That is why I support H.R. 2366, and I move for its passage.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) as much time as he may consume.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, for yielding, and also the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

I would also like to commend Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ and Ranking Member CHABOT for their proving that leadership and bipartisanship is alive and well in the United States Congress. The Madam Chair has worked very hard on this bill, and I appreciate her effort.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 2366, would create an important program within the Small Business Administration that gives our veterans not just a chance in a business enterprise but provides them with all the help and assistance a grateful Nation can offer.

This legislation is intended to help veterans through grants, information services and contacts with professionals in their field of endeavor. This Federal program will enhance the ability of a veteran to become an entrepreneur in his or her own right.

My bill puts an emphasis on providing veterans with market research, financial options and technological training important to become a successful small business owner.

H.R. 2366 not only expands the number and the scope of Veteran Outreach Centers, it ensures the opening of more doors and opportunities for our women veterans. Assisting our veterans returning from combat has been an area long overlooked, and it is high time we did something about it.

I am encouraged by the unanimous consent that this bill received in the committee and by the spirit of bipartisanship that is symbolic of its passage. Today, the House will pass a bill that will help individuals make an important transition from a veteran to a small business entrepreneur.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2366.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR EARMARK REFORM

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 491) providing for earmark reform, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would simply ask my very distinguished Chair for an explanation of exactly what it is that we're doing here.

I am happy to yield to the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules under my reservation, Madam Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What this measure does is absolutely guarantee that any earmark in a conference report that has not been passed in the House will be subject to a point of order even though the Rules Committee may have protected against all points of order.

Mr. DREIER. If I may, under my reservation, Madam Speaker, I would just like to make sure that we have in place a provision now, as was agreed on last week, that will ensure that the rights of Members, when it comes to raising a point of order, are maintained when it comes to appropriations bills.

I would say, Madam Speaker, that I believe this is a very good start. My personal preference would have been that we could have gone back to the provision that we had last year to allow the same kind of protection for earmarks when it comes to both authorization and tax bills. And I hope very much, Madam Speaker, that we are going to have an opportunity to work together. I look forward to working with the distinguished Chair of the

Committee on Rules and the leadership teams on both sides of the aisle to ensure that we can in fact pursue further transparency, openness, accountability and enforceability when it comes to the issue of earmarks.

With that, I withdraw my reservation, Madam Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 491

Resolved, That during the remainder of the 110th Congress it shall not be in order to consider a conference report to accompany a regular general appropriation bill unless the joint explanatory statement prepared by the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate includes a list of congressional earmarks (as that term is used in clause 9(d) of rule XXI) in the conference report or joint statement (and the name of any Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator who submitted a request to the respective House or Senate committee for each respective item included on such list) that were not committed to the conference committee by either House, not in a report on such bill, and not in a report of a committee of the Senate on a companion measure.

SEC. 2. It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of the first section of this resolution.

SEC. 3. A point of order under this resolution shall be disposed of by the question of consideration under the same terms as specified in clause 9(b) of rule XXI.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR RULES COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee is expected to meet Wednesday, June 20, to grant a rule which may structure the amendment process for floor consideration of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 30 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol no later than 10 a.m. on Wednesday, June 20. Members are strongly advised to adhere to the amendment deadlines to ensure the amendments receive consideration.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Appropriations. A copy of that bill is expected to be posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee on Tuesday afternoon.

Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and also should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the Rules of the House. Members are also strongly en-

couraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

SBA VETERANS' PROGRAMS ACT OF 2007

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2366) to reauthorize the veterans entrepreneurial development programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2366

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 “SBA Veterans’ Programs Act of 2007”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—OFFICE OF VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 101. Office of Veterans Business Development.

TITLE II—VETERANS ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES

Sec. 201. Veterans Assistance and Services program.

TITLE III—EXPANDING VETERANS BUSINESS OUTREACH CENTERS

Sec. 301. Increasing the number of outreach centers.

Sec. 302. Independent study on gaps in availability of outreach centers.

TITLE I—OFFICE OF VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 101. OFFICE OF VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT.

Section 32 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **PARTICIPATION IN TAP WORKSHOPS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Associate Administrator shall increase veteran outreach by ensuring that Veteran Business Outreach Centers regularly participate, on a nationwide basis, in the workshops of the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Labor.

“(2) **PRESENTATIONS.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), a Center may provide grants to eligible entities located in Transition Assistance Program locations to make presentations on the opportunities available from the Administration for recently separating veterans. Each such presentation must include, at a minimum, the entrepreneurial and business training resources available from the Administration.

“(3) **REPORTS.**—The Associate Administrator shall submit to Congress progress reports on the implementation of this subsection.

“(d) **WOMEN VETERANS BUSINESS TRAINING RESOURCE PROGRAM.**—The Associate Administrator shall establish a Women Veterans Business Training Resource Program. The program shall—

“(1) compile information on resources available to women veterans for business training, including resources for—

“(A) vocational and technical education;

“(B) general business skills, such as marketing and accounting; and

“(C) business assistance programs targeted to women veterans; and

“(2) disseminate the information through Veteran Business Outreach Centers and women’s business centers.”.

TITLE II—VETERANS ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES

SEC. 201. VETERANS ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) **VETERANS ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A Small Business Development Center may apply for an additional grant to carry out a veterans assistance and services program.

“(2) **ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.**—Under a program under paragraph (1), the Center shall—

“(A) create a marketing campaign to promote awareness and education of the services of the Center that are available to veterans, and to target the campaign toward veterans, disabled veterans, military units, Federal agencies, and veterans organizations;

“(B) use technology-assisted online counseling and distance learning technology to overcome the impediments to entrepreneurship faced by veterans and members of the Armed Forces; and

“(C) increase coordination among organizations that assist veterans, including by establishing virtual integration of service providers and offerings for a one-stop point of contact for veterans who are entrepreneurs or small business owners.

“(3) **MINIMUM AMOUNT.**—Each grant under this subsection shall be for at least \$75,000.

“(4) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT.**—A grant under this subsection may not exceed \$250,000.

“(5) **FUNDING.**—Subject to amounts approved in advance in appropriations Acts, the Administration may make grants or enter into cooperative agreements to carry out the provisions of this subsection.”.

TITLE III—EXPANDING VETERANS BUSINESS OUTREACH CENTERS

SEC. 301. INCREASING THE NUMBER OF OUTREACH CENTERS.

The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall use the authority in section 8(b)(17) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 647(b)) to ensure that the number of Veterans Business Outreach Centers throughout the United States increases—

(1) by at least 2, for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009; and

(2) by the number that the Administrator considers appropriate, based on existing need, for each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 302. INDEPENDENT STUDY ON GAPS IN AVAILABILITY OF OUTREACH CENTERS.

The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall sponsor an independent study on gaps in the availability of Veterans Business Outreach Centers across the United States. The purpose of the study shall be to identify the gaps that do exist so as to inform decisions on funding and on the allocation and coordination of resources. Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Florida for introducing this legislation.

I rise today to voice my strong support for the SBA's Veterans' Programs Act.

The SBA's Veterans' Business Outreach Initiative was established to facilitate business ownership among disabled veterans by providing one-stop assistance and counseling. Today's legislation will expand the success of this initiative.

As an exemplary public/private partnership, Veterans' Business Outreach Centers represent the comprehensive, cooperative and effective support that our Nation can and should provide our country's veterans.

This program provides greater opportunity to returning servicemembers and encourages economic development in communities across the country. Our troops fight for our country abroad, and we have a responsibility to provide for their future at home. Their sacrifice warrants our support. And they deserve every opportunity to succeed in business after their dedicated service to our country.

This bill provides veterans with the community and government support necessary to ensure their success, and I support its passage.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, veterans have not only been critical to the defense of our Nation, but with the increasing number of service men and women engaging in entrepreneurship, they have also been invaluable in helping our economy grow. These men and women have dedicated their lives to preserving our freedom. It is crucial that we show our appreciation for their service. The SBA Veterans' Programs Act of 2007 does just that.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2366, the SBA Veterans' Program Act of 2007. I urge its adoption.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2366, the SBA Veterans' Programs Act of 2007. This legislation will assist our soldiers when they return home with opportunities and information about starting a small business.

More than a million and a half (1,502,125) men and women have answered the call to serve their country since 2001. They interrupted their careers, put their families economic security at risk, and face big personal challenges upon returning home.

I recently visited Iraq and Afghanistan. That trip gave me an even greater appreciation for the significant sacrifices our soldiers must make and must cope with for the rest of their lives. If our soldiers faced mortal danger every day abroad, let us help them have economic security when they return home.

It isn't just the veteran who makes the sacrifice, their families do as well: their parents, their spouses, their children, girlfriends and boyfriends and siblings. They give up so much in defense of our country.

It is our job, as Members of Congress, to make sure that our Nation lives up to its com-

mitment to our veterans. It is a simple pact we have made with our troops—and one we are obligated to fulfill: after they have sacrificed to serve our country on the battlefield, we must do all we can to serve them here at home. The cost of any war must include caring for the warrior.

This legislation helps our veterans get started with business opportunities in their communities. It does so by providing grants, information services, and personal assistance to help veterans evaluate business opportunities; increasing the number of veteran business outreach centers around the country, and encouraging further assistance to women veterans.

Countless soldiers are returning from their tours of duty with new confidence and skills developed during their time in the military. This SBA program will help to ensure that those new abilities are put to good use when they return to civilian life.

This bill is the right thing to do for those who have given so much and it will directly impact Vermont and every State around the country. 97 percent of all Vermont firms are small businesses. My office has been involved in helping the Vermont Small Business Development Centers (SBDC) run business readiness classes for veterans. The Vermont SBDC is the primary small business assistance resource sought out by small business clients, lenders, government agencies and other economic development partners. The Vermont SBDC is the keystone in a statewide business assistance infrastructure tying together all appropriate resources and serving as a "one-stop" gateway and clearing house to serve small businesses' needs. Drawing on collaborative relationships among service providers, Vermont SBDC leverages economic development resources of all kinds for advancement of small businesses, growing the local economy.

Roughly 6 percent of deployed soldiers have small businesses depending on them. Veterans face a number of unique challenges, from increasing lengths and number of deployments overseas, to translating their military experience into business ventures. Yet, there is a lack of substantive programs to help these businesses survive through deployment, and to assist veterans returning home. This program is designed to meet current, real-time needs of people on active duty in business who now need to leave for protracted periods, or for those who have just come back and really "need" to do something new with their lives.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2366.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2366, the Small Business Administration Veterans' Programs Act of 2007. I commend my colleague from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) for introducing this legislation.

This bill would authorize the Small Business Administration (SBA) to award grants to Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs) for the establishment of programs that would improve outreach to veterans and veterans service organizations. Specifically, this bill would authorize SBDCs to use such grant funds to create a marketing campaign to promote awareness of the services made available to veterans through that SBDC, and to target the campaign toward veterans, disabled veterans, military units, federal agencies, and veterans service organizations. The bill would also au-

thorize SBDCs to utilize grant funds to develop and expand technology-assisted counseling and distance learning services designed to help veterans and members of the United States Armed Forces overcome barriers to entrepreneurship. This bill would further authorize SBDCs to facilitate and increase coordination among organizations that assist veterans, including through the integration of service providers and offerings into a one-stop point of contact for veterans who are entrepreneurs or small business owners.

This bill would further require that Veterans Business Outreach Centers (VBOCs) participate in the U.S. Department of Labor Technical Assistance Program (TAP). The Technical Assistance Program is offered in 173 locations throughout the United States and 53 locations internationally. H.R. 2366 would authorize VBOCs to provide grants to eligible entities located in TAP locations to make presentations on the opportunities available from the SBA for recently separated veterans. According to this bill such presentations must include, at a minimum, the entrepreneurial and business training resources available from the SBA. This bill would increase the number of authorized VBOCs by two in each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009.

Additionally, H.R. 2366 would direct the SBA to establish a Women Veterans Business Training Resource Program. This program would compile information on resources available to women veterans for business training, including resources for vocational and technical education, the development of general business skills, and business assistance programs. H.R. 2366 would direct that the SBA disseminate such information through VBOCs and women business centers.

Support for this legislation will help Congress fulfill its commitment to ensuring that our veterans and servicemembers receive the support they need upon separation from service. I support this legislation on behalf of all veterans and servicemembers, in particular those veterans and servicemembers from Guam. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2366.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARDOZA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2366.

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.

EXPANDING AND IMPROVING ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2284) to amend the Small Business Act to expand and improve the assistance provided by Small Business Development Centers to Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2284

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) The rate for American Indians and Alaskan Natives living below 50 percent the poverty level is 11.2 percent, nearly double the rate of the general population.

(2) The unemployment rate for American Indians and Alaskan Natives 16 years and over is 13.6 percent, nearly double the rate of the general population.

(3) Indian tribe members and Alaska Natives own more than 201,000 businesses and generate more than \$26,000,000,000 in revenues. The construction industry accounted for 16 percent of these businesses and 22.5 percent of their total receipts. The next largest was the service industry (13.2 percent and 3.4 percent, respectively). The third largest was the health care and social assistance industry (12.1 percent and 4.6 percent, respectively).

(4) The Small Business Development Center program is cost effective. Clients receiving long-term counseling under the program in 2005 generated additional tax revenues of \$248,000,000, nearly 2.8 times the cost of the program to the Federal Government.

(5) Using the existing infrastructure of the Small Business Development Center program, small businesses owned by Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians receiving services under the program will have a higher survival rate than the average small business not receiving such services.

(6) Business counseling and technical assistance is critical on Indian lands where similar services are scarce and expensive.

(7) Increased assistance through counseling under the Small Business Development Center program has been shown to reduce the default rate associated with lending programs of the Small Business Administration.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this Act are as follows:

(1) To stimulate economies on Indian lands.

(2) To foster economic development on Indian lands.

(3) To assist in the creation of new small businesses owned by Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians and expand existing ones.

(4) To provide management, technical, and research assistance to small businesses owned by Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians.

(5) To seek the advice of local Tribal Councils on where small business development assistance is most needed.

(6) To ensure that Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians have full access to existing business counseling and technical assistance available through the Small Business Development Center program.

SEC. 2. SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER ASSISTANCE TO INDIAN TRIBE MEMBERS, ALASKA NATIVES, AND NATIVE HAWAIIANS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 21(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) **ADDITIONAL GRANT TO ASSIST INDIAN TRIBE MEMBERS, ALASKA NATIVES, AND NATIVE HAWAIIANS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any applicant in an eligible State that is funded by the Administration as a Small Business Development Center may apply for an additional grant to be used solely to provide services described in

subsection (c)(3) to assist with outreach, development, and enhancement on Indian lands of small business startups and expansions owned by Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians.

“(B) **ELIGIBLE STATES.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an eligible State is a State that has a combined population of Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians that comprises at least 1 percent of the State’s total population, as shown by the latest available census.

“(C) **GRANT APPLICATIONS.**—An applicant for a grant under subparagraph (A) shall submit to the Administration an application that is in such form as the Administration may require. The application shall include information regarding the applicant’s goals and objectives for the services to be provided using the grant, including—

“(i) the capability of the applicant to provide training and services to a representative number of Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians;

“(ii) the location of the Small Business Development Center site proposed by the applicant;

“(iii) the required amount of grant funding needed by the applicant to implement the program; and

“(iv) the extent to which the applicant has consulted with local Tribal Councils.

“(D) **APPLICABILITY OF GRANT REQUIREMENTS.**—An applicant for a grant under subparagraph (A) shall comply with all of the requirements of this section, except that the matching funds requirements under paragraph (4)(A) shall not apply.

“(E) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF GRANTS.**—No applicant may receive more than \$300,000 in grants under this paragraph for one fiscal year.

“(F) **REGULATIONS.**—After providing notice and an opportunity for comment and after consulting with the Association recognized by the Administration pursuant to paragraph (3)(A) (but not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph), the Administration shall issue final regulations to carry out this paragraph, including regulations that establish—

“(i) standards relating to educational, technical, and support services to be provided by Small Business Development Centers receiving assistance under this paragraph; and

“(ii) standards relating to any work plan that the Administration may require a Small Business Development Center receiving assistance under this paragraph to develop.

“(G) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(i) **INDIAN LANDS.**—The term ‘Indian lands’ has the meaning given the term ‘Indian country’ in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code, the meaning given the term ‘Indian reservation’ in section 151.2 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph), and the meaning given the term ‘reservation’ in section 4 of the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1903).

“(ii) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term ‘Indian tribe’ means any band, nation, or organized group or community of Indians located in the contiguous United States, and the Metlakatla Indian Community, whose members are recognized as eligible for the services provided to Indians by the Secretary of the Interior because of their status as Indians.

“(iii) **INDIAN TRIBE MEMBER.**—The term ‘Indian tribe member’ means a member of an Indian tribe (other than a Alaska Native).

“(iv) **ALASKA NATIVE.**—The term ‘Alaska Native’ has the meaning given the term ‘Native’ in section 3(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602(b)).

“(v) **NATIVE HAWAIIAN.**—The term ‘Native Hawaiian’ means any individual who is—

“(I) a citizen of the United States; and

“(II) a descendant of the aboriginal people, who prior to 1778, occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now constitutes the State of Hawaii.

“(vi) **TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.**—The term ‘tribal organization’ has the meaning given that term in section 4(l) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(1)).

“(H) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2010.

“(I) **FUNDING LIMITATIONS.**—

“(i) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.**—Funding under this paragraph shall be in addition to the dollar program limitations specified in paragraph (4).

“(ii) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.**—The Administration may carry out this paragraph only with amounts appropriated in advance specifically to carry out this paragraph.”

SEC. 3. STATE CONSULTATION WITH TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 21(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) **ADVICE OF LOCAL TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—A Small Business Development Center receiving a grant under this section shall request the advice of tribal organization on how best to provide assistance to Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians and where to locate satellite centers to provide such assistance.”

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, small businesses are responsible for creating three out of every four new jobs and account for almost half of all sales in this country. There is no question the impact they have on economic growth and the development and revitalization of countless neighbors.

Currently, the Native American population is one of the most impoverished. Their unemployment rate is nearly double that of the general population, with almost half of all residents living on a reservation unemployed.

Providing opportunities for business growth within the Native American sector will create jobs, generate revenue and ultimately benefit local economies across the country. The Native American Small Business Development Act of 2007, introduced by Representative UDALL, works to increase prospects for Native Americans through small business ownership.

While many in the Native American population are struggling, there is strong interest to engage in entrepreneurship. For these communities to have a growing small business sector, resources must be available locally and be culturally sensitive.

This legislation has enjoyed bipartisan support in the past and has passed the House in previous Congresses. It is designed to provide culturally tailored assistance for entrepreneurial development in some of the most disadvantaged areas of this country.

□ 1845

Not only will this bill help combat poverty and unemployment, but it will bring new services and opportunities to Native American communities. It is my hope that in the 110th Congress, H.R. 2284 can finally become law and expand the right to business ownership. I urge support of this 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, today I rise in support of the request to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2284, a bill to provide additional Small Business Development Center resources focused on Native Americans, Alaskan Natives and Native Hawaiians. The bill, the product and dedicated effort of the author, Congressman TOM UDALL, former Small Business Committee member, was passed without objection by voice vote.

I would like to thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for working in a cooperative and bipartisan manner to bring this matter to the House floor.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the sponsor of the legislation.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for their work and commitment to expanding small business opportunities. I am especially grateful for their efforts to bring this bill to the floor today. I would also like to thank all my colleagues who supported this bill by joining me as cosponsors.

This important legislation before us today, H.R. 2284, allows Small Business Development Centers to apply for an additional SBA grant to provide specified services assisting small business start-ups and expansions owned by Indian Tribal Members, Alaskan Natives or Native Hawaiians. My bill ensures those seeking to create, develop and expand small businesses have full access to the counseling and technical assistance available through SBDCs. The

tools offered by the SBDCs can assist these entrepreneurs with the information and opportunity to build sustainable businesses in their communities.

H.R. 2284 also ensures participation of governing bodies of Indian tribes, Alaskan Native entities and Native Hawaiian organizations by requiring grant recipients to request their advice on how best to provide assistance. Our intent is to ensure that these business development tools are provided in a culturally sensitive way.

Small businesses create 75 percent of all new employment opportunities and make up 99 percent of all employers. They anchor our neighborhoods, provide jobs and contribute to the overall economic development of many communities. That is why it is so imperative that we take steps to help ensure that small business development reaches the places in this country where economic prosperity has yet to be fully realized.

I have the great honor of representing 14 Pueblos, the Jicarilla Apache Nation and a portion of the Navajo Nation. Many of these communities would greatly benefit by more economic development. It is clear we can do more to aid Native American entrepreneurs in my district and throughout the country. I hope to help rectify this situation with the passage of this legislation.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, in closing, with unemployment rampant on Native American reservations, legislation that not only fights poverty but fosters the development of job creation is critical. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2284.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2284, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to expand and improve the assistance provided by Small Business Development Centers to Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians. I commend the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for introducing this important legislation to address poverty and unemployment amongst these disadvantaged and underserved communities. I also thank my colleague from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), Chairwoman of the Committee on Small Business, and the members of the Committee on Small Business for their continued leadership toward helping strengthen our country's small businesses and in addressing the socioeconomic challenges faced by our indigenous communities.

H.R. 2284 will enable small business development centers to assist Native American communities in the areas of job creation and economic growth. This bill helps individuals to utilize their own valuable business skills so that their small businesses, and in turn their community, may prosper.

This is a strong bill. But I believe that it can be strengthened by expanding the eligible grant recipients to include small business development centers that work with the indigenous populations of the territories, particularly in

Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa. Pacific Islanders from the territories endure economic adversity similar to that experienced by Native Americans, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that either in conference on this legislation, or on a similar proposal, that we take action to address the small business development needs of the indigenous peoples of the U.S. territories.

This bill, if enacted, would provide for valuable federal assistance for Native Americans, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage and to support economic development for all indigenous communities throughout the United States.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2284, which will amend the Small Business Act to improve the assistance provided by Small Business Development Centers to Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians.

This bill will provide management, technical and research assistance to small businesses owned by Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians and ensure them full access to existing business counseling and technical assistance available through the Small Business Development Center program.

Mr. Speaker, in a recent report by the distinguished Visiting Senior Fellow at the East-West Center and Emeritus Professor at the University Hawaii, Dr. Seiji Naya, the poverty rate for Native Hawaiians was 15 percent in 2005 while the state average was 9.8 percent. Native Hawaiians accounted for 27 percent of the total State population in poverty. The per capita income for Native Hawaiians was only 67 percent of the state average. In terms of per capita income, 32 percent of Native Hawaiians earned less than \$10,000 in 2005 compared to only 18 percent for Non-Native Hawaiians.

Native Hawaiians are committed to changing these statistics through innovative educational and entrepreneurial programs. One of the most promising government programs that will enable them to do this is the Small Business Act, particularly Section 8(a) which has given Native Americans an opportunity to participate in the economy of this country by providing a fair chance to obtain federal contracts. As a result, hundreds of Native American, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs have been given the opportunity to demonstrate their business capabilities, while providing valuable services and products to the government and the private sector.

The Native Hawaiian organizations that have taken advantage of the 8(a) program have provided hundreds of new well-paying jobs for Native Hawaiians and Non-Native Hawaiians alike. Many Native Hawaiians have received training in new marketable skills. The profits from these enterprises have been plowed back into the Native Hawaiian communities to provide essential social, health and cultural benefits traditionally funded by government or not at all.

H.R. 2284 will provide the necessary assistance to help make sure that these worthy programs continue to grow and expand as much as possible by providing needed assistance and business expertise. I urge unanimous approval of this measure.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and encourage adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2284.

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. GOHMERT. 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.

SBA WOMEN'S BUSINESS PROGRAMS ACT OF 2007

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2397) to reauthorize the women's entrepreneurial development programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2397

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 "SBA Women's Business Programs Act of 2007".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—NATIONAL WOMEN'S BUSINESS COUNCIL

Sec. 101. Annual studies on problems hindering the success of women entrepreneurs.

Sec. 102. Additional progress reports.

TITLE II—WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTERS

Sec. 201. Revised funding formula.

Sec. 202. Matchmaking formula change.

Sec. 203. Termination of funding.

Sec. 204. Women's business center awards to be made public.

TITLE I—NATIONAL WOMEN'S BUSINESS COUNCIL

SEC. 101. ANNUAL STUDIES ON PROBLEMS HINDERING THE SUCCESS OF WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS.

Section 409 of the Women's Business Ownership Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 7109) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) PROBLEMS HINDERING THE SUCCESS OF WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS.—The Council shall conduct at least one study per year that evaluates the problems hindering the success of women entrepreneurs. The Council shall select the topic for the study in consultation with the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate.”

SEC. 102. ADDITIONAL PROGRESS REPORTS.

Section 406(d)(4) of the Women's Business Ownership Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 7106(d)(4)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, and on a biannual basis (notwithstanding paragraph (6)) submit to the President and to the Com-

mittee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report containing a description of, and the status of, such initiatives, policies, programs, and plans”.

TITLE II—WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTERS

SEC. 201. REVISED FUNDING FORMULA.

Section 29(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may provide financial assistance to private non-profit organizations to conduct projects for the benefit of small business concerns owned and controlled by women. The projects shall provide—

“(A) financial assistance, including training and counseling in how to apply for and secure business credit and investment capital, preparing and presenting financial statements, and managing cash flow and other financial operations of a business concern;

“(B) management assistance, including training and counseling in how to plan, organize, staff, direct, and control each major activity and function of a small business concern; and

“(C) marketing assistance, including training and counseling in identifying and segmenting domestic and international market opportunities, preparing and executing marketing plans, developing pricing strategies, locating contract opportunities, negotiating contracts, and utilizing varying public relations and advertising techniques.

“(2) TIERS.—The Administrator shall provide assistance under paragraph (1) in three tiers of assistance as follows:

“(A) The first tier shall be to conduct a 5-year project in a situation where a project has not previously been conducted. Such a project shall be in a total amount of not more than \$150,000 per year.

“(B) The second tier shall be to conduct a 3-year project in a situation where a first-tier project is being completed. Such a project shall be in a total amount of not more than \$100,000 per year.

“(C) The third tier shall be to conduct a 3-year project in a situation where a second-tier project is being completed. Such a project shall be in a total amount of not more than \$100,000 per year. Third-tier grants are renewable subject to established eligibility criteria as well as criteria in subsection (b)(4).

“(3) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts made available for assistance under this subsection, the Administrator shall allocate—

“(A) at least 40 percent for first-tier projects under paragraph (2)(A);

“(B) 20 percent for second-tier projects under paragraph (2)(B); and

“(C) the remainder for third-tier projects under paragraph (2)(C).

“(4) BENCHMARKS FOR THIRD-TIER PROJECTS.—In awarding third-tier projects under paragraph (2)(C), the Administrator shall use benchmarks based on socio-economic factors in the community and on the performance of the applicant. The benchmarks shall include—

“(A) the total number of women served by the project;

“(B) the proportion of low income women and socio-economic distribution of clients served by the project;

“(C) the proportion of individuals in the community that are socially or economically disadvantaged (based on median income);

“(D) the future fundraising and service coordination plans;

“(E) the diversity of services provided; and

“(F) regional distribution within the 10 districts of the Administration.”

SEC. 202. MATCHMAKING FORMULA CHANGE.

Section 29(c)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(A) For the first and second years of the project, 1 non-Federal dollar for each 2 Federal dollars.

“(B) Each year after the second year of the project—

“(i) 1 non-Federal dollar for each Federal dollar; or

“(ii) if the center is in a community at least 50 percent of the population of which is below the median income, 1 non-Federal dollar for each 2 Federal dollars.”

SEC. 203. TERMINATION OF FUNDING.

Section 29(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) TERMINATION.—An organization that has conducted a project under this subsection—

“(A) is not eligible to conduct another such project; and

“(B) may continue thereafter to use the women's business center logo only with the consent of the Administrator.”

SEC. 204. WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTER AWARDS TO BE MADE PUBLIC.

Section 29(g)(2)(B)(ii)(V) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(g)(2)(B)(ii)(V)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, and make available to the public the award made to each applicant so selected”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the face of small business is changing in this country. Women entrepreneurs now account for 50 percent of all small business owners and are growing at a phenomenal rate. The SBA Women's Program Act of 2007, sponsored by Congresswoman FALLIN, works to enhance opportunities for women by increasing access to in-depth outcome-oriented counseling and training. It strengthens SBA's Women's Business Centers to ensure that they continue to serve the important role of assisting small business owners.

While many have taken advantage of the services Women's Business Centers offer, not all budding entrepreneurs are getting the resources they need to successfully start and own a business. A significant gap exists between the

number of women in our country and those involved in entrepreneurship, particularly in certain industry sectors.

Representative FALLIN's legislation will increase the reach of Women's Business Centers to help develop entrepreneurship, particularly in underprivileged areas. By setting standards, it ensures that those who want to start their own firms have quality support and training resources available. The increased research that this bill requires will make sure that challenges currently impacting women are identified and addressed.

The SBA Women's Procurement Act of 2007 builds on the strong track record of Women's Business Centers. The expansion of these centers has the potential to spur economic growth in disadvantaged communities and to even move impoverished women from welfare to entrepreneurship.

I strongly support this 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 the request to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2397, the SBA Women's Business Programs Act of 2007. I would like to thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for working in a cooperative and bipartisan manner to bring this bill, authored by Ms. FALLIN, a freshman member of the committee, to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN).

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ and Ranking Member CHABOT for their support for this legislation and also in helping to build a strong bipartisan coalition in the Small Business Committee.

This bill, the SBA Women's Business Act of 2007, will strengthen the Women Business Centers program that was established in 1997 by making it more efficient and more accountable. The Women's Business Centers are a very important part of the grant programs that are funded by the Small Business Administration. Today, Women's Business Centers all across the country are providing women entrepreneurs with much-needed technical assistance in starting and operating their own small businesses.

In the mid-1990s, the Federal Government began awarding grants to Women's Business Centers that were operating as nonprofit organizations in conjunction with institutions of higher learning. Originally, these grants were intended to be awarded to business centers in their first 5 years with the understanding that after the first 5-year period had ended, the center would be financially self-sustaining.

Although many Women's Business Centers did meet this goal, some have not for a variety of reasons. As a re-

sult, a greater percentage of the funding for this program has been consumed by the operating costs of potentially unviable centers rather than the intended purposes of establishing new business centers. The result is a drag on the system and viable business centers that are not truly serving an unmet need in their communities. This jeopardizes the effectiveness in the viability of the entire program.

The SBA Women's Business Programs Act of 2007 will restore the original priorities held by the Federal Government when this program was created. By offering a three-tiered system of funding and lower caps on spending for older business centers, we can ensure a balanced percentage of funding is used to support both new and existing business centers.

The first tier requires that at least 40 percent of the total funds be reserved for the purpose of establishing and supporting new Women's Business Centers during their first 5 years of existence. The second tier will use 20 percent of the total funds to help sustain the centers that have successfully existed during their first 5 years.

Lastly, the third tier will use a maximum of 40 percent of the funds to continue supporting centers that have existed for 8 years or more and have met the necessary benchmarks set forth by the SBA to receive this funding. This three-tiered system will offer a helping hand to newly established centers while slowly weaning the older centers off the dependency of the Federal grants.

It is important to realize that this legislation does not affect the overall funding level of this program. Rather, it rearranges the distribution of funds to reflect the original intention of these grants, an offer of temporary assistance rather than one of permanent dependency on the Federal Government.

This legislation will ultimately restore accountability and efficiency to a program that, while well intentioned, has become weighed down by inefficiency. These are goals that every Member of Congress can all support. The SBA Women's Business Programs Act of 2007 has passed in the Small Business Committee with overwhelming bipartisan support, and I want to encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this today.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the small business face in America is changing. We have more and more women who would like to get involved in opening and starting their businesses, and the bill that we have before us as sponsored by Representative FALLIN does just that.

It promotes opportunity for women by increasing access to business counseling and training through the devel-

opment of the Women's Business Center. This will better enable women to have flourishing enterprises and help to spur job creation and economic development across this Nation. I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, as a husband, a father of a young daughter, the proud brother to 6 sisters, and having served alongside dedicated women in the military, I have seen firsthand the role that women play in economically strengthening American society. And this is why I rise today to support H.R. 2397, the SBA Women's Business Programs Act of 2007.

Despite their significant contributions, women who work full time, year round, still only make 77 cents for every dollar made by their male counterparts, and women business owners, particularly those from socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds, face significant challenges resulting from inadequate community resources. Such resources include lack of access to capital, training resources, and networks of assistance.

Today, women-owned firms are one of the fastest growing, successful small business sectors. The number of women-owned firms has increased at nearly double the rate of all firms, and those with socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds have grown at twice the rate of their counterparts and 6 times the rate of all U.S. firms. As the number of women entrepreneurs grows, particularly those from underserved communities, I believe it is critical that women have adequate and appropriate resources to prepare them for success in the marketplace. To that end, H.R. 2397 proposes to expand the agency's commitment to the Women's Business Centers (WBCs).

WBCs provide in-depth, substantive, and outcome-oriented counseling, training and mentoring, resulting in substantial economic impact as measured by successful business start-ups, job creation and retention, and increased company revenues. They also provide financial, management, and marketing assistance to women small business owners.

H.R. 2397 supports the growth of women small business owners by expanding entrepreneurial development assistance, particularly in low-income areas. The legislation dedicates funding to the opening of new WBCs in underserved areas, while implementing new benchmarks to ensure centers that continually receive funds are meeting performance requirements. These metrics, which include information on clients served and fundraising plans, will help to preserve resources for centers that have demonstrated success helping women entrepreneurs while promoting the expansion of assistance centers into underserved areas.

H.R. 2397 is important legislation which promotes economic security for America's women, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2397, the Small Business Administration Women's Business Programs Act of 2007. I commend my colleague from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN) for introducing this important legislation to reauthorize the women's entrepreneurial development programs of the Small Business Administration (SBA).

Most notably H.R. 2397 would authorize the SBA Administrator to provide financial assistance to private nonprofit organizations to conduct projects for the benefit of small businesses owned and operated by women. The bill notes that such projects shall provide, among other things, financial assistance, including training and counseling on how to apply for and secure business credit and investment capital, preparing and presenting financial statements, and managing cash flow and other financial operations of a business concern; management assistance, including training and counseling in how to plan, organize, staff, direct, and control each major activity and function of a small business; and marketing assistance, including training and counseling in identifying and segmenting domestic and international market opportunities, preparing and executing marketing plans, developing pricing strategies, locating contract opportunities, negotiating contracts, and utilizing varying public relations and advertising techniques.

H.R. 2397 would also direct that the National Women's Business Council (NWBC) conduct at least one study per year that evaluates the challenges hindering the success of women entrepreneurs, and mandates that NWBC select the topic for the study in consultation with the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate.

Support for this legislation will help Congress fulfill its commitment to ensuring that women owned and operated small businesses are able to access the resources and training they may require in order to achieve success. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2397.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2397.

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.

□ 1900

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2563, by the yeas and nays;
H. Con. Res. 151, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 233, by the yeas and nays.
The postponed votes on S. 1352, H. Con. Res. 21, H.R. 2359 and H.R. 2284 will be taken tomorrow.

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

MAJOR SCOTT NISELY POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2563, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2563.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 0, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

YEAS—386

Ackerman	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)
Aderholt	Culberson	Hayes
Akin	Cummings	Heller
Alexander	Davis (AL)	Hensarling
Allen	Davis (CA)	Herger
Altmire	Davis (IL)	Herseth Sandlin
Arcuri	Davis (KY)	Higgins
Baca	Davis, David	Hill
Bachmann	Davis, Lincoln	Hinchev
Bachus	Davis, Tom	Hinojosa
Baird	Deal (GA)	Hirono
Baker	DeFazio	Hobson
Baldwin	DeGette	Hodes
Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Holden
Barrow	DeLauro	Holt
Bartlett (MD)	Dent	Honda
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hooley
Bean	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoyer
Berkley	Dicks	Hulshof
Berry	Dingell	Inglis (SC)
Biggart	Doggett	Inslee
Bilbray	Donnelly	Israel
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Issa
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Drake	Jackson-Lee
Blackburn	Dreier	(TX)
Blumenauer	Duncan	Johnson (GA)
Blunt	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Boehner	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Bono	Ellison	Jones (NC)
Boren	Ellsworth	Jones (OH)
Boswell	Emanuel	Jordan
Boucher	Emerson	Kagen
Boustany	Engel	Kanjorski
Boyd (FL)	English (PA)	Kaptur
Boyd (KS)	Eshoo	Keller
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Kennedy
Brady (TX)	Everett	Kildee
Bralley (IA)	Fallin	Kilpatrick
Brown (SC)	Farr	Kind
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	King (IA)
Brown-Waite,	Feeney	King (NY)
Ginny	Ferguson	Kirk
Buchanan	Finer	Klein (FL)
Burgess	Forbes	Kline (MN)
Burton (IN)	Fortenberry	Knollenberg
Buyer	Fossella	Kucinich
Camp (MI)	Fox	Kuhl (NY)
Campbell (CA)	Frank (MA)	Lamborn
Cannon	Franks (AZ)	Lampson
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Capito	Gallely	Lantos
Capps	Garrett (NJ)	Larsen (WA)
Cardoza	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Carnahan	Giffords	Latham
Carney	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Castle	Gillibrand	Lee
Castor	Gillmor	Levin
Chabot	Gingrey	Lewis (CA)
Chandler	Gohmert	Lewis (GA)
Clarke	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)
Clay	Goode	Linder
Cleaver	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Clyburn	Gordon	Loeb sack
Coble	Granger	Lofgren, Zoe
Cohen	Green, Al	Lowey
Cole (OK)	Green, Gene	Lucas
Conaway	Grijalva	Lungren, Daniel
Cooper	Gutierrez	E.
Costa	Hall (NY)	Lynch
Costello	Hall (TX)	Mack
Courtney	Hare	Mahoney (FL)
Cramer	Harman	Maloney (NY)
Crenshaw	Hastert	Manzullo
Crowley	Hastings (FL)	Markey

Marshall	Petri	Slaughter
Matheson	Pickering	Smith (NE)
Matsui	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
McCarthy (CA)	Platts	Smith (TX)
McCarthy (NY)	Poe	Smith (WA)
McCaul (TX)	Pomeroy	Solis
McCollum (MN)	Porter	Souder
McCrery	Price (GA)	Spratt
McDermott	Price (NC)	Stark
McGovern	Putnam	Stearns
McHugh	Radanovich	Stupak
McIntyre	Rahall	Sutton
McKeon	Ramstad	Tancred
McMorris	Rangel	Tanner
Rodgers	Regula	Tauscher
McNerney	Rehberg	Terry
McNulty	Reichert	Thompson (CA)
Meek (FL)	Renzi	Thompson (MS)
Meeks (NY)	Reynolds	Thornberry
Melancon	Rodriguez	Tiahrt
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (KY)
Michaud	Rogers (MI)	Rohrabacher
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Roskam
Miller (MI)	Rothman	Roybal-Allard
Miller (NC)	Royce	Royce
Miller, Gary	Ruppersberger	Ryan (OH)
Miller, George	Ryan (WI)	Ryan (WI)
Mitchell	Salazar	Sánchez, Linda
Mollohan	Sali	T.
Moore (KS)	Sánchez, Linda	Sarbanes
Moore (WI)	T.	Saxton
Moran (KS)	Sánchez, Linda	Schakowsky
Moran (VA)	T.	Schiff
Murphy (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Schmidt
Murphy, Patrick	T.	Schwartz
Murphy, Tim	T.	Scott (GA)
Musgrave	Sarbanes	Scott (VA)
Myrick	Saxton	Sensenbrenner
Nadler	Schakowsky	Serrano
Napolitano	Schiff	Sessions
Neal (MA)	Schmidt	Shadegg
Neugebauer	Schwartz	Shays
Nunes	Scott (GA)	Shea-Porter
Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Sherman
Obey	Sensenbrenner	Shuler
Olver	Serrano	Shuster
Ortiz	Sessions	Simpson
Pascrell	Shadegg	Peterson (MN)
Pastor	Shays	Peterson (PA)
Paul	Shea-Porter	
Payne	Sherman	
Pearce	Shuler	
Pence	Shuster	
Perlmutter	Simpson	
Peterson (MN)	Sires	
Peterson (PA)	Skelton	

NOT VOTING—46

Abercrombie	Graves	Reyes
Andrews	Hoekstra	Ross
Becerra	Hunter	Rush
Berman	Jefferson	Sanchez, Loretta
Bishop (GA)	Jindal	Sestak
Bonner	Johnson, E. B.	Shimkus
Boozman	Kingston	Snyder
Butterfield	LaHood	Space
Calvert	Lipinski	Sullivan
Capuano	Marchant	Taylor
Carson	McCotter	Walz (MN)
Carter	McHenry	Weiner
Conyers	Meehan	Weller
Cubin	Murtha	Wexler
Davis, Jo Ann	Pallone	
Flake	Pryce (OH)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1922

Mr. McNERNEY and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTING KILLINGS OF DOZENS OF INDEPENDENT JOURNALISTS IN RUSSIA AND CALLING ON RUSSIAN PRESIDENT TO AUTHORIZE COOPERATION WITH OUTSIDE INVESTIGATORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 151, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 151, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 1, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

YEAS—388

Ackerman	Coble	Giffords
Aderholt	Cohen	Gilchrest
Akin	Cole (OK)	Gillibrand
Alexander	Conaway	Gillmor
Allen	Cooper	Gingrey
Altmire	Costa	Gohmert
Arcuri	Costello	Gonzalez
Baca	Courtney	Goode
Bachmann	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bachus	Crenshaw	Gordon
Baird	Crowley	Granger
Baker	Cuellar	Green, Al
Baldwin	Culberson	Green, Gene
Barrett (SC)	Cummings	Grijalva
Barrow	Davis (AL)	Grijalva
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (CA)	Hall (NY)
Barton (TX)	Davis (IL)	Hall (TX)
Bean	Davis (KY)	Hare
Berkley	Davis, David	Harman
Berry	Davis, Lincoln	Hastert
Biggert	Davis, Tom	Hastings (FL)
Bilbray	Deal (GA)	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Hayes
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Heller
Bishop (UT)	Delahunt	Hensarling
Blackburn	DeLauro	Heger
Blumenauer	Dent	Herseth Sandlin
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, L.	Higgins
Boehner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hill
Bono	Dicks	Hinche
Boozman	Dingell	Hinojosa
Boren	Doggett	Hirono
Boswell	Donnelly	Hobson
Boucher	Doolittle	Hodes
Boustany	Doyle	Holden
Boyd (FL)	Drake	Holt
Boyd (KS)	Dreier	Honda
Brady (PA)	Duncan	Hooley
Brady (TX)	Edwards	Hoyer
Braley (IA)	Ehlers	Hulshof
Brown (SC)	Ellison	Inglis (SC)
Brown, Corrine	Ellsworth	Inslee
Brown-Waite,	Emanuel	Israel
Ginny	Emerson	Issa
Buchanan	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Burgess	English (PA)	Jackson-Lee
Burton (IN)	Eshoo	(TX)
Buyer	Etheridge	Johnson (GA)
Camp (MI)	Everett	Johnson (IL)
Campbell (CA)	Fallin	Johnson, Sam
Cannon	Farr	Jones (NC)
Cantor	Fattah	Jones (OH)
Capito	Feeney	Jordan
Capps	Ferguson	Kagen
Cardoza	Filner	Kanjorski
Carnahan	Forbes	Kaptur
Carney	Fortenberry	Keller
Castle	Fossella	Kennedy
Castor	Fox	Kildee
Chabot	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Chandler	Franks (AZ)	Kind
Clarke	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Clay	Gallegly	King (NY)
Cleaver	Garrett (NJ)	Kirk
Clyburn	Gerlach	Klein (FL)

Kline (MN)	Musgrave	Shadegg
Knollenberg	Myrick	Shays
Kucinich	Nadler	Shea-Porter
Kuhl (NY)	Napolitano	Sherman
Lamborn	Neal (MA)	Shuler
Lampson	Neugebauer	Shuster
Langevin	Nunes	Simpson
Lantos	Oberstar	Sires
Larsen (WA)	Obey	Skelton
Larson (CT)	Oliver	Slaughter
Latham	Ortiz	Smith (NE)
LaTourette	Pascarell	Smith (NJ)
Lee	Pastor	Smith (TX)
Levin	Payne	Smith (WA)
Lewis (CA)	Pearce	Solis
Lewis (GA)	Pence	Souder
Lewis (KY)	Perlmutter	Spratt
Linder	Peterson (MN)	Stark
LoBiondo	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
Loebsack	Petri	Stupak
Lofgren, Zoe	Pickering	Sutton
Lowe	Pitts	Tancredo
Lucas	Platts	Tanner
Lungren, Daniel	Poe	Tauscher
E.	Pomeroy	Terry
Lynch	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Mack	Price (GA)	Thompson (MS)
Mahoney (FL)	Price (NC)	Thornberry
Maloney (NY)	Putnam	Tiahrt
Manzullo	Radanovich	Tiberi
Markey	Rahall	Tierney
Marshall	Ramstad	Towns
Matheson	Rangel	Turner
Matsui	Regula	Udall (CO)
McCarthy (CA)	Rehberg	Udall (NM)
McCarthy (NY)	Reichert	Upton
McCaul (TX)	Renzi	Van Hollen
McCollum (MN)	Reynolds	Velázquez
McCreery	Rodriguez	Visclosky
McDermott	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
McGovern	Rogers (KY)	Walden (OR)
McHugh	Rogers (MI)	Walsh (NY)
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Walz (MN)
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Wamp
McMorris	Roskam	Wasserman
Rodgers	Ross	Schultz
McNerney	Rothman	Waters
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Watson
Meek (FL)	Royce	Watt
Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Watt
Melancon	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
Mica	Ryan (WI)	Welch (VT)
Michaud	Salazar	Weldon (FL)
Miller (FL)	Sali	Westmoreland
Miller (MI)	Sánchez, Linda	Whitfield
Miller (NC)	T.	Wicker
Miller, Gary	Sarbanes	Wilson (NM)
Miller, George	Saxton	Wilson (OH)
Mitchell	Schakowsky	Wilson (SC)
Mollohan	Schiff	Wolf
Moore (KS)	Schmidt	Woolsey
Moore (WI)	Schwartz	Wu
Moran (KS)	Scott (GA)	Wynn
Moran (VA)	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Murphy (CT)	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Murphy, Patrick	Serrano	Young (FL)
Murphy, Tim	Sessions	

NAYS—1

Paul
NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie	Graves	Pryce (OH)
Andrews	Hoekstra	Reyes
Becerra	Hunter	Rush
Berman	Jefferson	Sanchez, Loretta
Bishop (GA)	Jindal	Sestak
Bonner	Johnson, E. B.	Shimkus
Butterfield	Kingston	Space
Calvert	LaHood	Snyder
Capuano	Lipinski	Sullivan
Carson	Marchant	Taylor
Carter	McCotter	Weiner
Conyers	McHenry	Weller
Cubis	Meehan	Wexler
Davis, Jo Ann	Murtha	
Flake	Pallone	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1930

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution noting the disturbing pattern of killings of numerous independent journalists in Russia since 2000, and urging Russian President Vladimir Putin to authorize cooperation with outside investigators in solving those murders."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING OVER 200 YEARS OF SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 233, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 233, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

YEAS—389

Ackerman	Cantor	Duncan
Aderholt	Capito	Edwards
Akin	Capps	Ehlers
Alexander	Cardoza	Ellison
Allen	Carnahan	Ellsworth
Altmire	Carney	Emanuel
Arcuri	Castle	Emerson
Baca	Castor	Engel
Bachmann	Chabot	English (PA)
Bachus	Chandler	Eshoo
Baird	Clarke	Etheridge
Baker	Clay	Everett
Baldwin	Cleaver	Fallin
Barrett (SC)	Clyburn	Farr
Barrow	Coble	Fattah
Bartlett (MD)	Cohen	Feeney
Barton (TX)	Cole (OK)	Ferguson
Bean	Conaway	Filner
Berkley	Cooper	Forbes
Berry	Costa	Fortenberry
Biggert	Costello	Fossella
Bilbray	Courtney	Fox
Bilirakis	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Blackburn	Cuellar	Gallegly
Blumenauer	Culberson	Garrett (NJ)
Blunt	Cummings	Gerlach
Boehner	Davis (AL)	Giffords
Bono	Davis (CA)	Gilchrest
Boozman	Davis (IL)	Gillibrand
Boren	Davis (KY)	Gillmor
Boswell	Davis, David	Gingrey
Boucher	Davis, Lincoln	Gohmert
Boustany	Davis, Tom	Goode
Boyd (FL)	Deal (GA)	Goode
Boyd (KS)	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Gordon
Brady (TX)	Delahunt	Granger
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Green, Al
Brown (SC)	Dent	Green, Gene
Brown, Corrine	Diaz-Balart, L.	Grijalva
Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, M.	Gutiérrez
Ginny	Dicks	Hall (NY)
Buchanan	Dingell	Hall (TX)
Burgess	Doggett	Hare
Burton (IN)	Donnelly	Harman
Buyer	Doolittle	Hastert
Camp (MI)	Doyle	Hastings (FL)
Campbell (CA)	Drake	Hastings (WA)
Cannon	Dreier	Hayes

Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herstheth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery

NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie
Andrews
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bonner
Butterfield
Calvert
Capuano
Carson
Carter
Conyers
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Flake

McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)

Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tancred
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1937

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2764, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008

Mrs. LOWEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-197) on the bill (H.R. 2764) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

FAST TRACK TRADE AUTHORITY

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 2007, Fast Track trade authority will expire. Now is the time for Congress to replace an outdated system that removes congressional authority, as set out in the Constitution, "to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

As it stands with Fast Track in place, Congress has no control over the content of trade agreements. We can vote on trade agreements only after they have been negotiated and signed, but we are responsible for trade agreements negative effects. Over 3 million American manufacturing jobs have been lost.

American wages have stagnated. We have lost our family farms, and we have failed to encourage income equality in the developing nations with which we have trade agreements. That's after Fast Track.

Let's replace Fast Track with a better system. Congress should be able to decide with whom we negotiate trade agreements and what goes into those agreements. Let's restore the balance of powers on trade established in the Constitution.

RECOGNIZING SEVERAL OUTSTANDING STUDENTS FROM ROBERTS WESLEYAN COLLEGE

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

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize several outstanding students from the Roberts Wesleyan College, which is located in my congressional district.

In today's world, if we needed an innovative cutting-edge solution to a challenge, we look to our institutions of higher education. Each year, the Motion Picture Association of America partners with Students in Free Enterprise to host a national competition to produce a public service announcement regarding the importance of intellectual property rights. For the second year in a row, Roberts Wesleyan College placed among the top 3 of over 40 competitors.

These talented Roberts Wesleyan students won a cash award, and their broadcast now has a chance to achieve national exposure. Their outstanding accomplishment will have an impact on both the local and the national level.

I commend the efforts of these students.

ALMOST 4,000 DEAD IN IRAQ

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, sadly, we are moving toward almost 4,000 dead in Iraq. I don't believe there are enough times that we can recount for the American people how many have already died; 25,000 are injured.

I am grateful to the Democratic leadership for providing enhanced funding for the veterans hospitals and the Veterans Affairs Department to break the backlog of those veterans' wait for services and to help those in outpatient centers who need care.

But the real issue is when is the Iraqi Government going to stand up?

Just this past weekend, bombing occurred in Afghanistan where we need to turn our attention, but we understand that there is a possibility that the Iraqi Parliament will end its work and go off on a vacation for July and August while our soldiers are dying.

It is time now for this administration to understand the misdirection of this mission, to cause the Iraqi Government to stand up so that we can stand down. How many more lives, how many more families for these brave and wonderful men and women on the front lines of Iraq? They are our heroes, they are the patriots. We salute them.

It is time now for the administration to stand up for them and make the Iraqi Government stand up and take care of the Iraqi people.

□ 1945

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007,

and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

BOO WHO?

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, when Ms. USA recently appeared in Mexico City, she was repeatedly booed every time she was onstage. Apparently, the host and hostess and the "Politically Correct Police" missed it or just ignored it.

The pro-amnesty crowd is moving right along in its efforts to convince the American public that illegal immigration exists because people would do anything to be an American; interesting logic considering recent events. But I've never understood the logic in rewarding 12 to 20 million law breakers with amnesty for any reason.

In America, we seem to do things a little bit different. We cheer for our country. We wave our flag. We invest in our country, and we respect our neighbors. And by respecting neighbors, I don't mean we invade somebody else's country, demand benefits and protest brazenly in the streets waving foreign flags. And where I come from, we never boo a lady.

The booing incident of Americans doesn't come as a big shock to most of us. It has happened before in U.S.-Mexico sporting events. The Mexican team and the Mexican fans booed the U.S. players. It is the disappointment in the lack of reaction from some of our leaders to realize that they are not welcoming future Americans into our country with their amnesty giveaway; they are just giving away the country.

A pathway to citizenship, or earned citizenship, or any other giveaway program they want to call it only works if people really want to become Americans. If you want to be an American, then there are some responsibilities to that. You just don't get to take all you can and leave when you are done.

I don't agree that this amnesty nonsense is what's best for America, and I know, without a doubt, that the uncontrolled border is a natural disaster. Sure, it's great for Mexico. Their struggling economy depends on our citizens; or rather, their citizens' loyalty to their country, not loyalty to our country.

But the argument is that we have to allow those living in our country illegally the opportunity to come out of the shadows and be a part of our country and our culture. That simply is not going to happen, because their loyalty lies with their former nation. And an amnesty giveaway is going to legalize their loyalty to their home country, not make them Americans.

Mexico and other countries promote illegal immigration to the United States with one understanding: You send your money back home to Mexico. And America is not home. Billions

headed south last year to Mexico alone. Remittances from the United States were the second highest revenue for Mexico, right behind the sale of crude oil, beating out tourism.

So when the United States gets booed, people that don't understand this are a bit taken aback. Is it irony or arrogance? Most people don't bite the hands that feed them, especially when you have them eating out of your hand.

The administration recently said, "Those determined to find fault with this bill will always be able to look at a narrow slice of it and find something they don't like. If you want to kill this bill, if you don't want to do what's right for America, you can pick out one little aspect of it."

Although I respect the President greatly, I respectfully suggest he is in error. We cannot accept the narrow slice or the whole amnesty pie. We are not that much of a glutton for this pie in the sky.

Americans deserve better. They deserve real immigration reform that secures the borders with the utmost of urgency and an end to political preference policy for illegals, a policy that discriminates against American citizens and legal immigrants.

We need to end employment opportunities and social benefits intended and entitled to Americans and have legislation that puts the needs and benefits of Americans first.

Kowtowing to Mexico, the country that takes and takes from America but booed Ms. USA off the stage, is exactly what's wrong with this new Senate amnesty bill and this administration's position.

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

WAITING FOR THE NEXT BIG EVENT

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last month, despite my objections and many of my colleagues, Congress passed a bill to continue funding the occupation of Iraq. Now everyone is waiting for the next big event in the war, General Petraeus's report on whether the escalation, the surge, is succeeding. This report is due in September.

But with our brave American troops and innocent Iraqis continuing to die, we are remiss if we twiddle our thumbs and wait for September. We need to hold this administration accountable for its actions in Iraq, and we need to do it today, not 3 months from now.

So I want to go back to January 10 of this year, the night that the President announced his new surge policy in a speech to the Nation, to see if he is delivering on what he promised. On that night, he said, "America will hold the Iraqi government to the benchmarks it has announced."

But here we are, Mr. Speaker, 6 months later, and the Iraqi government has made virtually no progress on any of its benchmarks. Even Lieutenant General Douglas Lute, our new war czar, expressed frustration about this in his Senate confirmation hearing. General Lute said, "My assessment would be that the Iraqis have shown very little progress."

Mr. Speaker, back on January 10, we were told that the surge would help the Iraqis carry out their campaign to put down sectarian violence. But the Pentagon's own report on the current situation, which was released last Wednesday, said that the violence continues to be driven by sectarianism. In other words, we've sent our troops to fight a civil war that has nothing to do with protecting America from terrorism.

Also, back on January 10, the escalation speech included these words: "Our military forces in Anbar are killing and capturing al Qaeda leaders."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, in the Senate hearing I mentioned a moment ago, Senator EVAN BAYH quoted a top CIA expert in saying that the American presence in Iraq is creating more members of al Qaeda than we are killing.

The President claims that he has the power to grab people off the streets of America, declare them enemy combatants and order the military to hold them indefinitely. But last week, a Federal Appeals Court ruled that, "to sanction such authority would have disastrous consequences for the Constitution and for the country."

The President says that he is a strict constructionist when it comes to the Constitution. But he has shown that he is not a strict constructionist, not a loose constructionist, but a non constructionist who simply ignores the Constitution.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for a new policy in Iraq. We must fully fund the safe redeployment of our troops. We must guarantee the very best health care for our veterans. We must work with the Iraqi people and the international community to provide for the reconstruction of Iraq. We must look to diplomacy, not preemptive war, to help Iraq and its neighbors to achieve political solutions to the region's problems, and there must be no permanent American military bases in Iraq.

And America must rely, once again, on our most powerful weapons in the fight against terrorism, our Constitution and our democratic values.

And, Mr. Speaker, we must bring our troops home.

PROSECUTION OF FORMER U.S.
BORDER PATROL AGENTS

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House well know, in February 2006, U.S. Border Patrol Agents Ramos and Compean were convicted in a U.S. District Court in Texas for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler. They were sentenced to 11 and 12 years imprisonment, respectively, and today is the 153rd day since the two agents entered Federal prison.

What Members of this House may not know is that 10 years of each of their sentences were based on an indictment and conviction for a Federal crime that does not exist. The Federal crime they were convicted of does not exist.

The law that they were charged with violating has never been enacted by the United States Congress but rather was fashioned by the Office of the United States Attorney for the Western District of Texas, Johnny Sutton.

The law that the agents were charged with, 18 United States Code section 924(c)(1)(a) as enacted by Congress, requires a defendant to be indicted and convicted either of using or carrying a firearm during and in relation to the commission of a crime of violence or possessing a firearm in furtherance of a crime of violence.

However, neither Mr. Ramos nor Mr. Compean was ever charged with the specific elements of the crime. Instead, Mr. Sutton's office extracted from the United States Criminal Code a sentencing factor, discharging a firearm, and substituted that sentencing factor for the congressionally defined elements of the offense.

In this case, I can imagine how difficult it would be to obtain an indictment and conviction for "using," "possessing" or "carrying" a firearm when the Border Agents were required to carry firearms as part of their job. That difficulty may well, very well, explain why this United States Attorney's Office unilaterally changed Congress's definition of a crime to a definition that would be easier to prove by the prosecution.

Any change in the elements of a crime amounts to the seizure of legislative authority by a Federal prosecutor. When this encroachment upon the legislative power of Congress was brought to my attention and to the attention of my colleagues, Congressmen VIRGIL GOODE and former Texas State judge, Congressman TED POE, we joined forces with the Gun Owners Foundation, U.S. Border Control, U.S. Border Control Foundation and the Conservative Legal Defense and Education Fund to file a friend of the court brief in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Court.

The brief urges reversal of these unjust convictions and 10 year mandatory minimum sentences by spelling out how changes contained in two counts

of the indictment against the agents are "fatally defective" because they fail to charge an offense as defined by the statute.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues and the American people have been greatly concerned about the denial of due process of law to Agents Ramos and Compean. The American people must be confident that prosecutors will not tailor the law to make it easier to convict in a particular case. Federal prosecutors take an oath to enforce the law, not to make the law.

It is my understanding that the House Judiciary Committee will soon hold hearings to examine the prosecution of this case, and I want to thank Chairman JOHN CONYERS for his interest in investigating the injustice committed against these two Border agents.

I encourage the chairman and the committee to take a thorough look into the actions of the Office of U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Texas and its pattern of aggressively prosecuting law enforcement officers, including Ramos and Compean, former Border Patrol Agent Aleman and Deputy Sheriff Gilmer Hernandez. These are legitimate legal questions and concerns about this prosecutor's office, and they need to be answered.

And again, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his interest and concern about justice to right an injustice.

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

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

□ 2000

HIGHLIGHTING THE COBB COUNTY
SHERIFF'S OFFICE

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the exemplary important work of the Cobb County Sheriff's Office. This Georgia agency has been screening County Jail inmates to identify and deport illegal immigrants. This is a hugely important effort. After these criminals serve their time, we need to deport them.

Many jailed illegal immigrants are incarcerated for crimes like rape, armed robbery and drug trafficking. We want to do more than simply get these criminals off our streets. We want, Mr. Speaker, to get them out of our country.

Six deputies with the Cobb County Sheriff's Office recently underwent specialized training with Immigration and Customs Enforcement to identify illegal immigrants in our jails. Cobb Coun-

ty is the first department in Georgia and indeed one of the first in the Nation to work with ICE on this initiative. They are setting a fine example for communities across America, and our cities will undoubtedly benefit from the widespread adoption of this program.

After all, our State and local law enforcement officials are our first responders in the fight against illegal immigration. They play a critical role in stopping criminal aliens from harming our citizens.

Here's how this new program works. Local law enforcement officials travel to Herndon, Virginia, to train with Immigration and Customs Enforcement. They get experience in immigration law, criminal law, document examination, alien processing, and cross-cultural communication.

These trained deputies then return home to their communities where they work with ICE agents to identify illegal immigrants in local jails by comparing fingerprints with ICE and FBI databases and interviewing prisoners.

The program may be new but it is already working. In the Cobb County jail alone, which holds nearly 2,200 inmates, law enforcement officials have identified 63 people of interest to Federal immigration authorities. That is 63 rapists, robbers, and drug lords that we can get off of our streets and out of our country.

Mr. Speaker, we know local law enforcement officials are often our front line of defense when it comes to identifying and removing illegal immigrants from our communities. As we look for solutions to the current illegal immigration crisis, we must empower our State and local officials and help them coordinate with Federal agents. And that is why I proudly supported an amendment last week to the Homeland Security appropriations bill. We passed that on the floor to support this new and promising ICE program so that we don't just provide funding to communities located within 100 miles of the southern border; otherwise Cobb County, Georgia won't have qualified.

Last summer I examined border security efforts along the United States-Mexican border, and during that trip I observed our Border Patrol agents loading up buses and planes with criminal illegal immigrants being deported back to their home countries. Now Cobb County is playing a vital role in this process, and I am incredibly proud of their efforts. The sheriff's office is helping rid our society of dangerous criminals who have no business being here in the United States.

Especially, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Cobb County Sheriff Neil Warren, Cobb County Police Chief George Hatfield, and the six Cobb deputies who went through the specialized training: Paul Harrison, Claudia Cross, Marco Cabrera, Olanda Palmer, and Paul Diaz. Their effort to uphold the rule of law is commendable, and I urge more local agencies to consider participating in this critical program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking the Cobb County sheriff's office for its commitment to getting dangerous, criminal, illegal immigrants out of our community.

THE IRAQ WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, last week President Bush defended his war in Iraq saying it would be a disaster if we left. Well, if the President doesn't know it by now, we already have a disaster on our hands.

Allow me to read a few headlines from the past week to give everyone a sense of how well the war is progressing:

The Washington Post, June 18, 2007, General Petraeus: "Iraq 'Challenges' to Last for Years."

New York Times, June 16, 2007, "In Iraq Secretary Gates Says Progress Toward Peace is Lagging."

New York Times, June 13, 2007, "Violence Rising in Much of Iraq, Pentagon Says."

MSNBC.com, March 17, 2006, "Cost of Iraq War could surpass \$1 trillion. Of course, the estimates vary but all agree price is far higher than initially expected."

A Pentagon report released last week gave a grim outlook of the situation in Iraq. While the number of U.S. troops on the ground reached a record high as a result of the President's so-called troop surge, violence in Iraq has continued to increase. In fact, since the surge was announced, 500 American troops have been killed. According to the report, much of the violence that plagues Iraq is attributable to "sectarian friction and each faction is driven by its own political and economic power relationships."

Further, "Illegally armed groups are engaged in a cycle of sectarian and politically motivated violence, using tactics that include indiscriminate bombing, murder, executions and indirect fire to intimidate and provoke sectarian conflict."

Simply put, Iraq is a full-fledged civil war.

The number of suicide attacks in Iraq has increased from 26 in January to 58 in March and April. Remember IEDs, that is, improvised explosive devices? Now insurgents are increasingly using a more advanced type of IED called EFPs, or explosively formed projectiles, to kill our soldiers. These new bombs are being used in rapidly increasing numbers and are extremely effective at piercing the armor of our Humvees, tanks, and troop transports, causing mass casualties. As of today, there have been 3,526 U.S. deaths; there have been 26,000 Americans wounded, some very serious; 60,000 to 100,000 Iraqi civilians have died; and there are over 1,000 attacks per week, on average, and steadily growing.

We have spent over \$435 billion of taxpayer money. The total cost to our economy could be upwards of \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion.

It is time to face the facts. Bombs and bullets have not and will not bring us peace in Iraq.

In January, I, along with my colleagues BARBARA LEE and LYNN WOOLSEY, introduced H.R. 508, the "Bring the Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2007." This bill repeals the authorization of force in Iraq, requires a complete withdrawal of troops within 6 months, and puts Iraq on a path to sovereignty and peace. This bill seeks to end the cycle of violence that has plagued Iraq since we began this occupation.

There is bipartisan opposition to the war in Iraq, and a majority of Americans not only think President Bush is doing a poor job handling the situation in Iraq, but a majority also support setting a timetable for withdrawal. Our constituents sent us a strong message in November and continue to demand an end to this war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we in Congress have the courage to bring this war in Iraq to an end.

DR. AL SIMONE

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

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Dr. Al Simone, an outstanding individual in the community of Rochester, New York. Dr. Simone retires this month from the presidency of the Rochester Institute of Technology. He was RIT's eighth president, the eighth in 177 years.

Dr. Simone came to Rochester from a place where the weather is a little bit more predictable. He was the president of the University of Hawaii system and chancellor of the University of Hawaii at Manoa for 9 years.

Dr. Simone has led RIT to become the one of the Nation's leading career-oriented universities with 15,500 students from all 50 States and more than 100 foreign countries, 2,800 faculty and staff, and an annual operating budget of more than \$490 million. RIT is now the tenth largest private university in the Nation in terms of full-time undergraduate enrollment. The endowment has climbed to more than \$570 million during his tenancy.

Dr. Simone is a prolific writer and has written several books and numerous journal publications on the application of mathematics, statistics, and computers to economics and business. In fact, Dr. Simone is collecting data and information for a book right now on higher education, which he expects to write within the next few years during his retirement on the sunny shores of Keuka Lake.

Dr. Simone is a real trailblazer. He was the first American university

president, for instance, to officially visit North Korea, Vietnam, and Vladivostok when these areas were closed to the United States except for cultural and educational exchange.

A native of Boston, Dr. Simone received his B.A. in economics from Tufts University and his Ph.D. in economics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has taught at Tufts, MIT, Northeastern University, Boston College, Boston University, University of Cincinnati, and the University of Hawaii.

The community will certainly miss Al's leadership and I know I will miss working with him.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will join me in wishing him and his wife, Carolie, a long, happy, healthy retirement with their children and their grandchildren.

THE RED INK KEEPS GETTING DEEPER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the topic of my remarks tonight will be "The Red Ink Keeps Getting Deeper."

If we look at the trade procedure the Bush administration wants Congress to pass called Fast Track, we should know that it is shorthand for Congress blindly signing away its constitutionally granted duty to regulate commerce with foreign nations. That is right in the Constitution. Under Fast Track procedure, Congress loses any opportunity to negotiate, amend, or improve the Bush administration's misguided trade policy.

We have seen what happens when Congress hands the reins over to the executive branch. When we look at our soaring trade deficit and our ravaged middle-class communities, we see how Congress could have improved each one of the trade agreements we were forced to consider as a whole under what was called Fast Track. It is like a fast ball through here that you can't even amend.

The Commerce Department just released an example of the Bush administration's horrendous leadership on this issue. The first quarter account for 2007 is another \$193 billion deficit in the red, which totals 5.7 percent of GDP, a total drag on economic growth in this country. And, in fact, this quarter's debt is larger than the last quarter of 2006. The red ink keeps getting deeper every single quarter.

Our national security is forced to take a back seat to foreign investment while workers lose their pensions and their health benefits or their jobs, and illegal immigrants scramble across our borders attempting to flee the destruction caused by our failed trade policies in those countries. This should not be happening.

When Congress reclaims our power to amend trade agreements, we can use trade policy in a manner to level the

playing field, to help people and not just fan the flames of more corporate greed in the global marketplace.

Congress cannot accept Fast Track in any form. We must demand and create a new model for trade that has not just a logic but also an ethic. We must bring people back into the trade equation, not just investors.

Our trade policy touches people around the world, from middle-class Americans in the heart of this country to Mexican corn and bean farmers facing extinction come next January as some of NAFTA's provisions phase out for them. Our trade policy touches factory workers in China toiling for starvation wages.

We, as most powerful Nation in the world, must accept our responsibility to protect people from corporate greed and our own people from security risks. We cannot trust President Bush to defend our jobs. We have seen he has not been able to do that. And we cannot watch him dictate trade policies that Congress is blocked from amending. We have to take the responsibility given to us in our Constitution.

Instead of approving more lopsided trade agreements, Congress should fix our current situation. Trade should create jobs in America. It should not exploit Third World workers. It should elevate, not reduce, America's image abroad. Congress should fund the North American Development Bank to support job creation in communities where jobs have been offshored and outsourced. And we should require our trade competitors to adhere to environmental standards. We should abolish child labor worldwide. We should stop labor trafficking. And we should fix our broken immigration system that is so tied to failed trade policies. A new trade model must be created that meets America's most principled values, democratic rights and justice for all.

Under Fast Track authority, however, Congress cannot even control our own floor schedule. President Bush will decide what policy we consider and when we vote on it. We simply can't accept that. Congress must reclaim its own power. Democrats must lead the way to a more sensible and ethical trade policy that brings prosperity to people here at home as well as around the world, restores our reputation abroad, and advances democratic principles, that's with a small "d," respect for people.

The world has suffered at the hands of Bush administration trade policies for too long. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing any more blank checks for this President or any President who tries to move a trade agreement through here on renewing Fast Track. Congress ought to reject Fast Track and we should stop making the red ink deeper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. GINNY

BROWN-WAITE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2015

GENERAL PETER PACE

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. This evening, we have heard some talk about the war that we're engaged in, the fighting in Iraq, the fighting in Afghanistan, this long war against Islamist extremists that we're engaged in. And tonight I am very pleased I am joined by a number of my colleagues here this evening to talk a little bit about that military action, to talk about that war and to talk about the military leaders that we are so blessed to have in this country.

I think sometimes we sort of forget that there are people who have devoted their entire lives to serving this country and to providing exemplary leadership to our young men and women as they fight for us in Iraq and Afghanistan and around the world. We have some new officers in the lineup, and we will talk very briefly about those tonight, I suppose. We have a new commander of Central Command, Admiral William Fallon. We have, of course, General David Petraeus, named by the President to be the senior U.S. commander of the multinational forces in Iraq and confirmed unanimously, I might add, by the Members of the Senate. Lieutenant General Raymond Odierno, and other fine officers that are leading our young men and women.

I know some of my colleagues would like to talk about one of the officers who is going to be leaving that chain of command, the very fine Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the first Marine Corps officer ever to hold that position, my good friend and a great American, General Peter Pace.

I would like to afford a few minutes to my friend and colleague from South Carolina who I know has some words he wants to say about my friend, Pete, and give us a little idea of what his biography is.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Congressman KLINE, thank you for your leadership tonight. And particularly I want to thank you for your family service, your service in the Marine Corps, your son's service, who is in the central front himself, having served in Iraq. We are very grateful for your family's service.

I am here tonight really indeed to point out the extraordinary service, 40 years of service, of General Peter Pace. I think it's extraordinary, and I hope

the American people indeed look at this record of service.

The perspective that I am here is that I served 31 years myself in the Army National Guard, the Army Reserves. Really, the reason I served so long is because I have such great appreciation for the confidence and capabilities and the patriotism of the military of our country.

Additionally, I have the perspective of being a parent. I have four sons who are currently serving in the military of the United States. In particular, I am very grateful my oldest son served for 1 year in Iraq. I know firsthand of the bravery of our troops, the success of our troops in protecting America by keeping the terrorists and stopping them overseas. I am also grateful, I have a son who is a doctor in the Navy. We are very proud of his service, and his wife, and what they mean to our country.

Additionally, I've got a third son who is a signal officer who has served in Egypt with the Army National Guard, and a fourth son who has just joined the Army ROTC. He will be participating in the simultaneous drill program of the National Guard.

I give all my credit to my wife, Roxanne, for training these four guys. But I will point out that a reason that we have such faith in their service is because I have such faith in people like General Pace. I have entrusted my four sons to the leadership of the American military, which by every poll, every time it is done, I am afraid lawyers don't come out too well, politicians don't come out too well by standards, even the media suffers when it comes time to judge the level of perception of a profession, even ahead of the clergy is the military of the United States, and I believe they deserve it.

The final perspective I have as a Member of Congress. I have been here 5 years. I serve on the Armed Services Committee. The communities I represent, Fort Jackson, Paris Island, the Marine Air Station in Beaufort, the Beaufort Naval Hospital, but the greatest highlight that I've had is to visit with our troops overseas.

I have been to Iraq seven times. I have been to Afghanistan three times. I've visited probably 30 different countries. When we visit, we visit with the generals; we visit with the diplomats; we visit with the top American and foreign officials. But one of the real highlights is that we have the opportunity to go into a dining facility. And of course, they make it pretty simple for Members of Congress; they have a little flag identifying our home State. And we will go and we will find junior officers and enlisted personnel. And that's where you find out the extraordinary quality of the young people serving our country. Indeed, I believe it is the new Greatest Generation, people who don't whine, who understand that our Nation has been attacked. On 9/11, it was attacked. Beginning back in 1979, with the seizure of our embassy in Tehran,

we have had multiple attacks until we came to 9/11/01. And we've learned a lesson. And these young people are protecting our country.

Indeed, it was just three weeks ago today that I was in Baghdad and had the great opportunity to meet again with General David Petraeus. I have great faith in his leadership and what he's doing, protecting American families by creating a level of stability in Iraq.

Additionally, I had the privilege of visiting with the 218th Mechanized Infantry Brigade in Kabul, Afghanistan. This is the Army National Guard of South Carolina being very ably led by General Bob Livingston.

I was in that unit, Congressman, for 25 years, so I know firsthand of the capabilities of the person serving that unit as they are training the Afghan police and training the Afghan Army. A sad reminder today with the heinous homicide attack on the Afghan police; 35 policemen were killed yesterday. It is a chilling but a sad reminder that, indeed, the police that are being trained in Afghanistan and being trained in Iraq, the armies being trained in both of those countries, they have been the primary focus of attack of the terrorists because we are making progress in training people to provide stability in their own country.

Now, when I think of General Pace, it's really incredible that he has had a 40-year record of service. He graduated from the Naval Academy in 1967. He was sworn in as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on September 30, 2005. And what is particularly meaningful is that he is the first Marine to serve in this position and also the first Marine to serve as Vice Chairman—

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield? Could you say that again?

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. And I knew this would get your interest, being the Marine, Congressman KLINE, that you are, and indeed, I want to commend you. If anyone ever doubts, I want to point out that you wear a U.S. and Marine flag everywhere you go, without fail, with your congressional pin. And if anyone mistakes the pin as the People's Republic of China, I want them to know that indeed it is the Marine Corps of the United States of America.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. General Pace was born in Brooklyn, New York. He grew up in Teaneck, New Jersey. He holds masters degrees in business administration from George Washington University, attended Harvard University for the Senior Executives Course in International Security. He also is a graduate of the Infantry Officer's Advanced Course at Fort Benning, Georgia; the Marine Corps Command and General Staff College at Quantico, Virginia; and the National War College at Fort McNair in Washington.

In 1968, upon completion of The Basic School at Quantico, General Pace was

assigned to the Second Battalion, Fifth Marines, First Marine Division in the Republic of Vietnam, serving first as a rifle platoon leader, and subsequently as assistant operations officer. He was later assigned to the Marine Barracks in Washington, D.C., where he served a number of billets, to include Security Detachment Commander at Camp David, White House Aide, platoon leader and Special Ceremonial Platoon.

General Pace has held command at virtually every level and served in overseas billets in Nam Phong, Thailand; Seoul, Korea; and Yokota, Japan.

While serving as president of the Marine Corps University, then Brigadier General Pace also served as Deputy Commander of Marine Forces, Somalia, from December 1992 to February 1993, and as the Deputy Commander, Joint Task Force, Somalia, from October 1993 to March 1994.

After his assignment as the Director of Operations, (J-3) Joint Staff, Washington, D.C., then Lieutenant General Pace served as the Commander, U.S. Marine Corps Forces Atlantic/Europe/South. He was promoted to General and assumed duties as the Commander in Chief, United States Southern Command in September 2000.

As the Vice Chairman from October 2001 to August 2005, General Pace served as the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, Vice Chairman of the Defense Acquisition Board, and as a member of the National Security Council Deputies Committee and the Nuclear Weapons Council.

General Pace's personal decorations include: Defense Distinguished Service Medal, with two oak leaf clusters, Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with Combat V, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal with gold star, Navy Commendation Medal with Combat V, Navy Achievement Medal with gold star, and the Combat Action Ribbon.

General Pace and his wife, Lynne, have a son, Peter; a daughter, Tiffany Marie; and a daughter-in-law, Lynsey Olczak Pace.

Colonel Congressman KLINE, again, I want to thank you for bringing many of us together tonight to pay tribute to a great hero, an American hero who has served our country for 40 years, who has served the last 2 years as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Peter Pace, a person that I know and respect; I know that the military respects. I just want to thank you again for your efforts this evening.

I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman. I thank him for his comments, and certainly for his service and for the service of our sons. I know that the South Carolina National Guard is held up by the Wilson family, and we are grateful. I know that all the people of South Carolina are grateful to their service to the National Guard, and for your service in the Guard and here in

Congress. And I know that General Pace appreciates your kind remarks.

Pete and Lynne Pace were next-door neighbors for Vicky and I when I retired from active duty in the Marines in 1994. He is not only a fine man and a fine officer, but a good neighbor.

I understand that we are joined now by my colleague from Missouri, who had some words that he wanted to share with us concerning General Pace's forthrightness; is that right? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Congressman KLINE. And thank you for providing this opportunity for a number of us to make several points.

The first that I would make would be to show a respect for General Pace for his 40 years of service. I have two sons who are graduates of the Naval Academy, one who is returning from his second visit to the Middle East as an officer and as a Marine, and another who is just going off to his basic school this July. And I have a third son at the Naval Academy who hopefully will be graduating in another couple of years, and he might also choose the Marines as well. So I have a respect for the Marines just from what I have learned from my own sons, and particularly as a Congressman, having watched and had a chance to observe General Pace's leadership.

We are here partly this evening, in talking on this subject, because General Pace is not being renominated by Secretary Gates and the President. And he is not being renominated primarily because of concerns about his political correctness. In fact, a certain prominent Democrat in the other body has criticized Pace because he is "not in touch." Now, that is a significant concern to me.

My own personal background, while I was in the Army some, has been more in the business world. But any organization can atrophy if the organization makes an effort to fill the organization with yes-men, with people who don't have the courage to speak up and to speak their opinions.

Now, throughout America's history, we have had generals, some who don't even speak up very delicately, but do express their opinion and have had to pay a political price. And I think that history in many cases has shown that while what these men may have said may not have been popular in their day, yet it was accurate. I think particularly of people like General Patton, who, when he had finished his business of crushing Naziism, said, Let me after the communists and the Russians and the Soviets because they are no different than the Nazis. Well, looking back historically, we realize what he said was absolutely right, but he was not politically correct. He wasn't a yes-man.

But it's my opinion that the reason the First Amendment is the first amendment is because Americans appreciate somebody who will speak in a forthright, straightforward manner and

can give their opinion respectfully, but still with some level of force.

□ 2030

I think that General Pace has done that and is now going to pay the price politically for not being a "yes" man or lining up with somebody's preconceived political notions. I think it is a sad day in America's history where we don't have more respect for the first amendment and have way too much respect for political correctness and trying to go along and get along and just be a "yes" man and keep everybody happy.

I think that one of the great things about our generals is that they do take a look at the details, they analyze the situation, and they say what is right, what is wrong, and what their opinion is. I think it is a shame that this general should be penalized for that particular situation.

I would be happy to yield back to my good friend, Congressman KLINE. I appreciate your giving me a chance to say that I think that our organizations need to have room for people who don't always necessarily agree. I think we are better Americans, we are stronger Americans, when we can look each other in the eye and say, I love you, brother, but this is my opinion on this subject.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Again, I thank the gentleman for his service and his son's service and obviously the good parenting job that you have done, having your sons go into the Marine Corps. My son went into the Army. I have got to tell you, I am so proud of him sometimes I just bust out, but occasionally I wonder where I may have gone wrong in that upbringing thing. But I know you are proud of your sons and I of mine and JOE of his and all of our sons and daughters who are serving so well and so bravely in this war and in wars past.

I want to just remind my colleagues and those who may be following this discussion tonight what is at the core of the fine men and women who are leading our men and women into combat, and I go back to the very, very famous words of General Douglas MacArthur after he retired and he went back to West Point, his alma mater, and gave a speech. In that speech, I am just going to read a paragraph of it here, he said some words that strike to the core of these men and women that we are talking about tonight. This was back on May 12, 1962.

General MacArthur said, "For all eyes and for all time, it is an expression of the ethics of the American soldier. That I should be integrated in this way with so noble an ideal arouses a sense of pride and yet of humility which will be with me always.

"'Duty,' 'Honor,' 'Country,' those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you want to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to regain faith

when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn."

I think it is important for us to understand, and a little bit later this evening I am going to talk about some of those values and some of the fine young men and women who go to these service academies and provide the outstanding leadership that we have.

Of course, tonight we are talking about that leadership and quite a bit about General Peter Pace, the first Marine Corps Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the man who is going to be retiring here in the coming months after he has served us so well in so many years.

I am joined now by my friend and colleague and classmate, I guess, we came to Congress together in the 108th Congress, Dr. PHIL GINGREY.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, my friend from Minnesota, not just Representative JOHN KLINE, but Colonel JOHN KLINE of the United States Marine Corps. Representative KLINE, you mentioned a number of great leaders. I consider you among them.

It is fitting that we do this during this hour tonight to pay a special tribute to General Peter Pace and General Petraeus, Admiral Fallon and General Odierno, all of those you have mentioned. This is our chain of command. These are the brave men and women that we talk about, as you just referenced, when we go to those service academy days and we look at those youngsters in the 10th or 11th grade and they are with their parents and thinking about a service academy. And I am saying to them, as I am sure my colleagues tonight in this colloquy have done, you say, "You know, young man, young lady, you could be the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or you can be the Central Commander."

It is just when you look and you say that, you want to feel that they know that they are going to be respected, and that Members of Congress are not going to denigrate them in a public way.

I think that is a very, very disappointing thing that has been occurring, Mr. Speaker. In fact, a Member recently was quoted as saying that this Member felt that General Pace was guilty of dereliction of duty because of his support for the Bush's Iraq policy.

Now, President Bush, like him or not, is the Commander in Chief, and if General Pace did not support the Commander in Chief, then that, I think, Colonel KLINE, you can explain it better than I can, you talk about a dereliction of duty, but I am proud to be here tonight.

I thank the gentleman for giving me a little bit of time. I know we have other Members who are colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. We have already heard from a couple of them who are veterans and who have

sons that are serving. I wish I could say that I was a veteran.

So I am very proud of my colleagues. I am proud of these leaders of our military. Especially I want to say to General Pace, Mr. Speaker, you know, one of my favorite country songs by Garth Brooks is "Some of God's Greatest Gifts Are Unanswered Prayers." If the General was praying to get reconfirmed as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, maybe this will be God's answer to him: "General, you have served 40 years. You are a four-star general. You have done a great job for this country, and we salute you." Tonight I want to salute General Peter Pace.

I yield back to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks and for his service here. You have been a great colleague and a great champion for our men and women who are serving so bravely and so well all around the globe. It is not just Iraq, as my friend knows, and here shortly I will be recognizing another colleague to talk about this threat that we face. But first, I want to recognize my friend and colleague on the Armed Services Committee and a great American himself, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HAYES.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the colonel for yielding. I appreciate Congressman KLINE for his diligence in bringing this important matter to the floor. You and I have been friends for years. I have been here a little longer, but I say without reservation that probably the main motivation that you and I serve, aside from our specific constituents in our own districts, is our love for the military and our desire to do anything and everything we can to support them at all levels of service.

I represent Fort Bragg, Pope Air Force Base, Joint Special Operations Command, U.S. Army Special Operations Command at the epicenter of the universe in Fayetteville, North Carolina. And as I have spent time with these young men and women in all parts of the world, I am continuously astounded, amazed, and incredibly appreciative for what they do every day and every night of the year to keep us free. I say that simply as a little bit of a background to pick up on what Colonel Wilson and Dr. GINGREY have said in tribute to General Peter Pace.

For 40 years, Pete Pace has absolutely signified, has identified, has personified, the greatest qualities of the American citizen-soldier-marine that anybody could absolutely personify. He served in virtually every theater for 40 years. He has exemplified Semper Paratus. He has been faithful beyond belief to our country. He would still be serving, were it not for political correctness and cheap-shot politics, that has unfortunately become a part of what we do.

I think General Pace said it better than anyone. When given the opportunity to resign, he said, "Why would I

leave my men on the battlefield? If you tell me my job is done, then my job is done.”

General Pace, your job has never been done. It will never be over, because the memory of your service will be extremely strong in all of our minds.

Colonel, I would like to add a few more remarks. I feel it is highly inappropriate that the Senate majority leader would make disparaging remarks about General Pace and General Petraeus, the commander of our troops in Iraq and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, General Petraeus and General Pace have had a tough job, and now they should not be fodder for political gain with a group of left-wing liberal activists, or anyone else for that matter. Gentlemen, scholars and warriors, they have devoted their lives to serving our Nation, and have done it well.

What is most puzzling is that the Senate majority leader put his endorsement behind General Petraeus and trusted him to carry out our objectives in Iraq when he was confirmed on January 26 of this year. Obviously he felt General Petraeus was more than competent when he voted to confirm him.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone is content with the existing situation in Iraq, neither General Petraeus nor General Pace. General Petraeus, the commanding general, has cautioned it is too early to judge the success of Baghdad's security and stability. He informs us that the new security effort is just beginning to reach the full number on the ground, because they still have an additional brigade just coming into Iraq, General Petraeus is now in his third tour of duty in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader and others have visited troops serving as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. I have been there. I think it is good that lawmakers see the situation firsthand. But there is real arrogance in saying that someone with a commander's-level experience and General Pace's experience is out of touch with the situation in Iraq.

As I said, I have visited Iraq many times and recognize General Petraeus as a military commander and as the expert he is on this issue. As he makes determinations regarding the security situation in Iraq, I will ask tough questions. If you are going to declare that he is out of touch or incompetent, then you have already made up your mind. You have already determined the outcome is going to be labeled a failure.

Mr. Speaker, what message are we sending our troops when the leadership of the other body has already declared that their effort in this new security strategy is a failure before they have really begun?

The 82nd Airborne from Fort Bragg in my home district is currently deployed to Iraq as part of the troop surge. These servicemembers and others are there at the tip of the spear. It

is time for everyone to put partisan politics aside and stand together in solid support of our men and women in uniform.

General Pace has had an incredible, distinguished career, serving in every capacity, and he deserves much better. His record merits thanks and a second term as chairman. Instead, he becomes another victim of the campaign of personal destruction.

General Pace, thank you for Semper Fi. You have always been faithful.

Nobody wants their troops to return home sooner or more safely than I do. They should not stay in Iraq one day longer than necessary. While we have soldiers on the ground fighting the war on terror for us over there, we should have no patience for cheap-shot political gamesmanship on this critical national security issue here at home.

Colonel Kline, again, thank you. General Pace, thank you, and Lynn, and your family. We are ever grateful for your service.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his words and for his strong support of our men and women in uniform. I know the people down in North Carolina are very proud to have you serve. There is no greater champion for our Special Operations Forces than you are and for all those fine soldiers down there, and I know that General Pace appreciates your support. So I thank the gentleman for joining us this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about the kind words that have been said tonight about General Pace. I certainly add to those.

I mentioned earlier that I thought that General Pace was a fine man and a fine marine and a fine commander and a great neighbor when he and Lynn lived next door to Vicky and I down at the Marine Base at Quantico. I just have to share another story with my colleagues standing here.

There was another time when General Pace and I were neighbors, and it was not such a nice location as the Marine Base at Quantico and the fine quarters there up on the hill.

We were serving together in Mogadishu in 1992 and 1993 in the rubble of that country, in some pretty tough times and bad weather and bad conditions and starving people. We had some folks who were intent on shooting each other and shooting us.

□ 2045

I remember going into the building one time and General Pace was sitting there, sort of an old, bombed-out room of the Embassy.

I said, “General, how is it going?”

He said, “We are here, we are serving our country and we are in the Marines.”

He was a fine friend and fine neighbor, whether he was in the idyllic hillside down in Prince William County or bombed-out rubble in Mogadishu. You couldn't have a finer man with you. I am very proud to have known him and

served with him, and I am very grateful for his many years of distinguished service, living by those ideals we discussed earlier.

There are some more commanders that we want to refer to later tonight, but we want to put this in the context of this terrible war we are fighting. We are fighting an evil and adaptive enemy, and I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Colonel, it is an honor to join you tonight and my colleagues on the floor. Anytime I have the privilege to stand and honor our men and women in uniform, I try to begin with what John Stuart Mill said about war. He said, “War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse. The person who has nothing for which they are willing to fight, nothing which is more important than his own personal safety, is a miserable creature and who has no chance of being free unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself.”

Those better persons that Stuart Mill referred to are the people we rise tonight to honor, the men and women in uniform of our Armed Forces.

They understand from time to time it is necessary for people to put themselves between a threat and our civilian population, and they know that freedom, every time it has been extended from one generation to the next, it has been by those people who have been willing to put themselves and their lives, everything they have, their whole measure, between the threat and our civilian population.

Tonight, Colonel, I come to the floor to talk briefly about this threat because, unfortunately, the conversation revolves around one theater in this war and that is Iraq. We know mistakes have been made. We know it has not gone as well as we would have liked. Wars are that way. Stuart Mill said it is an ugly thing.

I don't know of a war that has been perfectly executed. I know that the march to Baghdad was perfectly executed, but I know that intentionally the insurgents have wreaked havoc wherever they could, from bombing the Samarra mosque which initiated the last 16 months of internal strife within Iraq, by design, knowing that that would test our will to see if we were a “paper tiger” or if we were the strong and determined United States of America.

I think a lot of people forget who it is that threatens freedom-loving people all around the world. They are called the jihadists, the Islamists, the radicals within Islam. The problem here is this is not just a religious issue, it is a political agenda. The call is for a Shariah, global Islamic rule. That's the truth. Read. I would encourage people to read “Hatred's Kingdom.” Read “America Alone.” Read “Looming Towers.” Read “While Europe Slept.”

Read “Londonistan.” Read “Epi-center.” Read “Knowing the Enemy.” You will understand the history of how we got where we are.

One slice, the Wahhabi movement, the most radical out of the Saudi Arabia Sunni sect. A man named Sayyid Qutb came to the United States about the time I was born in the late 1950s, was educated at Northern Colorado State University, and went back and began to indoctrinate the Wahhabi sect that western liberalism, self-determination, freedom, would create apostasy and ungodliness and it must be stopped.

One of his lieutenants was Osama bin Laden. One of the people that he taught at university was Osama bin Laden. These things didn't happen by accident. For years this has been brewing. It is a real threat.

Unfortunately, the left has a propaganda campaign in this country to cause people to believe this is all just Iraq, if we would just leave Iraq, if we had never gone we wouldn't have a problem, or that life would just return to normal or that everything would just be okay. It is just simply not the case. We were not in Iraq before September 11. We weren't in Iraq before 1993. They hit us over 40 times since 1979. You have to study the history of it all.

When the Wahhabis took Mecca in the late seventies, the Saudi Arabia Kingdom made a deal with them that they would start spending money in this country.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I couldn't agree with you more in your explanation of what we are up against; but it strikes me the differences we hear on the floor of this House. This evening some of our colleagues were saying we have to get out of Iraq now. We have to end the war. If we bring our troops tomorrow, say they, we will end this war. And presumably, then, everything will be fine. And that simply doesn't track with the history that the gentleman is describing. It does not describe the enemy that was willing to hijack planes and fly them into buildings and kill women and children. Every day we see the stories in Baghdad of people blowing up women and children. Our just bringing our troops home doesn't, wouldn't, couldn't, signal the end of this war and of the determination of that enemy. It strikes me the difference that we see in this body.

Mr. WAMP. The words we hear in Washington run almost in denial of the words of our enemy, of Zarqawi when he was still alive, of Zawahiri about expanding the caliphate, reestablishing the caliphate, from Morocco to Indonesia, this huge part of the world, to come back with Islamic rule. And this is dangerous because they don't believe in a theocracy as we do. They don't believe in pluralism. They don't believe in the freedom of religion. We believe everyone should have the right to worship as they please. This is a Shariah. This is Islamic law they are calling for.

This is Islamic rule they are calling for, and this is where politics, the military and religion all come together. And we didn't do that, they are doing it. That's the truth.

Frankly, the left has misled and twisted and distorted and run a PR campaign that is driven by politics, denying even the weapons of mass destruction realities. Hans Blitz said, Where did the 8,500 liters of anthrax that we knew were in Iraq go? Two tractor-trailer loads. Probably Syria.

I have news for you, those are weapons of mass destruction. For people to say over and over again there weren't weapons of mass destruction in Iraq is one of the greatest lies ever told in this country.

He gassed his own people. They came running out with their eyes bleeding out of their face. Weapons of mass destruction were in Iraq. The threats were real. Over half the Democrats of the United States Senate voted to remove Saddam Hussein by force, almost half the Democrats in the House voted, and now it is convenient to say we should retreat, we never should have gone. This was a misguided war.

These men and women in uniform, they know that these threats are real and we have to stand up and face these threats. I pay tribute tonight to the Guard and Reserve from my State, the 181st where my nephew is at Fort Bliss training to go to Iraq right now. And the 278th that just came back, the might battery of the Marine Corps Reserve; Colonel Brett Hale who just commanded the Dragonslayers in Iraq for a year, my constituent, my patriot, my hero, who says in the public square in Chattanooga, Tennessee: I have been there and I have seen what we are doing. I know that it is important.

These are the people who have been. These are not the people at home saying things about the ones who have gone.

Eight brave men from my district have given their life in defense of our freedom; and when some people say they have died in vain, it makes me angry because they didn't die in vain, nor has any patriot who has ever given their life in defense of freedom for this country died in vain. Freedom comes with a huge price, and these men and women are willing to put their life on the line for us, and we come to the floor tonight to honor them so they know we stand behind them.

And there is widespread bipartisan support for our troops. But our troops are in harm's way on our behalf. You can't say they shouldn't be there, we are not for them; and then say, oh, we are for them. It is a paradox. It is just wrong-headed sometimes for the leader of the United States Senate to say the war is lost while they are in harm's way fighting for what they believe in. They know these threats are real.

We can leave Iraq tomorrow and this threat is not going away. This threat is a greater threat to freedom in the world than Nazi Germany ever was. It

is growing all over the world. Read these books. If you haven't read to understand the threat, there is no way you could be there to know what is happening in Europe and all across the country. The radical elements of Islam have infiltrated through the mosque and trained people up all over the world. That is the truth. And they are in this country. Nobody wants to hear it because it is not politically correct, but that is the truth. I hope, I hope that God showers us with his grace so we don't get hit hard again like we did on September 11, but the threats are real.

I come to the floor tonight and say “thank you” to the men and women in uniform on our behalf. All of them. We came to honor General Pace tonight, but every one of those Guardsmen and Reservists whose families didn't know that they were going to have one or two or even three deployments, thank you families for allowing your son or daughter or husband to go, or wife to go, on our behalf.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman very much for his insight and certainly his passion on this issue. I, too, want to thank all of the men and women in uniform. And certainly we are here tonight talking some about the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Peter Pace, who will be retiring this fall, but we are also here to talk about the other leaders and the values that are at their core.

Minnesota is like other States in the Union. We have members of our National Guard who have deployed, and deployed again in some cases. We have 2,600 members of the Minnesota National Guard serving in Iraq now as members of the Red Bulls, and we are so proud of them and looking forward to them coming back this summer. The sooner the better.

That is an issue that has been mentioned by Members on both sides of the aisle that there have been mistakes made, and there certainly have. One of the early mistakes was not building up the size of the active forces and relying so heavily on these men and women in the reserve component, the reserves that the gentleman from Tennessee mentioned, and the members of the National Guard from all over having to go, having to leave their civilian jobs and leave their families and go and serve, and they do so willingly and bravely and well. And then they come back and have to resume their civilian lives, and we have to do a better job of reintegrating them in this body. We need to not let up.

But I want to thank you, Mr. WAMP, for coming down here and helping us understand what it is that we are fighting. You put it so well.

I know the gentleman remembers way back when the 9/11 Commission came out, and in that report they said we are fighting Islamist extremists. They didn't say we were just fighting al Qaeda. Certainly we are fighting al Qaeda. And it seems so long ago now,

and as you pointed out, it is even clearer now that this enemy that we are fighting is very, very determined. It is the jihadists in that moment that are at the core of this, and they are not going to quit.

□ 2100

America's a great country, greatest in the world with great people. But we're an impatient people, and it's difficult; no, it is impossible for us to understand what's in the minds of people who are not only willing but apparently eager to strap bombs to children and blow them up and kill innocent, innocent men, women, and children in the name of their cause and reestablishing that sharia law and that caliphate and then moving on to the world.

And so like you, I am just grateful for the men and women in uniform and for all they have done and for their leaders. And before we wrap up here this evening, I want to mention briefly some of the other leaders that we don't sometimes talk so much about, but they are part of this fight, and they're an integral part.

We just got a new commander of Central Command, Admiral William Fallon, a new leader, will bring new ideas and a new face. We've been ably led in the past, but it's important sometimes that we get a change of face and a new idea, get a new team sometimes. And Admiral Fallon is bringing some new insights into this fight.

He was a naval aviator, a graduate of Villanova University in 1967, came through the Naval ROTC program, as I did. I have a lot of good things to say about the service academies. I think they do a terrific job, but there is no question that we get fine officers, men and women, who come through our other commissioning programs like the Naval ROTC program.

Admiral Fallon served as an aviator in Vietnam, has had a very distinguished career. He is going on now to take overall command of everything in Central Command which, of course, includes all of Iraq and the surrounding countries, and we're glad to have him.

General David Petraeus has been mentioned this evening, a really fine officer, graduate of the West Point Military Academy, has a Ph.D., very distinguished career. I've had the pleasure of sitting and talking with General Petraeus on two previous trips to Iraq. He was the commander of the 101st Airborne Division and Operation Iraqi Freedom One, and when I went over there, my first trip to Iraq, he was the commanding general up in Mosul. I had a chance to go and talk to him, and I was impressed then with his intelligence and his determination and his leadership.

What a fine job the 101st did, not only in winning the initial combat but in starting to establish some local government and progress amongst the people of Mosul. And I thought at the time, what a fine officer, and all my colleagues who traveled over there, Re-

publicans and Democrats, came back with glowing reports of General David Petraeus.

It was later my son became a member of the 101st under a different commander and has gone to Iraq and served for a year and come back and served well, and General Petraeus left that division in good shape.

General Petraeus went back to Iraq and served as the man in charge of training the Iraqi security forces, and so he was able to see firsthand what the difficulties were and what we needed to do there. And then he went on to become probably the Nation's foremost authority in unconventional warfare, ideally suited to his job. And so when the President nominated him to be the senior American commander in Iraq, he was unanimously confirmed by the United States Senate.

And under him is Lieutenant General Raymond Odierno, another fine officer with previous service in Iraq and a graduate of the United States Military Academy. All of these officers, too many awards and decorations to name.

My point this evening is that we are ably led by fine men who hew to an ethic of, as General Douglas MacArthur said, "Duty, Honor, Country," but the core values seen at the Naval Academy and the United States Marine Corps of honor, courage, commitment, all of these men exemplify those core values, and they provide firm, steady, well-informed leadership to the men and women who serve us so well in all the corners of the world. And they're doing a good job.

I just want to share with you a couple of quotes that I've got here about things that are going on in Iraq. Goodness knows we see plenty of bad news, and there is certainly some to share. And every time there's an explosion and our soldiers are killed or wounded, it pains us deeply. And when civilians are killed, it's a tragedy. But we're fighting against an enemy that is fierce and determined, as my colleague Mr. WAMP from Tennessee outlined so well.

This is a tough enemy and we need tough soldiers to fight them, and all of us recognize that you cannot win this only militarily, that you need economics and you need politics and you need diplomacy. And I would say that these leaders that we've talked about tonight, Admiral Fallon, General Petraeus, General Odierno and certainly the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Peter Pace, understand that very well. But they're attending to the first order of business first. They want to make sure that our men and women are well-led. They're fighting to win. We in this body, my colleagues, need to make sure that we're giving them every chance to win.

And I just notice some quotes that have just been in the news in the last couple of days. U.S. Ambassador Ryan Crocker says, "It is noteworthy that violence is down in the two areas where the surge is focused, Anbar and Baghdad."

And our friend from the other side of the Capitol, Senator JOE LIEBERMAN says, "Our troops have succeeded in improving security conditions in precisely those parts of Iraq where the surge has focused."

We can't win it all in a day. It's going to be a long fight. The men and women serving and fighting understand this. We need to understand this and make sure that we are, in fact, being true to ourselves and true to them.

I want to share just a brief story about the fine leadership that we have, not just these men that we've talked about tonight, but the fine young men and women who are stepping up to lead our Armed Forces today.

One of the great things we get to do as Members of Congress is nominate these fine young students to go forward to the academy. We're always thrilled when one is selected to go, and the joy that they have and the pride that their families feel is certainly moving.

In my first year here as a Member of this body, my niece graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Vicky and I went up for several days of ceremonies and to share with my sister and brother-in-law and nieces their joy and pride in my niece's accomplishment.

She, by the way, now Captain Stroecker, is serving in the United States Army. She served a year over in Kuwait. She served in Germany, and she's the kind of officer that makes us proud.

But while we were there at West Point, we were surrounded by these young cadets, some of them just getting ready to be commissioned. And we were there when the second lieutenants' bars were pinned on, but I remember sitting with Vicky in the audience and witnessing a ceremony that I found to be very moving. It was a very impressive thing to watch.

This is a ceremony where the graduating class turns over command, turns over command to the brigade, to the rising seniors, the juniors rising to be seniors, and you see the long gray line march out in that ceremony. Movies are made about the long gray line, stories written, and it's moving to watch it, and they march out, and they pass command from one class to the next.

And I remember thinking as that ceremony was going on and looking at those fine, fine young men and women, I remember thinking, no wonder, no wonder that the United States has the finest Armed Forces in the world and no wonder that we're the best we've ever been, with all apologies to the Greatest Generation, my father's generation, an Army World War II veteran, but today's Army and today's Marine Corps and Navy and Air Force and Coast Guard are the best they have ever been, all volunteer, all eager, all determined. They understand that enemy that my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, was describing. They know that what they're doing is

important, that without their success we are in great danger.

But as you look at those fine young men and women and when you are there, when they move on to become second lieutenants, you just can't help but notice that that's the reason why our men and women in uniform today are led by very, very fine leaders.

Well, I see that we're nearing the end of the time for this Special Order. I'm sure there is more to be said about the fine men and women who are leading our military, and that's what we were about this evening, to talk a little bit about the conflict we're involved in, the importance of that leadership and the people who are leading and certainly to talk about General Peter Pace, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Pete, I think it was my colleague, ROBIN HAYES, who said, we love you, and we thank you, and we wish you all the best. And I know that sometimes you thought about these words, I certainly have over the years, President Ronald Reagan said way back in 1985; he said, some people spend an entire lifetime wondering if they made a difference in the world, but the Marines don't have that problem. And Pete Pace has never had that problem. He has been a great leader. He is a great leader. We're looking forward to his leadership in the closing months of his tour as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We thank him for everything that he has done, that he is doing and that he is going to do.

TRIBUTE TO RUTH BELL GRAHAM

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Ruth Bell Graham, wife and confidante of the Reverend Billy Graham. Ruth Graham died last week at the age of 87, having lived a rich and selfless life of service.

She epitomized the faithful wife and mother and was a close spiritual adviser who probably did more than any other human being to make possible the global ministry of Billy Graham. I doubt whether we exaggerate when we say that Billy Graham could not have been the man he is known as today without the unwavering support of his wife.

While she may not have claimed much of the spotlight in his life, she raised a family that to this day is having a tremendous impact on the world.

Reverend Graham paid her the best tribute. He said that Ruth Graham was "the most incredible woman I have ever known." And when asked to name the finest Christian he had ever met, Billy Graham would always say, "My wife, Ruth."

In tribute to her, he said that, "She was a spiritual giant, whose unparalleled knowledge of the Bible and commitment to prayer were a challenge

and inspiration to everyone who knew her. No one else could have borne the load that she carried. She was a vital and integral part of our ministry, and my work through the years would have been impossible without her encouragement and support."

Despite her declining health in recent years, she always placed her husband and family before herself. She gladly accepted a role in the Graham family that involved offering support, prayer and encouragement. Never one to clamor for the public eye, Ruth nonetheless was a vital part of Billy Graham's ministry. She was a bulwark against the demands of the endless public involvement of Billy Graham's many responsibilities as a worldwide evangelist.

Ruth Bell Graham was born in China in 1920 to her medical missionary parents at a Presbyterian Hospital far north of Shanghai. She spent her childhood on the mission field, and sensed a calling to serve God and give her life to spread the gospel.

Ruth connected with her eventual home in North Carolina when she completed high school in Montreat, North Carolina, while her parents were home from China on furlough. She would later enroll in Wheaton College where she met her future husband, the fervent evangelist hailing from Charlotte, North Carolina.

After no small internal struggle over her desire to become a missionary, Ruth decided to invest her life in the mission of evangelism that so captivated Billy, and they were married in Montreat on August 13, 1943.

As Billy Graham's responsibilities as an evangelist continued to grow, Ruth and Billy moved to Montreat near her parents. Here, Ruth would raise a family of five children strong and stand behind the man who was preaching to millions of people across the world.

Ruth was a woman who lived the written word and treasured the Bible. She enjoyed assisting her husband as he wrote sermons and was an accomplished author herself. Over the course of her life, she would author or co-author more than a dozen books.

She also did not hesitate to start ministries of her own. Always concerned with reaching out to those in need, whether her local community or the global community, Ruth Graham created the Ruth Bell Graham International Children's Health Fund to help the world's neediest children and helped create the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Health Center in Asheville.

Franklin, their son, founded Samaritan's Purse Ministry which is based in Boone, North Carolina.

Ruth enabled and freed her husband to concentrate on his evangelistic calling. When he needed someone to turn to, Billy Graham knew that he could turn to her for counsel, encouragement and an intellect steeped in learning the scripture.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the Graham family today as they

mourn the passing of a peerless wife, sacrificial mother and faithful friend. May her memories serve to remind us of the profound meaning of a life given in service to God and family.

□ 2115

FAST TRACK TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to talk about trade, Fast Track, and what it's doing to this country.

As a former millworker that worked over 28 years at Great Northern Paper Company, I know firsthand that the trade deals are crippling manufacturing in the State of Maine. We have lost over 23 percent of our manufacturing base alone since NAFTA came into effect.

But it's more than just losing jobs. You're losing the identity and the community as well. We had certain labor market areas in the State of Maine that had over 33 percent unemployment rate. A lot of small businesses went under because the anchor of the community went under, it filed bankruptcy. The high school, senior class, was not sure whether they would be able to graduate from high school because the mill paid about 80 percent of the tax base. They hadn't paid their taxes, and the accreditation was in jeopardy. Alcoholism, divorce rates, people were filing bankruptcy because of trade.

You can go anywhere pretty much in the Second Congressional District in the State of Maine, and you'll see a lot of empty factories that are no longer there. You'll see factories but you will not see the number of vehicles in the mill yard because of machines being shut down.

It's because of our failed trade policy. We have to change the trade policy. We have to make sure that when Fast Track is up at the end of this month, that we not renew Fast Track. I think it's incumbent on each Member of Congress to look at these trade deals and have the ability to amend the trade deals. I don't think we should be a rubber stamp to the United States trade representatives, and that's what we are, rubber stamps: Either vote "yes" or "no," and that's wrong.

I have two colleagues here this evening who have really taken on this trade issue. They know firsthand from their own district what trade means to their constituencies. They know what it's done to the United States of America, as a whole. We have lost over 3 million jobs. We have to do better. We must do better.

I think the last election, when a lot of candidates were talking about trade, they are ready, the American people

are ready for a new direction. It's my hope that this Congress will give a new direction, will change that flawed trade policy, the flawed trade model.

I would like to recognize Congresswoman LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ from the west coast of California, who has started the House Trade Working Group that also Congresswoman BETTY SUTTON has been very active on, and it's an issue that is very important to all of us here in our constituency.

I recognize the Congresswoman from California.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Thank you, Congressman MICHAUD, and I also thank BETTY SUTTON for being here this evening to talk about the President's Trade Promotion Authority and its effect on working families. Mr. MICHAUD and I cochair the House working group, and we have been working very hard this year to emphasize the impact that our current failed policy has on average households.

We are here because we believe that our trade policies should ensure a fair shake for American working families, not just for those who sit in corporate board rooms. We have already spoken many times in this House about the flaws in the new trade deal recently announced by the administration. This new deal, which applies to the Bush negotiated Free Trade Agreements with Peru and Panama, is an improvement over past FTAs, but it still doesn't give American families much to be excited about, quite honestly.

Despite additional labor and environmental provisions, these agreements are based on the NAFTA trade model, the same failed NAFTA model that has hurt the American family for the past decade, the same NAFTA trade model that didn't bring about the jobs or the prosperity that we were promised, the same NAFTA model that didn't stop the immigration flow from Mexico, the same NAFTA model that hasn't been able to assure that our trading partners uphold the strong labor and environmental standards that we do here in the United States, thus putting our workers at a competitive disadvantage.

If the long-sought-after labor and environmental protections the administration promises to include in the Peru and Panama FTAs are no stronger than those that we were promised in NAFTA or its cousin CAFTA, they are little more than hollow promises. Yet the Free-Trade-At-All-Costs lobby asks the American people to have faith that the administration has really turned over a new leaf. They are asking us to trust that enforceable labor and environmental standards will be included in the text of the Peru and Panama agreements. But even if these agreements are the best written, fairest trade agreements possible, so long as they rely on this administration to enforce the labor and environmental standards they contain, they are not worth the paper that they are written on.

This administration has failed to protect workers here in the U.S. The BP

Texas City explosion, the Sago mine disaster and the 9/11 first responders and cleanup workers who have developed serious breathing ailments, these are just the most notorious examples of this administration's lack of dedication to provide even the most basic protection to workers: the right to work in a safe environment. Even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce says these new worker and environmental protections can't be enforced.

Now, if that isn't telling, I don't know what it is. They flatly came out and said they are not enforceable. This President has lost our trust, and with it any argument that he has to renew his trade promotion authority. The administration's track record does not demonstrate a commitment to the working families of America.

Free trade was supposed to create economic opportunity for everyone, for big businesses, as well as small businesses, working families at home and abroad, but that, quite frankly, hasn't been the case. The truth of the matter is that the NAFTA free trade model favors the wealthiest at the expense of small businesses, workers, families, and ultimately communities, like the communities Mr. MICHAUD was talking about that are dependent upon millwork for their life blood.

More than a decade after NAFTA and NAFTA-styled replicas, it's clear that the promise of economic prosperity has yet to arrive. Our trade deficit has ballooned into the tens of millions of dollars. Real wages for American families are down, and our manufacturing base is falling apart.

We need an administration committed to protecting the rights of workers, and until we get one we cannot grant this administration an extension of Fast Track authority. The American people deserve better. They deserve a commitment to trade that expands their opportunities rather than diminishes them.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help our working families get back on track to economic prosperity.

I urge them to oppose the Fast Track renewal, and I want to thank, again, my two colleagues for their leadership on this issue, because they have been trying to carry this message to those who have been unwilling to hear it.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much. I appreciate your comments, and I hope that the American people are listening, because this is extremely important. We are heading into what I call a perfect storm. We have the largest budgetary deficit in our history, with over 45 percent owned by foreigners. We have the largest trade deficit in our history, almost 7 percent of the GDP.

We cannot sustain those types of deficits and maintain our Superpower status here in this country.

With that, I recognize the gentlewoman from Ohio, who is a freshman Member, who is very, very knowledgeable

on trade issues, a labor attorney, and has done a phenomenal job working with the freshman class, bringing the freshman class the materials that they need to talk about trade for those who needed the materials.

I really appreciate your willingness to step out there your freshman year to really talk about trade. You understand the problems that trade has caused your State in Ohio, and we look forward to hearing your remarks this evening, Congresswoman SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you so much, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Both of you, your leadership is a shining example for all of us. As you point out, this is a moment of supreme importance when it comes to the trade policy of this country.

Last November, the American people cast their votes for new leaders with the hope that we would replace our broken trade system with one that will truly allow for fair competition, because we know that if given a fair playing field, we will excel in the global marketplace.

The first step, as both of you so rightfully point out, has to be that Congress must stop ceding its constitutional authority and responsibility over trade to the President. The lack of oversight and accountability, giving the President what's been called Fast Track authority, the damage that Fast Track authority has wrought on the United States trade policy has led to devastating consequences, some of which you have already heard about throughout this country. It certainly has had a devastating impact on the area that I represent. We have lost over 200,000 manufacturing jobs in Ohio since 2000.

That means that people's futures have been seriously put at risk. There are kids out there today who won't be able to go to college because of the jobs that their parents lost due to Fast Track, and the bad trade deals that resulted under Fast Track. There are people out there who won't have health care for their families because of the bad policy that has resulted under Fast Track.

For them and for every American who has been hurt by the Bush administration's harmful trade policies, we must, we must let Fast Track expire permanently at the end of this month. Now, we all know that the United States' Constitution gives responsibility for trade to the Congress, and there was a reason for that.

Our forefathers knew that they needed to keep that issue and control over that issue at a level that is closely connected to the people who are being represented. That's why Congress had that authority.

Unfortunately, with Fast Track, the problem is the administration negotiates the deals, signs them, determines all the terms, and then weighs it before Congress, and you have to vote "yes" or "no." You have no input on what the constraints are. You have no

say or ability to fix what is wrong with the deals as they come through. That is just not a path we should continue down.

As has been mentioned, Fast Track has enabled the passage of trade deals like NAFTA and CAFTA, and of course the WTO, the World Trade Organization, all of that has accelerated as our leader here has pointed out, it's all accelerated a trade in jobs crisis. It's marked by an \$800 billion trade deficit, and more and more people are feeling this across the country.

In fact, I actually have a letter here that was sent to our leaders in both the House and the Senate from organizations, organizations like American Medical Students Association, The Change to Win Coalition, Communication Workers of America, Defenders of Wildlife, Friends of the Earth, hundreds, hundreds of organizations, national, State organizations; a wide variety of people, church organizations, all who oppose us extending Fast Track authority to the administration, because they know that the resulting trade deals are devastating to our communities, our businesses, our workers, our farmers and our country.

So it is with honor that I stand beside my two esteemed colleagues here tonight to talk a little bit about this with them and with all of you at home who care, I know, deeply about us changing the direction on our trade policy.

The good news is there are things that we could be doing, and that we should be doing to stop leaving our companies and our workers at a disadvantage.

□ 2130

And so I'm looking forward to exploring that with you both tonight.

And at this point, Mr. MICHAUD, I yield back.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much. You're absolutely right when you talk about Fast Track, and we'll get into that a little bit more, because I know Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ has to go to another meeting, and I know she's been to Colombia a couple of times, so I'll be interested in hearing what she has to say about her trips to Colombia.

But before she does, before I yield time, I'd actually like to give a quote. And it's not very often I quote Pat Buchanan. But I saw this quote and I thought it was worth quoting. It says, "The trade deficit is a malignant tumor in the intestines of the U.S. economy." That's absolutely right. We have to start dealing with our trade deficit. And one way, one of the issues we have got to deal with is, as you mentioned Congresswoman SUTTON, is not to renew Fast Track, which is extremely important. Let Congress do our job that we're elected to do, representing our constituents.

I did have a chance to actually meet the President of Colombia a couple of weeks ago. I had an interesting con-

versation and asked several questions about the brutality and the murders that are happening in Colombia with trade unionists, and I'm looking forward to his response to some of the questions that I have.

But right now, I'd like to yield to the Congresswoman from California, who actually had a couple of trips over to Colombia. If you'd kindly let us know what happened and what we can do.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Sure. About 2 weeks ago I returned from Colombia, and it was my second visit in just 7 months. Colombia is one of the countries that President Bush negotiated a free trade agreement with without really seeking the advice of those Members of Congress who have been vocal opponents to the NAFTA trade model which he based this agreement on.

And I have to say at the outset, Colombia is a beautiful country. It's people are a warm people. We were well received there. And so I want to be very clear that I am for expanding trade with countries around the world, but in a way that is fair and balanced to both our workers here in the United States and also the workers in the countries that we seek to engage in trade with.

Just for the record, Colombia has a horrible record on human rights and labor rights violations. In Colombia, more trade labor unionists were killed there last year than in all the countries of the world combined. So it has an abysmal record with respect to violence towards people who try to organize workers to help lift them out of poverty. And nobody really wants to talk about that dirty little secret of Colombia's, because they want to talk about how much better things are in the first 6 months of this year.

The statistics do show that there is an improvement. I will grant them that, and I applaud that. But it still means that about 99 percent of the murders that happened last year have gone unsolved, and nobody has been brought to justice for that.

And the reason why trade labor unionists are targeted is because they speak out on behalf of people who are living in poverty, who are earning wages that don't allow them to support themselves or a family. They're working in dangerous working conditions.

And I have to say, on the trip that I just most recently returned from, we really weren't given a lot of time to go and actually talk to the workers themselves about their experience. We were basically told by the government that things are getting better and things were improving.

Interestingly enough, the first trip that I took to Colombia last November, I met with labor organizations, civil rights groups and advocates, and I met with the workers themselves who told me, "don't be fooled by the rosy picture that our government has painted. It's very dangerous here in Colombia to speak up if you are working in dangerous working conditions. It's very

dangerous in Colombia to speak up if you'd like to see your wages rise so that you can support yourself."

And, in fact, there is a very big informal labor sector in Colombia which isn't even subject to basic standards like a minimum wage. There's no minimum wage for these folks. There are no contributions made on behalf of them for the hours that they work into any kind of Social Security or pension system. And there are no workplace safety standards. A lot of these workers work in some of the biggest industries that they're pushing the free trade agreement because they say that they need to expand these industries, one of which being the textile industry, which is notorious for their workers that are part of the informal sector that don't have contracts, that don't have any basic rights.

And basically, in Colombia, when I bring up the point that there's this promise made to lift all these people out of poverty, but when they have to compete against U.S. goods, some of which will be subsidized, like many of our agricultural products, who is going to suffer the most? Who's going to bear the cost? Because they tell me, oh, yes, there are some transitional costs associated with moving towards this new free trade agreement, but they're transitional costs; they won't be forever, and not everybody's going to be affected.

But let me tell you who will be affected by those transitional costs: rural, poor, indigenous people and largely women who are heads of households. They are the ones that will suffer the most, not to mention American workers who will have to compete in industry with Colombia, where they have no minimum wage, no minimum work day, so they can work workers 16 hours a day if they want, and no safe working conditions.

And there's just, quite frankly, no way that American workers, who demand a certain level of respect and dignity at the workplace, are going to be able to compete in industries where those are the conditions that Colombian workers are working in.

Knowing all of this, did President Bush negotiate with Colombia a free trade agreement that would try to address those very basic labor standards? No. He based the Colombian free trade on the NAFTA model. They didn't even put in basic rights that are respected around the world as international standards for human and labor rights. He just said, hey, the marketplace is going to take care of it. We're going to move forward. This is the trade agreement, and Congress, because of Fast Track authority, you can't change it; you can't make it better; you can't amend it. It's either yes or no; you vote in favor of this. And if that's the choice that I'm given, my vote is no because it doesn't even try to address the problem with the labor standards and the violence in Colombia.

I say, hey, I'm willing to give Colombia the benefit of the doubt. If you can

show to me over a certain length of time, minimum of 2 years, that, yeah, you've gone after these people that have targeted labor unionists, and yeah, you've moved people out of the informal sector into the formal sector where people have basic standards, I'm willing to give Colombia an opportunity. But I'm not willing to enter into a trade agreement with them based on empty promises of how much better things are going to be.

All we heard when we were there, 90 percent of what we heard was how much better Colombia was at human rights and how much better they were at trying to find those responsible for killing trade labor unionists. But while we were there, one of the biggest scandals that has hit Colombia in recent months is the scandal of paramilitary groups that are linked to elected members of their congress, elected governors, some of whom were hand picked, and cabinet members, some of whom were handpicked by President Uribe himself. And these paramilitary groups have been responsible for killing people, for massacres of villages of people. And currently, 14 elected officials sit in jail because they've been tied to these paramilitary groups. And there are as many as two dozen more that are under investigation.

But we're supposed to trust President Uribe that they're going to bring these people to justice and that labor rights and human rights are going to be better in Colombia. I say, show me, and then we'll sit down and negotiate. But I thought it might be interesting to just inform you guys a little bit about what the flavor of that trip was.

And like I said, I think the Colombian people are wonderful people. I think we need to open up new markets. But we need to do it in a way that's fair and balanced for our workers here, so we don't continue to hemorrhage manufacturing jobs, and for the workers in these countries, which corporations will exploit.

And with that, I will yield back to Mr. MICHAUD.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ. You're absolutely right, and that's one of the problems with Fast Track and why this Congress should not renew Fast Track. Even if we did have a say in these trade deals, as you mentioned, particularly with Colombia, I'm not sure that even if we had the ILO standards in the agreement that that would help as far as the murders and the assassinations that are going on in Colombia. I've met with several elected officials on different occasions from Colombia, and they're scared for their lives. There's one senator that actually sleeps no more than two nights in a row in the same bed because he's been threatened with his life.

And we've been told, or I've been told in those meetings that they want to set an example, the paramilitary, and they force some of the other labor folks to go out there with actually, they told

me that they actually beheaded a trade unionist. And that's wrong. So no matter what we do on trade deals, like you, Congresswoman, I want to see results before I agree with any trade deal with Colombia at all. We have to get back to changing that model.

I'm very pleased actually to see another colleague from the great State of Ohio who has taken a great leadership role since he's been here on trade but also has introduced major legislation that will help deal with one of the components when you look at the flawed trade model. And he's also a member of the 30-plus caucus now, I guess, something caucus, congressman TIM RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. And I appreciate, I caught bits and pieces of the debate here, and I think you all have illustrated points that need to be made, and we need to keep making them here if we're going to have any headway.

And I remember sitting in the meeting with the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) where the politicians were talking about this trade unionist who was trying to organize a plant, and the next day or two days later, he's beheaded. Now, we think labor politics are tough in the United States, which they are, but I don't think they come anywhere close to that level.

And it is a pleasure for me to be here with my partner in Summit County, Ohio, Akron, Ms. SUTTON.

I just want to make a broad point and then talk a little bit about a bill that I have introduced with DUNCAN HUNTER on currency. And the first point I want to make, and I think everything that you were talking about is saying, we need to represent our values here in the United States of America, not just here when we hear about family values, and we need to have values and we all agree with that. But put it in our actions. And I think that's what we want to do, and the trade agreements that we sign consistently, I think, go against it. And when you look at what the results are, and Sojourners had a great magazine; I may have sent it to some of you.

Two percent of the world owns more wealth than the other 98 percent. Now, that's unbelievable. Two percent of the world own more wealth than the other 98 percent combined. That signals to us that the models that you were talking about, Mr. Speaker, are not sufficient for shared growth for all people.

And we're not saying that if you go out and you start a company and you take a risk and you take out a loan, that you shouldn't be able to make money. God bless you. Make all you want. But recognize that you're a part of a bigger system here that we're all a part of that, investments in education, the minimum wage which we finally were able to get passed, college tuition; all of these things matter, health care in the grand scheme of things. And what we want to do is start exporting some of these values that we hold dear.

And when you say, well, you can make something in China and there are

no labor laws, no environmental laws, no this, well, what's the alternative? We go back to those days? And I've been to China. You may have, too. Dumping waste in the rivers, like we had a problem up in Cleveland a few decades ago where the Cuyahoga River caught on fire. Now we don't want to go back to those days, where thousands and thousands of kids got asthma because we didn't have clean air regulations. We don't want to go back to those days.

So we are now in a unique period in history, because in the United States, we're the consumer. We're the ones buying right now. Now, that may not be the case 10 years from now, but we are now, and so let's leverage our power as consumers to make some of these changes.

And I hope that what we're doing here tonight, and Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Ms. SUTTON, what we're doing here tonight is going to help push those things along.

The China currency bill that we have introduced here basically tries to get China to comply with international law. And international law says you're not allowed to subsidize your goods.

Well, China is subsidizing their currency, which is kind of a little more complicated than a government saying, okay, you make this widget, we're going to fund you; we're going to subsidize you so you can sell it cheaper in another country.

What China's doing with their currency is basically subsidizing it so that every product that they send the United States is between 25 and 40 percent cheaper.

I have a company in my district called Wheatland Tube. And it's also in Mr. ALTMIRE's district in Western Pennsylvania. They make tubing. The final product that arrives on the shores of the United States from China is the same price as Wheatland Tube's raw materials before they even start the process. That's the kind of advantage China's getting with their currency.

And I know you all are supportive of this bill, and I think it's something that we can, not talking just about trade, but this is something that I think free traders and fair traders and Democrats and Republicans and people from all over the country are agreeing on. And I know Mr. LEVIN and Mr. RANGEL want to move on a bill that does something with China, and I hope that this is a component of that, and I'm confident it will be.

□ 2145

But those are the kind of things that we need to stand up and talk about. And if we don't, no one will, because there is a certain amount of people that will benefit from the current system, and they are the ones who want to keep it just the way it is. But it is important for us to come here, 700,000 constituents, 700,000 constituents, 700,000 constituents, it adds up if we unify and organize and do what I think

made all the great social movements in the country great, was organization, traditionally the Democratic Party, the unions, the churches.

And I will make one final point that I know I have made to you guys already. It is so important for us to bring in the church communities. I am Catholic, and I think the Catholic Church has an obligation. They speak out on so many issues that I think have less relevance than this issue on average people's day-to-day lives. And I hope that they step up and talk about this issue with the same passion that we hear them speak out on a lot, and the evangelicals we just need to pull.

Sojourners Magazine with Jim Wallace did a terrific job a couple of issues ago. But if this does not become a moral, value-centered movement, we are going to continue to struggle. We have the environmentalists and we have the trade unionists, and we have some of us in the Democratic Party. But if we don't pull in the church community, I think we are going to continue to fail.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Mr. RYAN. And you are absolutely right. This is more than jobs and the economy. It is a moral issue. And as I mentioned earlier about some of the problems that I have even seen in my district, my hometown, when the mills shut down because of unfair trade deals, it is a moral issue. And I hope that the churches do get involved in this issue.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I know that our friend from Minnesota is here, but I just want to tell one story because I heard it a few weeks ago from my cousin who worked for Delphi Packard.

The plant used to be 15,000 and now they are down to maybe 1,000 because of the global economy, trade deals, China, the whole nine yards. He worked there for probably 10 years, and many people worked there for 30 and made a great living. He is now taking the machines off the ground, taking the bolts out of the ground, helping move these machines, and they are shipping them to China. Now, let's talk about some dignity. This guy is taking out the machines and shipping the machines and his job off to China.

That is where we are at. And we have got some work to do. We are not saying build fences and don't compete. But investments in education, what we talked about early on with stem cells and alternative energy, let's create the new wave of jobs that need to be created for our people to work. It is not just trade and exporting. It is making investments in the U.S. and creating new jobs.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much. That is a very good point that you mentioned because the very mill

that I worked at, we had six paper machines. Four are no longer there. They were unbolted and shipped overseas. So that is absolutely right. People might not think they are going to unpack the machinery and move them overseas. It has happened. I have seen it happen, and it will continue to happen unless we change the flawed trade model that we have been operating. And part of that component that is absolutely right is the currency manipulation with China that we have to address.

And as Mr. RYAN had mentioned, we have Mr. ELLISON here, who is also another freshman Member of the freshman class who is very interested in the trade issue. So I yield to Mr. ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman MICHAUD, Congresswoman SUTTON, Congressman RYAN, and also Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ, who left us, because you all have been carrying the banner of trade all night, fair trade.

And I think that before I jump into my remarks that I pulled together for tonight, I just want to say this: We are talking about trade, Mr. Speaker, within the context of two decades of flat wages for working people. When you look at real wages, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about flat real wages for working people. We are talking about a system of health care where we leave 47 million people out of it and so many other people carrying an increasing burden on their jobs just to be able to afford the health care that their job does provide. It is within this context that I want to talk about trade tonight within flat wages, within increasing health care costs, within the context of increasing and mounting consumer debt.

The average American, when you take their mortgage out of the equation, has about \$13,000 worth of consumer debt to carry around. And that is talking about your credit cards and everything else. So we have got consumer debt, increasing health care costs, and flat wages. And now we are going to talk about trade, trade that has sapped our jobs.

If you look at NAFTA, NAFTA alone I want to talk about tonight. NAFTA was sold as a way to make sure that workers both in Mexico and in America would benefit. But has that really happened? Has that really happened?

What has really happened is the opposite. We have seen 3 million jobs lost, 30,000 in Minnesota alone. NAFTA, by permitting its heavily subsidized U.S. corn and other agricultural business products to compete with the small Mexican farmers, has driven the Mexican farmer off the land due to low price imports of U.S. corn and other agricultural products. Some 2 million Mexicans have been forced out of agriculture, and many of those that remain are living in desperate poverty. These people are among those who cross the border to feed their families.

NAFTA service sector rules allow big firms like Wal-Mart to enter the Mexi-

can market and begin selling low price goods made by ultra-cheap labor in China to displace locally based shoe, toy, and candy firms. These estimated 28,000 small- and medium-sized Mexican businesses have been eliminated. Wages along the Mexican border have actually been driven down by about 25 percent since NAFTA. The Mexican border has actually been driven down since NAFTA, reported a Carnegie Endowment study. An oversupply of workers, combined with a crushing of union-organized drives as government policy, has resulted in sweatshop pay, running sweatshops along the border, where wages typically run 60 cents to \$1 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned what is going on with Mexico because I think it is so important from the standpoint of the American worker, the American worker who is trying to put food on the table, hold jobs here in our country, it is critically important. We are talking about, as I said, flat wages, rising health care costs, increasing consumer debt. And it is so important to understand that this immigration debate we are having is heavily informed by what? Trade. Our trade policy is increasing the pain not only on American workers but on workers abroad. As we fight back and forth, to and fro, about what we should we do, more border security, higher walls, fences. We have all these raging debates around here around these issues. What we have literally done through this NAFTA trade policy and other trade policies like it is wiped out an economy in another country and not just pulled people here through higher wages but pushed them here by elimination of their economies in Mexico.

So, Mr. Speaker, I bring these points to the floor tonight so that we can have more informed debate so that when people say, hey, look, why are these folks making such a big deal about fair trade policy, it is important to know that the middle class is being pinched and squeezed. And so often even here in Congress, we are being told that the problem is some immigrant, when in reality the problem, I believe, is heavily subsidized agribusinesses and our trade policy, which allows us to dump cheap, low-cost corn into countries like Mexico, which wipes out their farm economy and drives workers there over here so that they can make a living.

Mr. Speaker, it is critically important that we understand these issues and we get these issues on the table as we debate them because it is hypocritical, in my opinion, to talk about spending \$700 million, or however much we are going to spend on a fence, and not adjust our trade policies. We can't build a fence high enough if we keep on destroying the farm economy in Mexico and dumping cheap commodity prices there. We have to fix our trade policy. We have to fix a trade policy that benefits American workers and workers around the world too, Mr. Speaker.

So I didn't come here to say a whole lot more than that, Mr. Speaker. I want to get this issue of trade policy in the debate as we talk about immigration policy, and I want to talk about trade policy within the context of the squeeze the middle-class people are feeling every day.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ELLISON brought up a very good point. There has been a lot of discussion over the past month about immigration, particularly in the Senate. We will be having our discussions here in the House. And that is part of the component when you look at trade. It is not a simple issue. And Mr. ELLISON hit the nail right on head. If you look at immigration, what is happening, they are coming across the border because they want a job. They want a good job so they can provide for their family like any one of us would be doing for our family, provide for our family.

I was reading an article, actually, "Since NAFTA, Winners and Losers." I will just read a part of this article. It says: "As a bonus," talking about NAFTA, "the predicted increase in jobs and prosperity in Mexico under NAFTA was expected to reduce illegal immigration. In 1994, when NAFTA was put into effect, then-Attorney General Janet Reno predicted that illegal immigration would fall by two-thirds within 6 years."

And I want to quote the former Attorney General Janet Reno: "NAFTA is our best hope for reducing illegal immigration in the long haul. If it fails, effective immigration control will become impossible."

I want to repeat that again. This is the former Attorney General Janet Reno: "NAFTA is our best hope for reducing illegal immigration in the long haul. If it fails, effective immigration control will become impossible."

And that is absolutely right. We have seen what is happening since NAFTA. The same flawed model is in existence. It is going to take a real active role of the freshmen class and Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle who really want to make a difference. A new direction, that is what we need, a new direction.

We need a new trade model. Part of that trade model will go to what Congressman RYAN had mentioned when you look at the China currency manipulation, when you look at the value-added taxes, legislation that has just been introduced, bipartisan legislation dealing with a value-added tax that we have to look at that accounts for a big portion of our trade deficit. In the United States, 94 percent of all U.S. exports and imports with trade deal with countries that have a value-added tax. That is hurting this country.

And for those of you who do not know what the value-added tax is, actually, for the countries who export their products to the United States, they actually have been rebating those companies the value-added tax to a tune of \$217 billion in 2006. Plus if the

United States wants to export their product over there, they are actually taxed to a tune of \$110 billion. This has to change. This has to change.

And when you talk about Fast Track, actually during the several discussions about reauthorizing Fast Track in 1974, 1988, and 2002, Congress actually encouraged the USTR to change the value-added tax so we can be put on a level playing field. We have got to change the rules. This is one of the components that we can deal with in changing that rule.

I yielding to Congresswoman SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MICHAUD, again, your leadership is inspiring.

And, Mr. ELLISON, thank you for being down here. You have been a tremendous leader on these issues, and your points about immigration and the complexity and the links between these subjects is well taken and important to recognize because, as you point out, Mr. MICHAUD, with the numbers about the value-added tax, the VAT tax, there is nothing free about that. When they call it "free trade," you kind of think you are going to get something good back in return, and it just hasn't been working.

And the reality is when you read the quote by the former Attorney General, at that point the issue was theoretical. It was hypothetical. We didn't know for a fact actually what would happen. We thought. We had our ideas. We had our suspicions. But it is no longer theoretical. We know how this trade model has failed, and it doesn't make sense for us to continue down that same path.

□ 2200

You know, we had some talk here this evening about some of the trade deals that are still pending under the Fast Track authority that the administration still maintains. And a couple of those were mentioned in passing, including the pending deals with Peru and Panama, and of course Colombia and Korea. And recently, the administration and some congressional leaders actually announced that the labor and environmental standards were going to be included in the Peru and Panama agreements. However, right after that announcement, reports indicated that those standards may be put into side letters, where we've seen them go and not be enforced. And we also heard those who represent the multinational interests who are benefitting under our current broken trade policy boast that the standards will not be enforceable. Those are concerning developments.

And I guess it is also important to note that, even if the standards are ultimately in the core of the FTAs, experience tells us that they will not be enforced. In 2000, Congress passed the Free Trade Agreement with Jordan, and it had those labor and environmental standards in it. As a result, it received broad support. Actually, some

of those who believe in fair trade and are committed to it voted for it because of those standards. But you know, alas, despite documented violation upon documented violation, those standards have not been enforced.

So getting back to sort of the points that you have all been making, rather than continuing to pass more free trade agreements that won't be enforced and will result in the consequences we've seen under the broken trade system, which means more lost jobs, a bigger trade deficit, more of the negative consequences, not just in this country, but it's out of whack all over; rather than doing that, it makes sense for us to focus on things like that of Mr. RYAN's bill that will help to fix our broken system.

You know, Congress should focus on replacing policies that reward businesses for outsourcing jobs with incentives and should focus on sensible tax policies and would help businesses and workers make it in America.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SUTTON. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. Under the current model that we have, who is the entity responsible for enforcing trade provisions such as labor or environmental standards? Whose job is it to police those standards?

Ms. SUTTON. Well, the greatest level of enforcement actually begins and rests most directly with the administration.

Mr. ELLISON. So has the administration been an advocate, protector of the rights of workers in America, much less right around the world?

Ms. SUTTON. The gentleman asks a good question. No. No. The answer is no. And I think that that's an important point. And our colleague, Ms. SANCHEZ, made a very important point, too, about how this administration feels about human rights and workers' rights because she talked about the fact that they negotiated, this administration, an agreement with Colombia, where the murder of labor organizers and human rights violations are routine. And I think the fact that they are willing to enter into that agreement without being extremely diligent on correcting that tells us all we need to know about what this administration thinks about the need to enforce and deal with labor rights, labor standards and human rights. So I think that is very concerning.

If we deal with things, though, like currency manipulation and we deal with things like making sure that products that are produced elsewhere are safe for consumption here, because again, there are costs associated with safety. We have seen a lot of bad repercussions in recent days about products coming from outside of this country here. In fact, today, just today in USA Today was an article that dealt with lead in children's jewelry and how it

was hurting our kids, and China refusing to agree to changing that practice.

I yield back to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. MICHAUD. Actually, I would like to follow up, Mr. ELLISON, if I might, because I have in front of me, actually, testimony of the Assistant U.S. Trade Representative, Ms. Moore, who attended our hearing in the Small Business Committee on June 13. And I will paraphrase. It says, "Our work aims to increase exports by expanding market access for American goods, creating a level playing field." She also mentions, and it gets right to your point, "In addition, we enforce agreements and resolve trade problems using a wide variety of tools." That is clearly not what's happening.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. Yes.

Mr. ELLISON. A wide variety of tools. I would be curious to know what some of those tools might be. Are we talking about tickling somebody with a feather, or what kind of tools are we talking about? Are we dragging somebody into a tribunal and getting sanctions on them, or are we just talking about something else?

Mr. MICHAUD. Well, if you are tickling them with a feather, it's probably a feather made in China.

And I can tell you, the Trade Working Group has worked very closely with a variety of different groups, environmental groups, religious organizations, labor, business organizations, the United States Business and Industry Council, associations, small manufacturing businesses here in this country. And the United States Business and Industry Council has told me directly that the United States Trade Representative has turned away businesses when they've brought complaints to the USTR primarily because the dollar amount wasn't enough. And I can tell you personally that, as you know, I worked at the Great Northern Paper Company for a number of years, and when the company I worked for, when I was talking to the public relations before they filed bankruptcy, they actually went to the Department of Commerce and talked about trade and what it's doing, and the response that they got: Yup, you've got a great argument, but go spend over a million dollars and come back to us later on. Well, we couldn't hold on. They filed bankruptcy. They closed the doors at the time, and it is devastating. So they are not enforcing those agreements, and we continue to see a huge disparity in our trade policy.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. Yes.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, if we already start out with what is a trade policy that is lax, a trade policy with a model that is not inclined toward saving American jobs, and then they won't even enforce the rules that they do have, what will happen if we vote for a

trade policy for Peru and Panama that supposedly has these provisions in it, but they don't enforce them?

The fact is, I would like to ask the gentleman from Maine and the gentlelady from Ohio what they think about a trade model which would give labor organizations, for example, the right to charge an infraction of a labor standard and to bring a country into court for violating a labor standard? What if the sole power for enforcing the labor agreement was not in the hands of a trade representative that was favorably inclined to multinational trade but not so much for American workers, but actually in the hands of a labor organization; how might that play out?

Ms. SUTTON. Well, the gentleman asks a good question. He makes, actually, a great point, because the reality here is that we clearly don't have an enforceable system. First of all, the rules aren't good to start with. They're inadequate, and we have talked a lot about how they're inadequate. But the reality is, this Congress could do a myriad of things, actually, to shape the roles. And they shouldn't be left up to just sort of an, oh, maybe if it's a certain dollar amount, maybe if it affects something I care about. No, it really should be guided by the infraction itself, the infraction of the law, the infraction of the rule.

So, one way would be possibly to go down the path that you're talking about. And there are other avenues that we might pursue also. But the point is, we really need to fix it because you heard our esteemed colleague from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) talking about how we are investing in new technologies. And we all agree with that, we are all supporters of innovation. But when you have a company that is subsidizing and giving a 40 percent advantage from the start, all of the new technology, all of the education and workforce training in the world, all the increased productivity will never allow us to overcome that 40 percent head start.

So, again, the points are well taken. Rather than focusing on trade deals that are going to just take us down the same path to lost jobs, why don't we fix those things and then create a system in which trade can flourish? Because I believe in trade.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SUTTON. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. Should our trade model be driven by promotion of American economic activity, including jobs? Or should it be driven by profit margins of huge multinational companies that really have no allegiance other than the profit margin each quarter?

Mr. MICHAUD. Well, I think a trade model definitely should look at jobs and putting us on a fair level playing field.

If you look at this Congress, particularly with the freshman class that we currently have who has been out there,

very aggressively, talking about a new direction, we do need a new direction; we have to pause with all these trade deals that are currently going on. Even the former President, Bill Clinton, said we ought to pause on these trade deals to see what's happening.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. I would yield.

Mr. ELLISON. He ought to know.

Mr. MICHAUD. That's true. He's the one that brought us NAFTA. But these issues aren't Democratic issues or Republican issues. These are issues that are important to the United States, important to our long-term future, and we have to look at changing that model. And it can be done in a bipartisan manner. Congressman TIM RYAN, who was on the floor, is sponsoring legislation with a Republican Member of this body, DUNCAN HUNTER, on the currency manipulation. I am glad to see that a Presidential candidate is out there talking about trade, along with DENNIS KUCINICH, who is also talking about trade. We have the value-added tax, which is another piece of legislation which has strong bipartisan support, once again, Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, Congressman WALTER JONES, myself and Congressman BILL PASCRELL.

So these issues are not Democratic issues or Republican issues. These issues are American issues. And we definitely have to be more aggressive. We have to change that trade model. And we have to sit down and pause, and sit down in a bipartisan manner, no backroom deals. We've seen what these backroom deals have done in the past, and they don't work. We have to work open so the public can see what is going on and the real effect that we currently are seeing with trade deals.

Ms. SUTTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. Yes.

Ms. SUTTON. You know, and to my colleague, Mr. ELLISON, your question, I think it bears sort of repeating. It is inexplicable, but the United States seems to be the only nation that does not find it acceptable to help our companies, to protect them, workers and communities, against unfair trade practices. And as a result, we are left at a disadvantage. All we are really asking for is that they have a fair shake. That's all we are asking for.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentlelady yield? I agree. American workers are some of the best in the world, innovative, hard-working, no doubt about it, and given a fair chance, can compete with any workers or anyone around the world, but we just need a fair opportunity. So I think we need a new model, a new way of doing business that will protect American workers and also protect American small businesses, and other businesses that actually are in the business of helping America prosper and do well.

And before we wrap up, because I think we are probably getting close, I

just want to say briefly that I hope that people who feel so passionately about immigration will incorporate into their arguments the impact of trade policy on immigration.

Mr. MICHAUD. You are absolutely right. And I would like to close by once again quoting former Attorney General Janet Reno, and I quote, “NAFTA is our best hope for reducing illegal immigration in the long haul. If it fails, effective immigration control will become impossible.”

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

NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the privilege to address you on the floor of the House on the House of Representatives. It is always a privilege.

And this time in our history reflects I think one of the most pivotal times that we’ve had. We are at war for one thing, and it is a pivotal moment within that war. And we are watching terrorists from overseas that have attacked the United States. And as we are watching our national security on that hand and as we are debating how we proceed to victory over al Qaeda and those terrorists on that end, at the same time our southern border is being flooded with just masses of illegal immigrants on a nightly basis. And to give, Mr. Speaker, some perspective on the scope of that problem, we have this testimony before the Immigration Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member, and I sat intensively through hearings and engaged in questions and actually testified myself for the better part of 5 years at this point, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2215

Mr. Speaker, the testimony that we get from the Border Patrol, as far as the Border Patrol representatives for the profession and the Government, identifies that 2 years ago on the southern border, our Border Patrol and other immigration officers interdicted 1,155,000, I believe, illegal immigrants attempting to come across our border. Last year, it was 1,188,000. The number increases.

Now, one might argue that the effectiveness of our Border Patrol is reflected in the increase in the number of interdictions from about 1,155,000 to 1,188,000. But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit also that that could very well be a reflection of increased numbers coming across our border. It is not possible to identify whether the Border Patrol is more effective or whether they simply have a larger mass of people.

But in any case, when questioned before Committee in testimony before Congress as to what percentage of the

illegal border crossers they were interdicting, the number fell between 25 percent and 33 percent. I believe the quote in the testimony was, “We think we catch between a fourth and a third of those who attempt to cross.” Now, that is not a very good record when you consider that there are 1,188,000 illegals, and that could potentially represent a third of those that tried or a fourth of those who tried.

So, I simply take that math and put that number at 25 percent, which is the lower part of the number, and then round it up to put it into a perspective in between the 25 and 33 percent. If you take that number and do the calculation, you come to about 4.6 million, let me see, about 4.6 million attempts. If you look at the interdiction numbers it amounts to and round it down, 4 million coming across our southern border on an annual basis, and that divides out to be about 11,000 a night coming across our southern border; 11,000, Mr. Speaker, every night on average. I say “night,” because during the day, the activity slows down. It doesn’t stop. But at night it speeds up.

I have gone down and sat on the border in the dark, and without night vision goggles and without the aid that we have of our security personnel down there, but I just sat there and listened, sitting next to that cattle fence, that is not a very good cattle fence, about 5 barbed wires and steel posts that are stretched out to where the wires are separated in the middle so that the illegal traffic can simply bend down and step over through the fence.

I sat there and listened maybe 3 hours at a crack with a retired Border Patrol officer. I could see the shadows filtering through. I could hear the cars coming down on the Mexican side of the border. I could hear one of them dragging its muffler rattling as it drove down there. I could hear it stop by a big mesquite tree. I could hear the doors open. You hear people get out. You hear them drop their packs on the ground and the doors close kind of quietly, but the doors close. You can hear them pick things up in a hushed whisper and talk. Then they line up in single file, and they walk through the mesquite brush in the desert that 100 or 150 yards on down to our border and then file through the fence single file and go on up through the brush into the United States.

Some of them, I will concede, are coming here because they would like to find a job and they would like to find a better life. Some of them will send money back to their family. Some of them, that pack they drop on the ground and pick up again is the pack of illegal drugs that they will be carrying into the United States and delivering to a predetermined location, perhaps 25 miles up into the United States across the desert along the highway where a vehicle is scheduled to pull off on a turnoff and have those packs of illegal drugs tossed into the back of that truck. Maybe some of the illegals get

in the truck and go on up into the United States. Some of them turn around, walk back across the desert that 20 or 25 miles and go down and get another load.

This goes on every single night on our southern border, Mr. Speaker, every single night. That isn’t all the drugs that come across our border, but that is one of the methods that they use. If we put a vehicle barrier in place, in some places we have them, that amounts to a 5-by-5 steel tubing that is welded on our steel posts, and these are a 5-by-5 steel piling that are set in the ground, and a 5-by-5 steel tubing that is welded on there at about bumper height of a vehicle, that vehicle barrier will slow down and actually stop vehicles from driving across the border, but it doesn’t stop individuals from walking right through there and carrying their packs of illegal drugs.

The number that is most commonly represented by the Drug Enforcement Agency is \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs coming across our southern border on an annual basis. That \$65 billion is, I believe, a street value. I don’t know what it is worth at the border specifically. In fact, they don’t know either. They have got some representations of the breakdown of who gets what share of the profit as it flows through the illegal drug cartels. But \$65 billion worth on the street is no small number.

That value in illegal drugs consumed by Americans destroys untold numbers of lives, an incalculable amount of human potential, and an innumerable number of children suffer because their father or mother or both are hooked on illegal drugs, methamphetamines, marijuana, heroin, cocaine, you name it, that comes across that border. Especially the methamphetamine that comes up into my part of the country, up the NAFTA Highway, as I heard some of my colleagues talking earlier, and the pain and the suffering and the death that has been dealt out by those illegal drugs, but pushed by \$65 billion worth, the street value in the United States.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to make the statement that we have a responsibility here in the United States to address the illegal drug consumption in this country. As long as we have the kind of demand that demands \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs on the streets, in noses and in the veins and in the systems of our American drug abusers, illegal drug abusers, there is always going to be somebody that seeks to meet that demand.

Right now, the most efficient system that is set up, the most competitive system that is set up, the system that has the distribution wired in, is the illegal drug lords that control our southern border and the families that control their segments, the drug cartel families that control the segments of our southern border.

Mr. Speaker, we can’t solve this problem by addressing the border

alone. We have to solve this problem by reducing and eliminating the demand here in the United States for illegal drugs. I am not going to spend a lot of time on this, but I want to go on record, Mr. Speaker, and let you and let the rest of the body know that there are three ways that we can address illegal drugs.

One of them is through interdiction. We currently do that. We try to stop all the drug pushers we can. We try to take all the drugs out of their hands we can. We try to take them off the street. We put them in prison. We put mandatory sentences on some of them, and some of them have faced those mandatory sentences. We are doing a lot of what we can do with interdiction.

The only other two places we can address the drugs is rehab, and we have invested some money in rehab and we have gotten some pretty good results from those who have hit bottom, from those, Mr. Speaker, who want to. But the rehabilitation isn't going to solve the problem with the demand.

So the third place is how do you reduce and eliminate the demand, and I will submit that the way to address this, if we want to dry up the demand of illegal drugs in the United States, we are going to have to provide random testing in the workplace and also in the educational field and also in the welfare rolls.

Now, we have a drug testing law in Iowa that I worked intensively to get passed and drafted a lot of the components and worked those pieces through. I spent 2 years doing not exclusively that, but focusing a lot of my time getting that legislation passed, Mr. Speaker.

What it provides for is preemployment testing, post-accident testing, reasonable suspicion testing and random testing. If you have those four categories of drug testing and you provide that for that in the workplace, in our educational institutions so our students are being tested, and in our welfare rolls, you will be able to, and we could as a society, if we determined we wanted to dramatically reduce the demand for illegal drugs, if we would put a drug testing system in place, we could dramatically reduce the demand.

By doing so in the workplace under those four methods that I said, pre-employment, post-accident, reasonable suspicion and random testing, we can provide and essentially guarantee a drug-free workplace.

I first brought my focus on this when as in the contracting business I had a Federal contract. The Federal contract required me to sign a document that I would guarantee a drug-free workplace. Now, I take those contracts seriously. When I sign my name to something, I intend to follow through. That is my commitment and that has been my record.

But it disturbed me that Iowa law didn't allow me to truly guarantee a drug-free workplace. I could watch out for it, I could check for it as much as

I could, I could educate my employees, but I couldn't legally test my employees. So I did what I could to meet a drug-free workplace. I think I provided a drug-free workplace, but I don't know that. But it set me down the path of working on the drug testing side of it.

We essentially don't have a conversation going on in America about how to eliminate drug abuse in America. That conversation doesn't exist in a meaningful fashion. We talk about all kinds of things, but \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs representing 95 percent of the overall drug consumption in America coming across our southern border and the attendant violence that comes with that and the drug cartels that comes with that, the smuggling of drugs and people and human slaves that are put into the sex slavery business, and that violence and the crime that is naturally associated with illegal drugs, we are not addressing the demand.

We are not particularly concerned about the abuse of drugs in the workplace. And I believe we have got to raise that issue. I believe that we need to bring the focus of America's society on dramatically reducing the demand for illegal drugs in this society so that we can provide a lot better culture for our children to grow up in than perhaps we grew up in. That is not being addressed, Mr. Speaker, and I want to raise this issue.

But on the other side of this, the flip side of this issue is U.S. demand, \$65 billion coming across our southern border representing 90 percent of the illegal drugs. The other side is on that side of the border, they are delivering that amount of drugs to us.

They are producing many of them in Mexico and Central America and the northern part of South America. Also there is heroin and other drugs coming in from China that flow into Mexico. And that distribution network is the magnet that draws those illegal drugs into Mexico. The marijuana that comes in, the methamphetamines that are manufactured there. The pseudoephedrine that come in from China to Mexico to be processed into methamphetamine, that spells a society that doesn't have the rule of law.

I will argue that we are deficient in our own rule of law here because we are not reducing the demand in the United States. But they are pouring across the southern border. And as much rhetoric as we have had about people that want to come here for a better life, we need to have a lot of rhetoric about what has happened to the lives of the people who have been sucked into this drug smuggling, who have been sucked into the drug consumption and become drug addicts? What about the lives of the American people who have been sacrificed on this altar of permissiveness that we don't have the will to shut down the abuse of illegal drugs in American and we don't have the will to shut down the flow of those illegal drugs across the border?

As I watch that and I look at the violence, and here two years ago, Mr.

Speaker, actually it was more than 3 years ago, I commissioned a GAO study, a Government Accountability Study, and asking this question, and that is, we saw the testimony of how many people didn't make it across the desert to come into the United States illegally. That number has grown in the years that I have been in this Congress from perhaps a little more than 200, to now over 450, and perhaps as many as 500 people dying coming across the southern border.

That is a human tragedy. It is an agonizing human tragedy. The images of that easily come to mind to the American people, because we have seen a lot of news on it, we have seen film on it, we have seen pictures.

The other side of that tragedy is of those that make it across the border, those 11,000 a night that try, the 66 to 75 percent of those that make it, or more, and I will add that when I talk to the Border Patrol officers on the border and I ask them what percentage of effectiveness do you have, what percentage of them are you catching that are trying to come across the border, 25 percent, 33 percent? They laugh at me. They say, no, that number is more like 10 percent.

That is the most consistent number I get when I am speaking confidentially with the people that are boots on the ground, facing this enemy to our society, eye-to-eye, face-to-face. Perhaps 10 percent. I get numbers that go down as low as 3 percent. But it is the testimony here that is the highest that I hear, that perhaps a quarter to a third of those are interdicted.

□ 2230

But of those that come across the border and get across the border, and we are losing 450 or 500 trying to come into the United States that don't make it across the desert, how many Americans die at the hands of those who do make it across the border? Those involved in the crime, and there is plenty of it, do commit crimes against American citizens.

The measure of that crime falls into this category: 27 percent of the inmates in our Federal penitentiaries are criminal aliens. Some of them came into the United States legally and overstayed their visa. But most of them came into the United States illegally and committed crimes. That is 27 percent.

If you look at the State penitentiaries, the same Government Accountability Office report has in there that they are only funding 25 percent through SCAAP, the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, that funds our States, our counties, our local prisons, reimburses them for the trouble of having to incarcerate criminal aliens here in the United States because the United States isn't able to control our borders, and the burden of enforcing that crime falls upon the local governments and the cities, increasingly. But the Federal Government is to reimburse them for incarcerating the inmates.

In the GAO study, it shows that we are only reimbursing for 25 percent of the cost of the incarceration of criminal aliens in the local prisons, State and local. When you do the math, that 25 percent comes to about \$22,000 a year by their numbers. That is a pretty typical number for the cost of incarcerating someone in a penitentiary.

So if they are paying 25 percent and it is costing \$22,000 a year for those that we do pay for, it is not \$88,000 a year, so the only other conclusion one can draw is, at least in our State penitentiaries, that at least 25 percent of the inmates are criminal aliens.

Now one comes to the conclusion that more than 25 percent of the inmates that are in our Federal and State penitentiaries are criminal aliens. They commit crimes against Americans. If they are committing crimes against Americans in the proportion that they are represented in our penitentiaries, that means more than 25 percent of the murders, more than 25 percent of the assaults, more than 25 percent of the rapes and more than 25 percent of the grand larceny, and the list goes on and on and on.

We have few in our Federal penitentiaries that are in there just because they violated immigration law. They may be there under that charge, but if they are and that is the charge that they are under, it is most likely that they simply could not make another charge stick and the prosecutors chose to use immigration charges rather than something else.

But just think, we are sitting here now with 16,400 murders a year in America. And if a fourth of those are attributable to criminal aliens, you are at 4,000 Americans a year. We crossed that sad threshold of those killed in action in Iraq, total, in addition to those killed in accidents in Iraq, over 3,000, a while back, Mr. Speaker.

But that number compared to the number of over 3,000 a year, in fact the almost 4,000 a year that die at the hands of criminal aliens here in the United States, and that is every single year. So, each year, we have had more Americans die at the hands of criminal aliens in this country than we have cumulative total of all of the soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines that have been killed in Iraq since the operations began in March of 2003. We have more Americans dying at the hands of criminal aliens on the streets and the roads and in the back alleys and homes of America each year than died on September 11, 2001. This total accumulates over and over again.

In addition to that number, there also is a slightly larger number of Americans who die at the hands of criminal aliens who have committed negligent homicide, generally in the form of drunk driving, although not always. If you add these numbers up, my numbers show 12 Americans a day murdered at the hands of criminal aliens, and 13 die every day at the hands of criminal aliens who have committed

negligent homicide, generally victims of drunk drivers. And I am not counting the criminal aliens who have been killed because of their own drunk driving, Mr. Speaker.

So you add that number up, and it comes to 25 a day, 25 Americans a day. If the news media focused on that instead of some of their other priorities, I think we would have come to a conclusion on this illegal immigration issue that we are facing. But what is coming across that border and the violence that flows with it, and again, I will stipulate that most are good people. When they are our neighbors we like them. And when they go to work, we like them. And when they go to church, we like them. And when they raise their children and educate their children and when they assimilate into the American culture, we love everybody that comes to America to do that. We love those who come here legally. Those who come illegally subvert the rule of law.

But the violence that is part of the society that they come from is significant. I have to talk a little bit about the levels of violence here in the United States compared to the countries that many of our immigrants come from.

That is, our violent death rate here in the United States is 4.28 per 100,000. And the violent death rate in Mexico is 13.2 per 100,000. That is actually one of the safer countries in South and Central America. I was in Sao Paulo, Brazil, a little over a year ago. They told us to be careful where we go because in that city, they have over 10,000 murders a year.

I don't know the violent death rate in Brazil, but I do know what it is in Honduras. It is nine times that of the United States. In El Salvador, they don't publish the violent death rate, and one can only presume what it might be and why they don't.

But in Colombia, the violent death rate in Colombia is 15.4 times higher than the violent death rate here in the United States.

So it stands to reason that if you draw young men, some of whom are involved in the illegal drug trade, from a society that is far more violent than that of the United States, anywhere from 3 times to 15 times more violent, you are going to see more violent crimes. You are going to see more murders, assaults and rapes. There are going to be more victims in the United States and more deaths. One couldn't expect anything else.

That doesn't mean that we indict an entire country and all of their nationals because some of the citizens are violent. But that means we have more crime here because we are drawing a young men concentration from a more violent society, and a significant portion of those who are involved coming into the United States are those who are dealing in illegal drugs because the demand here for \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs draws that in from those

countries, and necessarily it has to come across our southern border.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have laid the foundation for my passionate belief that we need to reinforce our southern border by building a double fence/wall on our southern border because I don't believe that a virtual fence is going to deter \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs.

I have an understanding how powerful a magnet a \$65 billion illegal drug market magnet is that draws those drugs into the United States with that kind of powerful profit incentive. They are going to be pushing against our southern border.

When you go down there, and I sit there at night, and it is five barbed-wire strands, five strands of barbed wire, kind of a poor cattle fence, and they are going through one after another. And I can't quite count them all because it is pitch black, and I can only see the shadows, and I can hear the footsteps and the fence creak. And I can put my ear down to the post and listen to the fence stretch as they go through and kind of count.

That is just one place, one location, one night, Mr. Speaker. But 11,000 a night on average every night. The numbers of people pouring across and the illegal drugs that are a part of that, America's economy is paying a tremendous price. Our society is paying a tremendous price. The potential, the human potential of our young people is slowly being undermined and destroyed by the illegal drugs that are coming in.

But the force of those drugs cannot be eliminated simply because we want to put in a virtual fence. We want to argue that we are going to put in ground-based radar and we are going to fly the unmanned aerial vehicles over the top. We will put some cameras in place, but some of that doesn't work in bad weather. Sometimes you can't get down there in bad weather to enforce.

Each time I asked the Border Patrol, does it help to build a double fence/wall, their answer is generally, nothing you can do will reduce the need for the number of boots on the ground. That is an interesting response, Mr. Speaker.

How is it that if we build physical barriers on the border, follow through and complete the commitment of the congressional mandate that the President signed, the Secure Fence Act, and build 854 miles of a double fence and roads, and tie that together with the technology that is necessary to supplement those physical barriers, how is it, if we build those barriers, we need more boots on the grounds, not less?

I am going to say, good physical barriers reduce the numbers of Border Patrol that we need. I am suggesting that we reduce those numbers; I am suggesting that we can invest our money more efficiently on the southern border than we are. And the wisdom of a double fence and wall on that southern border, if analyzed economically, holds up, and it holds up this way.

We are spending \$8 billion on the 2,000 mile southern border from San

Diego to Brownsville. That is \$8 billion every year, and that money goes to pay Border Patrol, buy Humvees, depreciate the Humvees and support them, and pay for the retirement benefits, training and equipment and helicopters, fuel, gas for our Humvees, the whole network that is necessary to keep the Border Patrol up and running. That is where the \$8 billion goes. That is \$4 million per mile.

Now, me being a contractor who spent my life building things and pricing things and sometimes designing construction projects, I bring this down to unit price. I have to calculate things in unit price.

Mr. Speaker, what would I do? Say, for example, I live in the country in Iowa on a gravel road and the four corners come together right by my house. If I had a border on my west road that ran from my house, a mile west right down the middle of that gravel road, I don't care how far it went east or west, but if it was my job to contain that one mile, and if Michael Chertoff, the Secretary of Homeland Security came to me and said, STEVE, we think you ought to control this border, would you bid that for us? It is costing us \$4 million a mile and two-thirds or three-quarters of everybody who is trying to get across the border goes across and goes off into the United States. Can you give us a price to give us more efficiency, a lot more than a fourth to a third efficiency? Give us something close to 100 percent efficiency.

So if you are a stopping a fourth of the people at \$4 million a mile, one would think, to get 100 percent of them, if we spent \$16 million a mile, maybe just maybe that linear equation would work out. I don't think it will, but that is one way of thinking about it.

So I would look at it and say, Mr. Secretary, \$4 million a mile, how about giving me a 10-year contract, and I can control the illegal traffic on this border.

Now I have \$40 million to work with; \$4 million for that mile, 1 year, times 10 years, a 10-year contract, \$40 million. I would look at that and think, I am going to hire myself a bunch of Border Patrol and buy myself a bunch of Humvees, and I am going to drive them up and down that road and hope that they come across the people coming across the border at night. I wouldn't do that.

I would have some people to guard the borders, yes; some people to be quick reaction responders, I certainly would. But I would look at that and say, if I make an early capital investment, if I built a wall on that border and a fence inside there a hundred feet, maybe another chain link fence inside that, I would set up some cameras and sensors, and it would be monitor-able from inside an air-conditioned office. Then I would have some Border Patrol to deploy if I needed them.

But for \$1.3 million, I could build this wall that I am about to build. And for

the balance of another million dollars a mile, I could put in another fence and we could have a solid wall, double fencing, and we could have probably an access road to run along there, and we could shut off more than 90 percent of the illegal traffic, more than 95 percent of the illegal traffic. In fact, I believe that we could tighten that down so tight there wouldn't be anybody coming across.

I say that because, not only does it make sense, I have seen the effectiveness of it. I went to Israel, and I took a look at the fence they have constructed in Israel. They were being bombed on a regular basis by suicide bombers from the West Bank.

□ 2245

They'd blow themselves up and blow up some women and children and men, too, didn't matter to them so long as they could take somebody with them. And so for the Israelis to protect themselves from those kind of attacks, they put a fence in place. And some places it's doubled; some places it's a little more than that. There are some watch towers and guard towers. They have some wire on top. They have sensors. Some of the sensors that they have are classified so they don't let the enemy understand how to defeat it.

But the fence structure that they put in place in Israel has been nearly 100 percent effective, and so I hear people here in this Congress will say, why do you want to build a fence and how tall do you want it to be? And I say, well, I'd put mine up 12 feet tall here, and then I'd put a wire mesh fence inside that's taller yet. Oh, 12 feet tall; if you do that, somebody's just going to build a 12-foot ladder and they'll climb over the top.

That is what you call a red herring, Mr. Speaker, and in fact, there have been very, very rare anyone could defeat the fence in Israel, and however tall you make the fence, yes, you can make a longer ladder. But there's always another way to defeat the people who think that's the easy way. It's one of the reasons to make it double because we can interdict them in between. And the sensors pick up the efforts, but if you don't slow them down, they charge across the border and scatter out across the desert. You can chase some of them down, but you cannot chase them all down, Mr. Speaker. And so fences and walls are effective. They have been proven to be effective, and they're cost-effective as well.

So let me just submit that that \$40 million contract for that 1 mile for 10 years, the \$4 million a year, for less than \$3 million I can put in a concrete wall and a wire fence and I can put in sensors. And then I'd sit back and monitor that mile from my office with little warning devices on it and I'd have somebody on 24 hours a day. I'd have people on call and maybe somebody patrolling it in intermittent cycles, but we'd shut that mile down, and we could shut that mile down for an early cap-

ital investment of less than \$3 million. And you'd only have \$37 million left over for the balance of the 10 years to pay yourself a minimum number of border patrol and somebody to monitor the sensor devices that you have.

We can put this together, but what we're doing is burning up a tremendous amount of taxpayer dollars at \$8 billion a year to get a fourth to a third efficiency when we can get 95, 96, 98 percent efficiency by investing in a structure instead.

Now, if we do that, we put a barrier in place that's very, very difficult to defeat, not impossible but difficult, and so the drug smugglers that are trying to get here, they are going to decide they don't want to try to go through there. They're likely to try by air again or by sea or some other method. In any case, we'll dramatically reduce the amount of illegal drugs on the streets of America, at least for a time, until they find another way to defeat us.

We have our choice. We can either work to defeat the illegal drug smugglers and try to keep those drugs off the street or we can capitulate. I'm not willing to capitulate, and I'm not hearing anybody in this Congress stand up and say that they want to legalize the illegal drugs.

And so I think we need to fight them, and I think this is the place to draw the line. This is the battle line, and it's on our southern border. I've talked to the Mexican senators about it. I believe they understand, and they're doing some things on their side to help out.

That's one of the battles that we have. We have a number of other battles, Mr. Speaker, and so it takes us, though, to this idea that legalize illegal drugs and then you don't have an illegal drug problem. That makes sense, doesn't it? But I'm not willing to go there, and we aren't in this Congress either. But the President and the open borders lobby have taken the stand that they think that we can't control our border, our southern border in particular, unless we legalize the 12 to 20 million people who come in here illegally.

Now, I continually ask the question of the representatives from the administration as they march forward before the Immigration Subcommittee, explain this to me, how is it that you can't enforce the law until we give amnesty to 12 to 20 million? How is it that if we do grant this amnesty or grant a legal status to 12 to 20 million people, how is America safer? If you want to bring people out of the shadows, and never mind they came here to live in the shadows, that's a function of sneaking into the United States and getting jobs illegally. When they were in hiding, that's living in the shadows. When you try to bring them out of the shadows, why would they come out? What kind of people would come out of the shadows? It would be those that are guaranteed amnesty. Those undesirables are not going to come out

of the shadows, Mr. Speaker. They're going to stay back there and they're going to run their drug trade and they're going to push their wives and their kids to go to work, and they're going to sit back and work in the black market. They're not going to come forward. We will not get people to come forward that are afraid that they will not be granted some kind of amnesty.

But the President's idea on this and the open border lobby's idea on this is somehow, if we grant amnesty to the 12 to 20 million people, then we can focus our law enforcement resources on the bad apples, a huge human haystack of humanity, 4 million strong pouring across our southern border every year. And in that haystack of humanity are the needles called terrorists and criminals, drug dealers, undesirable elements, people that no society wants in them. And if we legalize that huge human haystack of humanity, somehow it makes it easier to find the needles that are in it.

But I'll submit, Mr. Speaker, that those needles are not going to come out into the open unless they can be guaranteed some legal path, and those who will be legalized, and I reject that concept of destroying the rule of law and legalizing people that have broken our laws, but those who would be legalized would then get themselves a card where they could travel back and forth across the border at will.

Now, I would ask, does the administration and the open borders lobby expect to see more or less border crossings if you legalize people that are here illegally? Are they going to go back and forth more? Are they going to go back and forth less? I'll submit they'll go back and forth more because they have their illegal passage that they do now; they will still have that option. Of course, they will have the option of the card that says now you can go back and forth at will.

So we'll have more crossings across the border rather than less. When you have more crossings across the border, there are more opportunities to bring contraband across the border, more opportunities for terrorists to smuggle through, more opportunities for criminals to take advantage of the situation.

And so I can't believe that there's a rationale in this argument that if you legalize 12 to 20 million people, if you legalize them, somehow America is safer. They're not any different people than they were before. They're the same people. They're just travelling back and forth more than they were. They're still hiding the drug smugglers within them. The crime will still take place, and the rationale that you won't have as much illegal smuggling going on or we can solve a big portion of the illegal problem, the rationale is the same rationale that says legalize illegal drugs, then you don't have an illegal drug problem. Legalize illegal aliens, then you don't have an illegal alien problem.

That's as far as the rationale goes, but it surely does not solve the law enforcement problem, and no one in the administration can explain that to me, at least to the point where I could understand it, and I honestly tried, Mr. Speaker.

So the rule of law is at stake. To grant amnesty is to grant a pardon to immigration law-breakers and reward them with the objective of their crime. That's the fairest, most balanced definition of amnesty. It's one that holds up against the criticism.

The rule of law is the most essential element of American exceptionalism. If we didn't have the rule of law in America who would come here? They're leaving the other countries because they don't have the rule of law and they don't have the right to property and they can't be treated equally under the law and are not equal under the eyes of the law.

But the rule of law says that everyone, every man and every woman, is equal under the eyes of the law, and that if you're going to be held accountable for a crime, you're innocent until proven guilty; and justice for a poor man is the same as justice for a rich man. That's the rule of law. And that's one of the essential pillars and the most essential pillar of American exceptionalism.

But I don't know how many of those who are beneficiaries of the 1986 amnesty plan I've talked to who say I'm for this amnesty, you need to grant a path to citizenship for people who came here illegally, and I ask them why, and they say, well, it was good for me; it was good for me, it was good for my family.

But just that fact alone is surely not justification enough to tear the rule of law asunder and throw it over the side, Mr. Speaker. This rule of law is a precious commodity, a precious pillar of American exceptionalism, and if it's destroyed, we will never reach a glorious destiny in this country.

It's essential that we preserve the rule of law, and if we grant amnesty to 12 to 20 million or more, that will attract another 12 to 20 million, but regardless, the family, the friends, the progeny of the recipients of amnesty will be strong advocates for amnesty in coming years. If they get a path to citizenship, they will run for office. They will advocate for it. They will support candidates who advocate for amnesty, and they will continue to destroy this rule of law. America will never be the Nation that we have been again and never become the Nation that we can become because we will have almost knowingly and willfully sacrificed the rule of law on the altar of open borders because some businesses want cheap labor and they see an advantage in that. And some people want cheap labor and cheap votes, cheap votes on the left side, cheap labor more on the right than on the left but it's on both sides, and you put that coalition together, and the squeeze that comes on

American society and culture is the squeeze on the middle class. That's another pillar of American exceptionalism is the middle class.

We have been building this Nation on an ever broadening and an ever more prosperous middle class. An opportunity if you're an uneducated person with some ambition, maybe you get out of high school and you decide I don't want to go to college, it's not for me, but I want to go punch a clock and work my way up at the factory or at the meat plant or whatever it is, I want to make a good enough living that if I don't even move up the ladder, if I don't ever do that, I can still buy a modest home and I can still raise my family and send my kids off to school with expectation of a better life. That's been a foundation of the American dream, an ever broadening and ever more prosperous middle class.

Today, cheap labor has destroyed the opportunities for the undereducated, the high school graduate or the high school dropout that's an American citizen. They can no longer go punch a clock and feed their family and pay for a modest home because wages have been driven down so cheap. The people that are at the top of the scale believe that they will never have to compete and neither will their children ever have to compete with the cheap labor that's been poured into this country. They will live in gated communities, and they will send their children off to Ivy League schools and they believe they'll always have that foundation and that capital base to make their gated communities, and the guarded society will be the destiny for all of their progeny.

But the middle class can't hope for that. The middle class has been diminished in its numbers, and it is a percentage of society, and the relative prosperity has been diminished significantly. And the unemployment among the underskilled Americans has grown in direct proportion to the amount of unskilled labor that's coming here illegally to take on the jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I'm for the rule of law. I'm for the middle class in America. I'm for opportunity for everyone, no matter what their education level is. We simply have to have a policy here in the United States that favors Americans. And the rationale that says that we are going to be a Nation that is somehow or another the relief valve for all the poverty in the world needs to take into account that there's a limit to the number of people that can live in the United States.

And those who advocate for open borders, I ask the question, how many are too many? Where would you draw the line? They will never engage in that debate because they know they lose the minute they try to put a number down. They will say that it should be on supply and demand, this economy. And so if there's a demand for more labor, we ought to bring in more labor.

If we're going to be the relief valve for poverty in the world, Mr. Speaker,

there are at least 4.6 billion people on the planet with a lower standard of living than the citizens in Mexico, at least 4.6 billion. Are we going to open our gates up at our ports of entry and bring the people in, any willing traveler, might be the way the President would phrase it? And the answer to that should be no.

We can have compassion in a lot of ways, and one of them is to promote the American way of life around the globe. Be proud of who we are, be proud of our culture, be proud of our civilization, be proud of our history, be proud of the sacrifice of our Fore Fathers, be proud of the sacrifice of our current generation that's so proudly defended us around the world in the last 5 years.

But we needed to preserve our destiny. We need to reject amnesty, Mr. Speaker, and so I think that it's essential that we build the wall and we hold together the rule of law and we preserve the middle class and remember who we're about and what we are as a people.

By popular demand, I have occasionally demonstrated the construction of a wall so the people can understand, Mr. Speaker, how it can be done. I sat down and created a design for a concrete wall because I believe that it's harder to breach a concrete wall than it is a steel fence, and I think it's cost-effective.

□ 2300

But I want to describe what I have designed here.

Whenever we build for a fence or a wall, we need to have a foundation underneath it. There will be people that will try to dig underneath it, so I designed a slip-form concrete form.

This would go in a trench. You would set a trencher in here with a specially made grading machine that would trim this out and pour this concrete footing with a notch in it, trench and pour the footing as you go, so the hole didn't have a chance to cave in. As we poured this we would just drive the machine along and it would be trenching and pouring concrete, so there would be a cured foundation for the wall that would be completed as the trench and slip-form machine moved on.

This is what it looks like from the end. This would be what it looks like from the top, the notch in the top, and that groove there, it will be obvious where I put that. So as that trench is moved along, and the foundation of this wall sets like this, then I would bring in precast concrete panels. These panels would be about 13½ feet tall, and they could be about any width, but proportionately it looks like 6 to 8 feet. We could go wider, we could go 10 feet.

Perhaps once this was cured, even the next day, come along with truckloads of precast concrete panels. They would sit on the truck like this, pick those up with a crane, swing them into place, set them down right into the notch of the foundation. Just this simple.

It would take a little bit longer, but not appreciably longer to throw this all together in this fashion. It would be constructed 12-foot high precast panel, slip-form concrete wall. It would look a lot like that. I would set that down within about 3 feet inside the border. I put some wire on top here, stabilize this thing and provide it as a deterrent.

With concrete, you can mount anything on top for sensors. You can do cameras, vibration, motion detectors, you could mount any kind of new technology on top of this concrete. It wouldn't be possible to take a cutting torch through here. If you brought a concrete saw in to cut a notch through it, the noise and the vibration would be transferred down the wall, and our sensor devices would likely pick it up, or we could deploy some Border Patrol to that location.

But as you could see, I would go inside also another 100 feet, and I would put a mesh fence up, even taller than this, so that there will be essentially a no man's land in between the wall and the fence.

There are a lot of designs that would work. This is only one design, but I designed this and put the structure of this together, and I can put the estimate together too. This can be installed for about \$1.3 million a mile.

Now, somebody was complaining about the cost of this. What is it, gold plated? Well, you can build a four-lane Interstate for about \$4 million a mile, but that's what we are paying the Border Patrol to watch the border right now.

Now, I appreciate the work that they do, and I respect the work that they do, and I support them. They need better tools to work with. This is one of them that can be helpful. This is one of the components, or a version of fence and wall is one of the components to the Secure Fence Act.

This Congress has mandated that that fence be built, and we appropriated money to it last week to the tune of \$1 billion. The year before, we appropriated \$1,187,565,000 just to round it out to even dollars. We appropriated about \$2.2 billion to building the Secure Fence Act, and that includes money for technology, for virtual fence, as well as real fence.

We need to stop the flood at our southern border. We need to dramatically slow the flow of illegal drugs across that border. It will reduce the amount of crime perpetrated and committed against Americans. It will save lives. It will save at least hundreds of lives. It will probably save thousands of lives.

It will be cost effective, and it will send a message that America is a sovereign Nation that will protect its borders, and that we will direct traffic, human traffic and contraband, through the ports of entry. We will need to beef up our ports of entry. We need to have more Customs and Border Patrol people there, and more sophisticated devices there.

But if we can't stop the bleeding at our border, there is no amount of enforcement that we can do in the interior that will be effective. The best description I have heard is the description by Dr. PHIL GINGREY, a Congressman from Georgia, who has worked the emergency room. His description is if you have a patient come in the emergency room when they are bleeding all over the place, and they are bleeding from multiple wounds, and they are bleeding all over the floor, the first thing you don't do is grab the mop and the bucket and start to clean it up. You stop the bleeding. That's what you do.

We have a tremendous amount of bleeding on our southern border. We have got to stop the bleeding, stabilize the patient, and then we can have a debate on how to clean up the mess. It is a tremendous mess here in the United States, because the Federal Government hasn't enforced the immigration laws to the level it needs to, and that has been an open permission slip that has been granted now to a number of the employers who have taken advantage of it. They have hired the cheap labor.

The third thing is birthright citizenship, automatic citizenship that is a magnet for 350,000 pregnant mothers every year who come here to have their children in the United States. It's not a constitutional right, it's a practice to grant them citizenship here because they are born in the United States. Those things work against our sovereignty. Those things work against the middle class, those things would be against the rule of law.

I am going to continue to advocate that we construct this double fence of wall on the southern border, that we complete it and we follow through on the congressional mandate, and we insist that the administration follow through. We need to do border enforcement first, employer enforcement second. When we get those things done, we will have stopped the bleeding and shut off birthright citizenship as the other bleed. Then we could have a debate in this Congress about how to clean up the mess, and it is one, one tremendous mess.

That's my advocacy, that's my policy, that's where I stand.

I appreciate the privilege to address you tonight.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for the remainder of the time until midnight.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to come before the House once again. I am glad to be here with my good friend Mr. ALTMIRE.

As you know the 30-Something Working Group, we come to the floor weekly, talk about issues that are facing the Nation, and also give a report on

what's happening and what's not happening. We are hoping to do good things on behalf of the American people, and we hope that we can build a relationship with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, to help pass the American agenda.

Mr. ALTMIRE and I usually have some opening comments, and then we usually get into a conversation about some of the issues that we are facing this week, about some of the ongoing issues.

Over the weekend, I took the opportunity, because Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. RYAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. MURPHY, who are part of the 30-something Working Group, we do meet, and we talk about issues that we want to bring before the Members.

I can tell you there are 47 major measures that have passed this floor with a bipartisan vote of 79 percent, so that means that 75 percent of the issues that have passed this floor have had bipartisan support.

I see that we have one of our charts here to show, under the Democratic Congress, that Republicans all along, we were saying in the 109th, 108th Congress, some of them really wanted to vote for the priorities of America and move this in a new direction.

But obviously the Republican leadership in the 109th, 108th, going back even further, did not want to bring those issues to the floor. But when they were brought to the floor, the 9/11 Commission Recommendations, H.R. 1, passed with 299 votes with 68 Republicans voting affirmative; raising the minimum wage, H.R. 2, again, passed 315, passed with 315 votes here with 82 Republicans voting along with Democrats.

The funding to enhance stem cell research, H.R. 3, 257 and 37 Republicans; making prescription drugs more affordable, H.R. 4, 24 Republicans joined the majority of Democrats, passing that measure by 255; cutting student loan interest rates in half, H.R. 5, 356 votes in favor, passed the House with 124 Republicans joining the Democratic leadership on that vote.

□ 2310

And creating long-term energy initiatives, H.R. 6, 264, with 36 Republicans.

And Mr. Speaker, I think it's also important to be able to outline the fact that we want to move in a new direction. And so far, the President has signed the following: The first increase in the minimum wage in almost a decade, which will take effect on July 24 of this year. This is not fiction; it's fact. And it will be fully phased in. It will mean a raise of \$4,400.

And also, we passed tax incentives to be able to help small businesses; \$3.7 billion in additional emergency funding for veteran and military health care. This is \$3.4 billion in additional funds for military readiness also, including armored vehicles and also to

meet the National Guard shortfalls that they have been experiencing over some time.

Emergency funding to keep hundreds and thousands of children in 11 States from losing their health care. That's very significant.

Overdue funding to repair and complete flood areas of Louisiana and Mississippi, and also, assisting other gulf coast communities, schools and universities to rebuild and recover from Hurricane Katrina Rita and also Wilma.

Overdue disaster aid to American families and ranchers, more than 80 percent of the funding that they were looking for they were able to receive through this Democratic Congress.

Emergency wildfire funding, to be able to assist communities that have been waiting on Federal response, and also benchmarks for the Iraqi government and requiring the President to report the progress of the war to the Congress more than two times.

I think it's important to also state the many of the things that we've done here in the House, Mr. Speaker, without needing Presidential approval. We restored pay-as-you-go budget discipline for the first time in 6 years in Washington and received praise from major fiscal watchdog groups.

Also, passed a budget balanced by 2010 with no more deficit spending and no taxes after 2 years of Republican leadership failure to agree on a budget.

I think it's also important that we outline that we've imposed very strict ethics rules in the history of the House; also guaranteed that the House will operate as a green Capitol. I'm glad we have the chair of the Appropriations Committee that deals with the House, House Administration with us, the chairwoman.

Also, the Speaker has convened a National Summit on America's Children, and we're beginning to link Federal policy and law and cutting-edge research as relates to bring development; and also restored Congressional oversight, saving tens of millions of dollars that are being wasted here.

I think it's important that we also outline that stem cell research bill, supported by two out of three Americans, which offers hope for many, many families, is sitting on the President's desk right now waiting for action, Mr. Speaker.

And also, a bill ending the politicizing of the appointments of U.S. attorneys.

I can go on and on, but I think, as it relates to an opening, I think we're off to a great start, Mr. Speaker. And I think it's also important for the Members to realize that, for us to not only end the war in Iraq, but for us to be able to fulfill the dreams and the needs of the American people and those that are in harm's way, that we have to move in a bipartisan way. And when we can't move in a bipartisan way, then we have to take the majority of this Democratic majority that we have now to be able to get 218 votes to be able to carry out the will of the people.

Later on, since Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ has joined us, and I know Mr. ALTMIRE has something to add, too, I want to talk a little bit about the President's address, the President's radio address, because I think it's important that we address these issues as they come up. We should not allow any statement or any speech to go unchallenged because I think the American people, it's time for them to be leveled with. And I can't wait until this thing rolls around again, when we get into open discussion, because this is the good part about the 30-Something Working Group is that we do get an opportunity to kind of volley the ball around.

Mr. ALTMIRE, Happy Father's Day, belated Father's day, sir.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Thank you. Same to you. I had a wonderful Father's Day with my two children, and I'm happy to be back on this Monday night. And I did want to add some levity to the evening, because people watch late night television. We're here; it's after 11:00. And the gentleman perfectly set me up by talking about the President's radio address. So I wanted to read a quote from the President's radio address that, for those that know history and for those that don't, I'm going to remind them of some of the history. They're going to find this quote to be quite entertaining. And this is the President's radio address.

"In the weeks ahead, my administration will continue pushing for earmark reform and holding the line on Federal spending. The American people do not want a return to the days of tax and spend policies. They expect accountability and fiscal discipline in Washington, D.C."

Now, certainly, we don't disagree with that statement, but for those that understand the history of this administration, they can understand why some of us might be amused to hear the President saying such a thing, because I would remind my colleagues, if they need reminding, that prior to President Bush taking office, the 4 years immediately before his term, his first term, we had had 4 consecutive years of budget surplus, surpluses that were forecast as far as the eye can see.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office scored the 10-year projection of surplus at over \$5 trillion of surplus.

So President Bush comes into office, there's every reason to expect these surpluses are going to continue.

Well, what have we seen in the 6-plus years that this President has been this office? Well, we've seen six consecutive budget deficits, deficits that before the Democrats retook control of Congress, were forecast as far as the eye can see. And this has been the biggest spending administration in over the past 6 years before this year, the biggest spending Congresses in the history of this country.

So for the President to get on the radio and come before audiences and lecture the Democrats on fiscal responsibility, and I would re-read that last

statement on what he says the American people expect, "They expect accountability and fiscal discipline in Washington, D.C."

Well, over the course of that 6 years, the President added \$3.5 trillion to the national debt. Now, keep in mind what I said earlier, that the projection before he took office was, over the 10-year period, we would have over \$5 trillion in surplus. But, instead, in just 6 years, he had an \$8 trillion turnaround, from \$5 trillion on the plus side to \$3 trillion on the deficit side.

And I would suggest, if you had said to an economist going into that term, figure out a way that this is possible, how can a President, using economic policy, working with the Republican-controlled Congress, have a \$8 trillion swing from surplus to deficit, most economists would have said, oh, that's impossible. You can't possibly mismanage the economy in such a way that you could have that poor of an outcome. Well, unfortunately, we have.

So here, again, to have this President lecture this Congress on fiscal responsibility is simply inconsistent with the facts.

He also references earmarks in the appropriations process. And we do have Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ here, a member of the Appropriations Committee. And I know she will have something to say about this as well.

But I wanted to remind my colleagues about the history of the 12 years that the Republicans were in control of this House, from 1995 through 2006. Well, for that 12-year period, the 12 budget cycles that we had, I don't know if any of my colleagues would like to venture a guess, how many times in those 12 years do you think the Republican Congress finished the appropriations process on time? How many times were all the appropriations bills completed by October 1, which, under statute, is the beginning of the fiscal year?

The gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Would it be none?

Mr. ALTMIRE. Zero. That is correct.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That would be none.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Zero times in 12 years. Now, interestingly, you'd say, well, it must be difficult to do then. Maybe it's not often that we're able to do this. Does the gentlewoman from Florida wish to venture a guess on the last time that the budgets were all completed on time and the appropriations were completed by October 1 in their entirety?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. ALTMIRE, at the risk of being the little girl who shoots her hand up in the first row of the classroom, that would be the last time Democrats were in control right before the 1994 switch from majority to minority.

□ 2320

Mr. ALTMIRE. Right. In the 1994 year, the Democratic Congress, the last

year the Democrats controlled Congress, the Democrats were able to complete all the budget bills, all the appropriations bills on time. The last time it has happened. Then we had 12 years of Republican rule in this Congress, in this House, and we had 12 consecutive years where the appropriations bills were not completed on time.

So it should be no surprise to any of my colleagues and other outside observers that the Republicans are not anxious to see the Democrats come back into power and right away pass all 12 appropriations bills in a timely fashion. So I was not surprised, and I suspect others were not surprised, to see the extraordinary delaying tactics that we saw take place in this House last week, with continual and repeated procedural motions, motions to rise.

And those of us that sat here at 2 o'clock in the morning on that night, we realized that this was not about substance. This was not about policy. This was merely about denying the Democrats a legislative victory because the last thing those on the other side would want is for us to come in and right away pass the appropriations bills on time, which hasn't happened since 12 years ago when we last controlled Congress.

And, lastly, the President mentions earmarks. His quote again: "In the weeks ahead, my administration will continue pushing for earmark reform."

Well, what has been the history of earmarks under the Republican Congress? Let's go back to that 12-year period, and I know the gentlewoman knows the answer; so I will spare you the question this time. In 1994, that last year that the Democrats controlled Congress, there were 4,000 earmarks, approximately, in all the spending bills combined for \$26 billion. That is what they represented. Now, that sounds like a lot and it is a lot. It is a lot of earmarks and it is a lot of money.

Well, let's compare that to last year, the last year the Republicans controlled Congress. These were the people, you recall, that last week were decrying the use of earmarks and talking about how unfair it was how the Democrats were approaching it, and we have a President now who says he is going to continue pushing for earmark reform, "continue" being the operative word there. Well, when you hear the word "continue," let's think about what happened last year. Now, recall in 1994, 4,000 earmarks, \$26 billion. Last year, 2006, 16,000 earmarks, unprecedented, the highest in the history of the country, \$64 billion of earmarks, compared to \$26 billion in 1994.

So here again, please spare us the lecture about fiscal responsibility and accountability in the appropriations process and certainly as it pertains to earmarks. We have had, over the past 6 years of this administration and over the past 12 years of Republican leadership in this Congress, the biggest-spending Congress and administration

in the history of the country. They spent more money, they ran up bigger deficits, they used more earmarks for more money than any Congress and any administration in the history of the country. So please forgive me if I view with skepticism some of the President's comments over the weekend.

And at this time I will now turn it over to the gentlewoman from Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. ALTMIRE.

And I am going to maybe abbreviate my view on what happened last week and just call it what it is: hypocrisy.

Where were our good friend on the other side of the aisle when they controlled this process for 12 years? And I am not going to spend a lot of time on the process because that is all they have because if they allow the debate to turn to the substance of the legislation, the substance of the appropriations bills that we are moving forward and will pass off this floor, with the vast majority of them supporting it because they have to, because when they admit that the substance of the legislation that we are putting forward in the Homeland Security bill, in the military construction bill, in the other bills that will be coming forward to this floor, they have to admit that not only are they good bills but they go much further and do a much better job of providing for the needs of this country than they ever did.

On the floor last week, I took an opportunity to spend a few minutes debating the process with them. One of the things that I had an opportunity to engage in debate on was where was their outrage on the other side when they controlled this process? Where were the reformers, leaping to their feet, urging and pounding on their leadership to adopt transparency and to adopt a process in which they could have the maximum amount of input into earmark reform?

The answer is it was nonexistent because they didn't care about it. It didn't matter to them. They were very happy fat and happy to take all the earmarks they could get, bring them home, tied up with their lobbyists and their friends and their culture of corruption, all twisted up and intertwined, and that is what their process was like. And our process is clear and transparent and participatory and inclusive, and they can't stand it. So what they have to do is they have to try to muck up the perception of what we are doing here because if they acknowledge what is really going on, not only have we adopted a more inclusive, more transparent process when it comes to earmark reform, but the substance of our legislation they have to support because they know that we are going much further than they did.

I want to go beyond process, though, to President Bush's veto threat of the Homeland Security appropriations bill. He actually has threatened to veto this bill, which is just absolutely astonishing. And one of the things that I

have heard him articulate, Mr. MEEK and Mr. ALTMIRE, is that if the Congress proposes to spend \$1 over what he proposed in his administration's budget that he would veto any of that legislation. And that includes the Homeland Security bill, which provides for the homeland security needs for our border protection, for our first responders, for the 9/11 Commission recommendations that we passed in the first bill out of this Chamber during our 100-hour push for the Six in 06 agenda, and the President is actually proposing to veto a bill that would ensure that we spend more money on protecting our homeland domestically.

You know, you can argue process and earmarks and reform and all that. But at the end of the day, that is the stark contrast that people of this country have to choose from. When they go to the polls next November and when they evaluate how they think a Democratic Congress is doing versus how a Republican Congress did, at the end of the day, we are passing a Homeland Security appropriations bill that will really provide for the domestic homeland security needs, as opposed to continuing to twist us up and mire us in the war in Iraq with an endless, open-ended commitment that never proposes to get us out of there.

On top of that, we have a President who has been critical of a military construction bill that will provide for the largest single increase in veterans' health care in history. I mean this is how backwards their priorities are. Under the Republican control, their goal was to help lobbyists, was to make sure that they brought home as many earmarks that were pushed by lobbyists as they could. And, instead, what we are doing here is we have transparency, where people will know, anyone can know, who is sponsoring an earmark, where any Member can offer an amendment to strike an earmark, where any Member can offer to sponsor an earmark. Members will be able to participate in the conference process, which you would think that that would be a normal thing, but it wasn't normal under the Republicans because you couldn't even participate as the minority in the conference process.

□ 2330

But at the end of the day, all of that has been a deliberate distraction because they can't argue with the content of our appropriations bills because they are much stronger and go much further and do more for the country than they did. They don't win that debate. They don't win a head-to-head, toe-to-toe debate on the substance, so they have to try to distract people with the process. And that is what I am hopeful that we can get into in this 30-Something hour and future special order hours that we participate in, because what we need to make sure we focus on is the substance of our legislation, because they would like nothing better than to twist us up in debate on process.

Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, what they say and what we do are two different things. And the good thing about it is that right is on our side and the American people are on our side, be it Republican, Democrat, independent, those that are thinking about voting, those that may be voting for the first time in the 2008 elections. I think it is very important to lay the facts out, and that's what we are doing here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, we go through a great deal of work to make sure that we actually give facts, not fiction. And we know that there is a lot of fiction on this floor. That's what I would call it. And there is another word to call it, but I would just call it "fiction" to be honorable in this Chamber. But I think it is also important for us to just take the President's words for what they are. I am reading from his radio address, and this week, the President said the tax-and-spend approach is endangering the economic growth. And balanced budget efforts, mark "efforts," balanced budget efforts, that's what he's calling it, that's what the President is calling it, as it relates to the budget, saying they have passed a budget that would mean higher taxes; put another line under "higher taxes" because I want to come back to that; for American families and job creators, put a line under that.

I think it's important, just in that paragraph alone, Mr. Speaker, for me to just dissect that for a moment. Let me just work on that paragraph just for a moment. It's just a paragraph within many, but it's at the beginning of the President's speech. I think it's important, as we start looking at fact versus fiction, I mean, we need to have a segment in the 30-Something group, fact versus fiction, because I think it's important that we do away with the fiction, because we have two wars going on. We have a country that's begging for health care. We have children that we were about to lose their health care if it wasn't for the action of the Democratic majority here to be able to push that effort along and put it on the President's desk for him to sign.

Now, let's just start with the whole piece of endangering and taxes. Listen, I'm on the Ways and Means Committee, and unless there is a meeting that I missed or several days that I missed from Congress, I haven't seen anything that dealt with a tax increase. And I would challenge anyone from the White House or from the minority side of this Chamber to point out somewhere, anywhere, where taxes are being increased. Okay. That's what I thought. I think it is very, very important that we pay very close attention to what's being said here on this floor.

I think it's also important for us to underline "budget balancing efforts." People, Mr. ALTMIRE, they don't want an effort; they want it to happen. Okay? One of the first things we did

without the President's approval, thank God we didn't need it, to say that we're going to move pay-as-you-go rules and that we are no longer going to borrow from foreign nations. As soon as I can get my chart over here, I will pull it over, of how much money we have borrowed from foreign nations, Mr. Speaker, more than ever before in the history of the republic. As a matter of fact, I have my old chart here. I will use this one, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. For folks here in the Chamber, you know that this is an old chart. And I am really fond of this chart. The rubber stamp is in my office under lock and key because somehow my velcro chart somehow grew legs and it went somewhere. And I don't know where it is, Mr. ALTMIRE, but I think it's important that we find that chart. I'm going to put pictures around the Capitol. Have you seen the out-of-control borrowing that the Bush Administration and Republican Congress were able to do in the past?

Remember this chart here? And it talked about, it went all the way through 2005? Well, I am going to draw a line through that right now. And I know that we are going to have a new chart here on the floor, because our good people that work with us here, the new number that comes at the end of the 109th Congress and the Republican Congress, this number is no longer 1.50; it is now \$1.0019 trillion that the President Bush and the old Republican Congress passed under the rubber stamp policy of the Congress of the past, but not now; \$1.01 trillion, 42 Presidents before this President and the past Republican Congress, and between the two, they were able to borrow from foreign nations, these are foreign nations who I have outlined on the next chart, \$1.0019 trillion. Historical. Never happened before. No one can point to World War I and World War II.

Who are we borrowing from that we are putting a stop to here in this Democratic Congress? Let's just start with Japan at \$644.3 billion. Let's look over at China, Red China of all places, at \$349.6 billion. These numbers are old. Many other countries are involved in this. And, you know, that is just one sentence.

Then we move on, "They have passed a budget that will mean higher taxes for American families and job creators." Now, I have already addressed the issue of higher taxes. Taxes have not been raised.

So for the President to say this means that it's fiction. That's the word I choose. Job creators. Who's he talking about? Must be talking about Big Oil. I guess they're creating all kinds of jobs. I know there are a lot of people that are trying to figure out how they are going to get to their job, paying the high prices.

And look at the profits. Wow. And it's funny, remember that little thing I talked about, the meeting at the White House, and Vice President CHENEY with the executives, and then all of a sudden

the energy bill was written? And it was almost like every oil executive, somehow they figured out the six numbers to the Lotto. That Lotto happened to be the payoff by the American people. And their stock went skyrocketing up. In 2002, the profits were \$6.5 billion in profits. And look, 2007, \$30.2 billion, and you're paying almost \$3 at the pump. I wonder who the job creators are. And we took some of these incentives and give-aways away, or so-called incentives, that were just tax give-aways of the taxpayers' money back into finding alternative fuels.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I will yield, yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Let's zero in specifically on what we did compared to what they did. If you recall, that was the energy bill that they held open for 40 minutes longer than our normal time limit so they could twist enough arms to get the votes to ensure that they could give the oil companies \$14 billion in subsidies, give them those subsidies in the face of world record profits. Now, you know, we support profit. Profit is a good thing. Profit is not a bad word; it's a good thing. But when you are doing what they did, which was forgive the royalties that the oil industry would have been required to pay the Federal Government; they are supposed to pay the Federal Government to use the land that they drill on in exchange for the oil that they pull out and make a profit on. And the Republican majority gave away the \$14 billion and said, no, no, no, very profitable oil industry, that's okay, you don't have to pay us. Just put that in your pocket, no problem. And what we did, as part of our 100-hour agenda in the Six in '06 bills that we passed when we first became the majority is we passed a bill that repealed those \$14 billion in give-aways and said, what we are going to do with that money is we are going to use it to fund alternative energy research so that we can make sure that we truly make a commitment to wean ourselves off of our addiction to foreign oil, which were nice words that the President said in the State of the Union last year, but then promptly he signed that energy bill that gave \$14 billion in subsidies away to the oil industry. So I just wanted to jump off that poster because it really needed to be zeroed in on.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and thank you for yielding back.

Mr. ALTMIRE, this is why we come to work, this is why we, Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, to be able to point out, and I love this whole fact versus fiction. You know, this is probably going to be my new top ten because I think it's important that we outline these issues. Because the American people, hopefully what we are sharing with them, it's fact. Now, folks start writing speeches and start saying, well,

what sounds better or using words like efforts, you know "efforts" is open-ended.

□ 2340

Well, you know, I make a great effort to do some things around the house. But eventually I will get around to them. Well, we are dealing with the Federal Treasury, and it is not some sort of slush fund. That is the way it has been treated. We are talking about accountability.

I also want to point out Mr. Bob Novak, I don't think I am on his Kwanzaa list and he is not on mine, but he is one of the most conservative writers here in this town and well-known, and I appreciate his work, and we see him moving around on Sunday talk shows.

This is interesting. "Bush veto strategy." This is in the Washington Post. Just in case, we like third-party validators. We want you to go on, we want Members to be able to go on WashingtonPost.com. And this was June 18. It was actually on A-17, if you have an old copy of the Washington Post.

I will go down to paragraph three, where it talks about Bush was the first President since John Quincy Adams not to exercise his veto power during the complete 4-year term, even though the Republican-controlled Congress was on a spending spree.

All right, we have heard of shopping sprees. You look in the dictionary, let's just do it. Let's do it because we can. Let's do it because we can borrow from foreign nations and put this country in a posture that it has never been in before.

He has two bills in his second term, rejecting only the Iraq war bill, since the Democrats took control.

Let me just say this. One of them was that. Let me just point that out, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ALTMIRE. It is important that we outline that, that we outline the fact that the President has had a rubber-stamp Congress, and that even the conservative writers are saying, wait a minute. All of a sudden now you want to be Mr. Veto. You want to send a letter to the Speaker of the House saying if you go \$1 over my projected budget and I am going to veto the bill, even if it means healthcare for children, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, even if it means better healthcare for our veterans that are coming back and that are here and that are waiting in line 8 or 9 weeks to see the ophthalmologist, which is not what they signed up for and not the promise that we gave them. Even if it means that school districts will not have the money that they deserve as it relates to the Federal dollar.

The bottom line is I wish the President and I wish the Republican side had the kind of courage to stand up to corporate America when they were giving away all of the taxpayers' money during their spending spree. This is now what I am saying. This is what Bob Novak is saying.

I think it is also important to note that one of our Republican colleagues took enough time to get 147 votes against the Homeland Security bill, an appropriations bill, and also it is important that we point this out, because this was done to be able to say that we can withstand a veto. I think it is 146 that is needed to make sure that we can override the President if we need to override him.

The last point I want to make on this topic, you know I always have a number of points, but after we passed the bill that the American people wanted, date on redeployment of when troops will be redeployed out of the field and letting the Iraqi government know we will not be in the middle of a civil war forever and ever and ever, and passed this House and it passed the Senate. And before the President could even get to it, Republicans marched down to the White House, had lunch, and came out and said, "We stand with the President in not overriding his veto. We say that we stand with the President."

That is what the Republicans said. Not one Democrat was at the White House. I want to know how many more times that Republicans are going to go down to the White House and stand with the President. Are they going to stand in front of VA Healthcare? Are they going to stand in front of universal healthcare for children? Are they going to stand in front of everything that we came to Congress to do? And I talking about Democrats and Republicans?

And I am just going to say it, not every Republican went to the White House, but enough to be able to stop us from doing the business of the people of this country. And I think it is important that we outline these issues. Go to WashingtonPost.com.

There is an old saying out there, if I am lying, I am flying. The bottom line is this: It is right here. I didn't write it. Mr. Novak wrote it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman will yield, I am so pleased. We are all pleased that we have been joined by Mr. ALTMIRE and the 40 other Democratic freshmen in his class who are majority makers who came to Congress to help us move this country in a new direction and make it possible to move this country in a new direction.

The stark contrast you are talking about, where you have tired old, same old, do business as shall Republicans standing with the Republican standing with the President, supporting his veto, his suggestion that he would veto the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

Now, I sit on the Appropriation Committee so I know what is in that bill and had an opportunity to comment on it and participate in it, and I am proud to have supported it.

But I would like Mr. ALTMIRE, given that he is part of the new direction Democrats and our freshmen class who brought us to this point, to outline for us, let's talk just exactly what the

President is talking about vetoing. Let's outline that for folks.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

I did want to make clear, just for anyone who is watching this debate, that all of these bills that the President is threatening to veto over spending are compliant with pay-as-you-go policy. That is critical.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You are not borrowing and you are not taxing, am I correct?

Mr. ALTMIRE. It means we as the Congress are doing the same thing the American people have to do in their own home. Checkbooks, you have to have money on one side of the ledger if you want to spend it on another. That is something this Congress has not done.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Were PAYGO rules, in other words, not spending more than you are taking in, were those in place before Democrats took over the Congress?

Mr. ALTMIRE. They came into place in the 1990 budget agreement.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I mean just a few months ago, before November 7, in the 109th Congress.

Mr. ALTMIRE. They were allowed to expire, and that led to the record deficits of the past 6 years that I talked about earlier.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And who reinstated the PAYGO rules to make sure that we didn't spend more money than we took in?

Mr. ALTMIRE. On our very first day in Congress, it was this Congress that reinstated the pay-as-you-go. As a result, all of these appropriations bills that the President is threatening to veto, for the first time in 6 years, these appropriations bills are compliant with PAYGO. They say simply, as I said, you have to have money on one side to pay for it on the other. If you want to increase spending, or decrease revenue, for that matter, you have to find an offset to pay for it on the other side of the ledger. That is what the President is talking about vetoing.

Specific to the Homeland Security appropriations bill, which we passed last week, I just wanted to talk a little bit about immigration. Boy, we hear a lot about immigration, around the country on talk radio. I am sure each of you in your Florida districts hear about it. I can promise you in my Western Pennsylvania district, I hear more about immigration than I hear about any other issue, and there is not even a close second.

It is an important issue. It is an issue for a lot of people that we have illegal immigrants coming across the border. And for anyone who is talking about this Homeland Security bill that is concerned about that issue, I want to tell you that in this bill we have money for fencing.

The speaker before us had his prop out where he was showing about building a fence along the border. This bill has money to build the fence.

This bill has money for new technologies for detection of immigrants, illegal immigrants coming across the borders.

This bill has increased border agents and security agents that are able to enforce our laws, 3,000 new border agents along our southern border with Mexico.

It has new detention beds. We have a catch-and-release program where we don't have the capacity to hold on to folks that we are catching on the southern border, so we simply release them. This bill has money to stop that practice with new border agents and new detention beds.

So for anyone that is watching this debate that is concerned about immigration and thinks we need to secure the borders, we agree, and we passed a bill to make that happen. That is the bill the President is threatening to veto.

We also have port and aviation security measures. We have a situation where as a result of 9/11 we have to be very concerned about our aviation security, certainly, and our port security. We have money in this bill to increase our security on both of those. That is what the President is threatening to veto.

We have increased the money available for first responders. The President cut by 55 percent firefighter funding. So anyone who is concerned about firefighters, can you think of a more worthy commitment for our Federal spending priorities than the brave men and women who put their lives on the line every single day here at home to keep us safe and are doing it on a voluntary basis through the fire department?

The President cut that funding by 55 percent in his budget. Well, we restored that, because our priorities say that we should find that money, and through pay-as-you-go we did find the money to pay for that. But we put that money back in for our firefighters and our police, our first responders.

Lastly, before I turn it over to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who can speak as a member of the Appropriations Committee, this is so important. This bill ensures our tax dollars are spent wisely with the requirement for competitive bidding on contracts.

Now, anyone who has followed what happened in the Homeland Security arena over the past several years, and certainly that includes Katrina and the fiasco that took place with the no-bid contracts thereafter along the Gulf Coast, knows how important it is to ensure that our tax dollars are spent in a responsible and fiscally rational way.

□ 2350

We do that through the requirement that we do competitive bidding on contracts which has been in very short supply over the past 6 years.

So that is what is in this bill. We secure our borders. We put money into detection and prevention and detention of illegal immigrants. We secure our aviation, our airplanes and our air-

ports. We secure our ports. We put money in for first responders. That is what the Homeland Security bill does, and that is what the President is threatening to veto.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman outlining what the President has been threatening to veto.

I want to take it a step beyond the Homeland Security appropriations bill and outline a few of the other bills all related to homeland security that the President has also threatened to veto. Tonight what we aim to show, fact versus fiction, is basically who is for homeland security and who is just kidding, who is just talk, who is just a lot of hot air, versus who is supportive of putting forward substance.

The only thing I can think of in terms of a reason that you have these veto threats and suddenly the President discovers ink in his pen, never having threatened a veto in his first 6 years, instead of an "R" next to the idea there is a "D" next to the idea. Now this is from a person who has talked a really nice story about being bipartisan and working with the Democratic Congress. This is how he has been proposing to work with the Democratic Congress: proposing to veto the Homeland Security appropriations bill which has a lot of very important issues that went unaddressed by the Republican Congress.

Also, threatening to veto the 9/11 Commission recommendations which was his own 9/11 Commission. We just passed that bill in our Six in 06 agenda with a vote of 299-128. And that would fully implement the 9/11 Commission recommendations.

The Homeland Security authorization bill which is the statutory provisions in Homeland Security that go with the appropriations bill, he has threatened to veto that. That authorizes \$40 billion for the activities of the Department of Homeland Security and includes strong accountability measures which were nonexistent under the Republican majority.

He has threatened to veto the rail and transit security bill, H.R. 1401, which requires the Department of Homeland Security to develop plans to protect rail and mass transit and authorizes \$6 billion over 4 years in grants to protect those systems. We don't have a system in place to protect rail and mass transit.

In south Florida, we don't have a really strong mass transit system. You do in the major populations across the country. How many times have you been on a train and been checked or gone through security? There are no security measures around our rail system. We proposed legislation to do that, and the President is threatening to veto that.

The Dubai Ports bill, maybe people have forgotten about the proposal that the administration was completely supportive of and allowed to sail through their FISA process that would

have allowed essentially a state foreign-owned company to own port terminals in America. I mean, that just sailed through the administration's process. They basically ignored Federal law and allowed it to happen. We passed a law to tighten that. That passed 423-0. No threat to veto there. We weren't going to allow that situation to continue. We need to ensure foreign countries do not own our port terminals and further undermining our security in America.

Now we have passed the military construction appropriations bill that would ensure that we have the largest single increase in veterans health care in American history, in addition to the Wounded Warrior Assistance Act which responds to the Walter Reed scandal, also ignored by the Republicans. That passed 426-0, but it took Democrats to pass that legislation.

Really what this is about is who is for homeland security and who is just talk; who is for homeland security and who is just kidding. At the end of the day, actions are what speak louder than words. It is what you learned in kindergarten: Follow what people do, don't just listen to them talk, talk, talk. We have to show the American people what the Democrats are trying to accomplish that Republicans and this President is trying to block.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I just want to remind our colleagues who are with us tonight and watching us tonight that this is about preventing the Democrats from a legislative victory. It is not about the budget because this is compliant with pay-as-you-go rules.

I was amused in listening to the gentlewoman from Florida when I thought about what one of the major Republican Presidential candidates said recently, "The Democrats don't understand terrorism." The gentlewoman went through a very lengthy list of things that we have done here in the first 6 months on homeland security and on terrorism, and the fact that the President is threatening to veto many of those initiatives.

I would ask the question rhetorically, who among us, the Democrats or Republicans, don't understand terrorism? I think we are the ones putting forward initiative after initiative after initiative compliant with PAYGO rules to prevent terrorist attacks, as much as it is possible to do that, and to address these issues in a way that has not been done. It has languished for years.

The 9/11 Commission recommendations were put forward in 2003. Here we are 4 years later. September 11 took place nearly 6 years ago. We still have not implemented the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, and that is indefensible.

I would just say to anyone who says it is the Democrats who don't understand terrorism to take a look at the list that the gentlewoman has put forward that we have done in only 6 months after these initiatives have languished year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues, for more information, if they would like to learn, of course you can go to Speaker.gov/30something, or there is now a link on the Speaker's Web site to the 30-something Working Group of which the three of us are members as well as Mr. MURPHY and Mr. RYAN and others. So that site is www.speaker.gov, click on the 30-something icon and you can learn more about the issues and see the charts, even the gentleman's Velcro chart which is now missing.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And you can e-mail us as well.

Mr. ALTMIRE. That is 30somethingDems@mail.house.gov.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I would like to thank Mr. ALTMIRE and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Mr. Speaker, we have to remember that \$2 billion-plus a week are being spent in Iraq as we are here trying to resolve issues that we don't have money to resolve them.

Also I think it is important, at the top of the hour I meant to give this report, but as of this morning, June 18, 2007, at 10 a.m. the death total in Iraq is 3,517. Wounded in action and returned to duty is 14,283. Wounded in action and not returning to duty is 11,667. I think it is important that we share that with the Members constantly.

Mr. Speaker, I am also asking Members, I am trying to find a picture and I have been looking high and low for somebody to e-mail us a picture of this great White House meeting that the President had with the Republicans standing behind him saying they won't participate in overriding his veto of accountability in Iraq. I need that picture because we need that to be a chart so that we can discourage our friends on the other side of the aisle from going down and standing in the schoolhouse door on behalf of the majority of Americans' priorities.

Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to address the House once again.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and June 19 until 6:00 p.m.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for June 7 after 3 p.m. and June 15 after 4 p.m.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of travel delays due to weather.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of long-standing family obligations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 25.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 25.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, June 19 and 20.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, June 19, 20, 21 and 22.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUHL of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 19, 2007, at 9 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2236. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on a transaction involving U.S. exports to Israel pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2237. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Nevada State Implementation Plan, Washoe County District Health Department [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0619; FRL-8327-3] received June 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2238. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Allocation of Essential Use Allowances for Calendar Year 2007. [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0159; FRL-8325-5] (RIN: 2060-AN81) received June 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2239. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revisions to the Nevada State Implementation Plan; Request for Rescission [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0590; FRL-

8325-8] received June 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2240. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; NSR Reform Regulations [EPA-R05-OAR-2004-IN-0006; FRL-8327-1] received June 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2241. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Exemption from VOC Requirements for Sources Subject to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Boat Manufacturing or Reinforced Plastics Composites Manufacturing [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0716; FRL-8319-8] received June 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2242. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's report on the use of the Category Rating System for the period from June 2006 through May 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3319(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2243. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notice of the initiation of an audit of the Department's consolidated balance sheet and statement of custodial activity as of and for the year ending September 30, 2007; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2244. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Mgmt., Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2245. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2006, through March 31, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2246. A letter from the Interim President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, transmitting the 2006 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2247. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a copy of a legislative proposal entitled, "the Locality Pay Extension Act of 2007"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2248. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a copy of a legislative proposal entitled, "the Federal Employees Health Benefits Improvements Act of 2007"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2249. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2250. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Virginia Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2251. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Michigan Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2252. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report to Congress on stalking and domestic violence, 2005 through 2006, as required by Section 40610 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2253. A letter from the Branch Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Safe Harbor for Valuation Under Section 475. [TD 9328] (RIN: 1545-BB90) received June 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANTOS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 885. A bill to support the establishment of an international regime for the assured supply of nuclear fuel for peaceful means and to authorize voluntary contributions to the International Atomic Energy Agency to support the establishment of an international nuclear fuel bank; with an amendment (Rept. 110-196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union.

Mrs. LOWEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2764. A bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SIRE, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HODES, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2761. A bill to extend the Terrorism Insurance Program of the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. RENZI):

H.R. 2762. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the special diabetes programs for Type I diabetes and Indians under that Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAMPSON:

H.R. 2763. A bill to enhance research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of biofuels related technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to

the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2765. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 44 North Main Street in Hughesville, Pennsylvania, as the "Master Sergeant Sean Michael Thomas Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

H.R. 2766. A bill to establish regional dairy marketing areas to stabilize the price of milk and support the income of dairy producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 2767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable credit for the purchase of energy efficient tires; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself and Mr. BOEHNER):

H. Res. 491. A resolution providing for earmark reform; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. CASTOR:

H. Res. 492. A resolution honoring William "Bill" Clifton France, the former president, chief executive officer, and chairman of NASCAR, for his lifetime of contributions and dedication to motorsports; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS of California:

H. Res. 493. A resolution congratulating the women's water polo team of the University of California, Los Angeles, for winning the 2007 NCAA Division I Women's Water Polo National Championship, and congratulating UCLA on its 100th NCAA sports national title, making it the most accomplished athletic program in NCAA history; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. HILL, Mr. DICKS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BACA, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SIRE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. STARK, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BERRY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KIND, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. CLARKE):

H. Res. 494. A resolution honoring the esteemed former President William Jefferson Clinton on the occasion of his 61st birthday; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WATSON (for herself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H. Res. 495. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of Dame Lois Browne

Evans, Bermuda's first female barrister, Attorney General, and Opposition Leader in the British Commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. WAMP.
 H.R. 156: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 322: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 380: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 543: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 690: Mr. PASTOR, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 693: Ms. WATERS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 695: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 704: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 728: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 776: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 821: Mr. JINDAL.
 H.R. 864: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
 H.R. 938: Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 962: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 980: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 1078: Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 1125: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1174: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 1187: Ms. CASTOR and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 1188: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1225: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1280: Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 1331: Mr. WEINER and Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 1344: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 1363: Mr. TIBERI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1380: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 1398: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
 H.R. 1400: Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
 H.R. 1415: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 1416: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 1436: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1439: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
 H.R. 1541: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 1561: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1567: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1613: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 1657: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 1687: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 1688: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1693: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1707: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 1709: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1733: Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 1754: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. CHANDLER.
 H.R. 1783: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 1814: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1828: Mr. HARE.
 H.R. 1880: Mr. HARE.
 H.R. 1909: Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 1926: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 1933: Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 1959: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1964: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 1967: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1971: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1977: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 1992: Ms. CARSON.
 H.R. 2017: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 2027: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2032: Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 2045: Mr. RENZI, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2097: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 2108: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 2114: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 2126: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 2192: Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 2211: Ms. WATSON and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 2220: Mr. FOSSELLA and Mr. FORTUÑO.
 H.R. 2221: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
 H.R. 2223: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 2255: Mr. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 2265: Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 2284: Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 2342: Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 2361: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 2364: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2367: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2370: Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2384: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2387: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 2392: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2407: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 2432: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 2443: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 2449: Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 2452: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2464: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 2469: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 2526: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 2566: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2567: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2574: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2588: Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 2593: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 2596: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2604: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 2617: Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 2674: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2677: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. CASTOR.
 H.R. 2685: Mr. KIRK.
 H.R. 2708: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2727: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Ms. FALLIN.
 H.R. 2734: Mr. ROYCE.
 H.R. 2750: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. BACA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DICKS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BERRY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SHULER, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. Velázquez, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr.

MCNULTY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DENT, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GORDON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HASTER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGET, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LA TOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MACK, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. REGULA, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RENZI, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SALI, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHAD-EGG, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. WU, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 39: Mr. RUSH.
 H.J. Res. 44: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. SHULER and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. WELLER.
 H. Con. Res. 162: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. COHEN.
 H. Res. 154: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H. Res. 194: Mrs. GILLIBRAND.
 H. Res. 231: Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H. Res. 282: Mr. EMANUEL and Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Res. 309: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H. Res. 322: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
 H. Res. 356: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H. Res. 378: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WATSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H. Res. 406: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. WYNN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. SNYDER.
 H. Res. 426: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H. Res. 447: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 467: Mr. PALLONE.
 H. Res. 475: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H. Res. 477: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H. Res. 485: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 486: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY
 AMENDMENT No. 8: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MRS. MUSGRAVE

AMENDMENT No. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. 503. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. UPTON

AMENDMENT No. 10: Page 24, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,000,000,000)".

Page 24, after line 22, insert "\$4,000,000,000 shall be available for advanced nuclear energy facilities".

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. UPTON

AMENDMENT No. 11: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase light bulbs unless the light bulbs have the "ENERGY STAR" designation.

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 12: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 503. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is reduced by 1 percent.

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. GOHMERT

AMENDMENT No. 13: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. 503. NO FUNDS FOR CERTAIN SETTLEMENT.

None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement the Stipulation of Settlement dated September 13, 2006, in the litigation captioned Natural Resources Defense Council, et al. v. Kirk Rodgers, et al., United States District Court, Eastern District of California, No. CIV. S-88-1658-LKK-GGH.

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 503. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$1,305,000,000.

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 503. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$1,130,000,000.

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 16: Page 38, strike lines 7 through 13.

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. NEUGEBAUER

AMENDMENT No. 17: Page 37, strike lines 9 through 19.

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 18: Page 25, line 14, after the second dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$27,950,000)".

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. KLINE OF MINNESOTA

AMENDMENT No. 19: Page 18, line 10, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$142,000,000)".

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 20: Page 17, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$19,224,000)".

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 21: Page 16, line 19, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$101,550,000)".

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 22: Page 11, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$55,000,000)".

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 23: Strike Section 105.

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. WESTMORELAND

AMENDMENT No. 24: Page 4, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$18,000,000)".

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. WESTMORELAND

AMENDMENT No. 25: Page 5, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$184,241,000)".

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. WESTMORELAND

AMENDMENT No. 26: Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$481,186,000)".

H.R. 2641

OFFERED BY: MR. WYNN OF MARYLAND

AMENDMENT No. 27: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. 503. Of the amount made available for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for the Department of Energy, \$213,000,000 shall be made available for hydrogen technologies as authorized by section 974 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16314).

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. CULBERSON

AMENDMENT No. 1: In the item relating to "DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE", insert before the period at the end the following: "Provided further, That, of the funds made available under this heading, not less than \$20,000,000 shall be made available for rural water and sanitation projects in East Africa".