United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 22, 2007 No. 102

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 22, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ELLEN O. TAUSCHER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

In biblical times, after You proved victorious over Your people's enemies, Gideon was revered and the people wanted him to be their ruler. But Gideon replied: ''I will not rule over you, nor shall my son. It is the Lord you should seek to rule over you.''

Even today, Lord, we honor our veterans of war. We are proud that throughout our history in America, many veterans of war have served and presently serve here in Congress. But, in such a democracy as ours, it is You, Lord, we seek. It is You, Lord, who will rule over us, in and through Your servants.

Today we ask You to bless and reward those serving in the armed services of our country. Grant health, peace and consolation to all our veterans and those missing in action. Continue, Lord God of revelation and our history, to guide and direct this Nation in the path of peace now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side.

NEW OMB DIRECTOR

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, this week President Bush nominated former Congressman Jim Nussle to run the Office of Management and Budget.

Just before Mr. Nussle and President Bush took charge of America's books, we had a $236 billion surplus, the largest in U.S. history 3 years running. Under President Bush's watch and Jim Nussle's, in 5 short years we had a $318 billion annual deficit and $300 trillion in new debt owed to the Chinese and other foreign countries.

We have heard a lot from this President and the GOP Members about the importance of fiscal responsibility. We Democrats couldn't agree more. Unfortunately, when it comes to George Bush and the Republican Congress, we will forever be in their debt.

Mr. Nussle once said, can we continue to fund our war efforts on this type of ad hoc basis? I believe most of us would agree that we cannot and should not. We continue to give President Bush a blank check costing us nearly $1 trillion on credit card funding for this war.

Mr. Nussle and President Bush came to change Washington, and Washington changed them. Nominating Mr. Nussle tells Americans a lot of what they can expect from a Republican administration.

''DRAIN THE SWAMP'' MENTALITY IS DISAPPEARING

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, almost 6 months into the new Congress with a new majority, the ''drain the swamp'' mentality is disappearing as quickly as the Democrats' approval ratings in Congress.

A new Gallup Poll has the latest congressional approval rating at 14 percent, which is the lowest it's been since the Democrats took charge and the lowest of all time. This makes sense when you consider that the Democrat leadership continues to backpedal at every opportunity on the promises they made to the American people, whether it's a failure to enact openness and transparency to increase accountability for earmark reform, their failure to enact their 100-hour agenda, or the increased infighting that's being seen on the other side as it tries to cope with how to spin another broken promise to their constituents.

Enough is enough, and it's time to get down to the important business the American people elected us to do.

Printed on recycled paper.

CONGRESSIONAL GOLF TOURNAMENT

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, for over three decades, there has been a positive bipartisan tradition in this House to have Democratic Members of the House and former Members challenge Republican Members of the House and former Members on the battleground of the links of Andrews Air Force Base in a friendly golf tournament.

As the chairman of the Democratic golf team, I am proud to say that for the second year in a row, this week the Democrats eked out a close victory over our Republican colleagues led by Congressman ZACH WAMP. I want to pay a particular salute to my colleague, JOE BACA of California, the medalist in the tournament, who shot an even par 70. The rest of us, Madam Speaker, let me say that it's probably well advised that we not give up our day job based on our abilities on the golf links.

In this day of bipartisanship, it's, I think, rather positive to have a day where we can all get together on a bipartisan basis on the friendly links of Andrews Air Force Base golf course.

Mr. WAMP. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAMP. I just rise as the captain of the Republican team to say that these recruiting classes that you all continue to bring to Washington are a problem for us. Hopefully, the American people will weigh in the near future and send us an athlete or two in a larger class.

But congratulations to you. There is not enough of that comity, cooperation and fellowship around here.

Monday was a great day. To the captain of the team, CHET EDWARDS, and to JOE BACA, the low man, we did our best; they played their best and deserve their victory.

Mr. EDWARDS. I want to thank the gentleman for his comments, his great sportsmanship. I should have given credit to Congressman RAHM EMANUEL for his great recruiting class this year. He did a good job and brought our team over the top, just barely.

CRIMINAL ILLEGALS ARE SET FREE

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, new Colorado State law requires local law enforcement agencies to report illegals to Immigration and Customs Enforcement authorities when those individuals are jailed for crimes. Then the Feds are to deport these criminals back to their countries after they serve their sentences, but there is a problem.

The Federal Government doesn't deport these criminals. According to a Colorado newspaper, 37 out of every 38 illegals that are convicted and are reported to ICE for deportation are just released back on the streets of those towns. What does this mean for homeland security, for citizens and law-abiding legal immigrants? It means criminal illegals, instead of being sent home by Uncle Sam, are set free to roam our communities, to continue to steal, rob and hurt people.

Colorado police are doing their job, but, once again, when it's time to ante into the pot, the Federal Government folds its hand.

Instead of our Government trying to figure out ways to keep illegals in the United States with these amnesty giveaway plans, it ought to figure out ways to deport criminal illegals back to where they came from. Once again, our Government is missing in action.

And that's just the way it is.

IN RECOGNITION OF KIM OLIVE

(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. Madam Speaker, since July of last year, Kim Olive has served as the communications director for the Second Congressional District of South Carolina. I am grateful to say that she has done an excellent job serving on the staff. Kim has consistently been innovative in doing her duties, and her creativity, dedication and tenacity will be difficult to replace.

Kim began her time in Washington, DC, interning for Cassidy & Associates. She then came to Capitol Hill and interned for Congressman ROY BLUNT and worked for Senator RICHARD SHELBY and Congressman SPENCER BACHUS, both of Alabama, Kim's home State. After serving the people of the Second Congressional District for nearly a year, Kim will be leaving for the west coast to work in California.

An honors graduate of the University of Alabama, Kim is one of two children of Larry and Norene Olive of Florence, Alabama. She is a credit to the people of South Carolina and Alabama, and I wish her Godspeed.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 502, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 502 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 502

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2771) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2771 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 502.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 502 provides for consideration of H.R. 2771, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2008, under a structured rule.

The rule provides H.R. 2771 with 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill and its consideration except for those arising under clause 9

or 10 of rule XXI. The rule also waives points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule makes in order and provides appropriate waivers for three amendments, two offered by Republican Members and one bipartisan amendment.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, the legislation we will consider today, H.R. 2771, funds the legislative branch of our government. This includes funding for the House of Representatives so Members of Congress have the resources we need to serve our constituents.

It includes funding for the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, the Office of Compliance and other government agencies.

□ 0915

The bill also takes a bold step forward and begins implementing the Speaker's Green the Capitol Initiative. For the first time ever, the House of Representatives will take steps to address the threats of global warming by ensuring the House operates in a carbon-neutral manner.

The bill provides initial funding to Green the Capitol by switching to 100 percent renewable wind energy for the House's electricity needs, increasing the use of cleaner-burning fuels, and making congressional offices more energy efficient.

This is necessary as Members of Congress must set an example for our constituents by being as environmentally friendly as possible, especially as we ask them to do the same in their own homes.

Most importantly, however, this bill shows the Democratic majority's commitment to change the way our government is run. This bill demonstrates a commitment to fiscal responsibility, increased oversight and increased accountability.

Madam Speaker, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have attested to, this bill is fiscally responsible. It provides an increase of only $122 million, or 4.1 percent over the 2007 enacted level. This is significantly lower than the 13 percent increase requested by the President. And much of the increase is attributable to unavoidable expenses that come in a Presidential election year.

Reducing the President's budget request by nearly one-quarter of a billion dollars shows that the Democrats are committed to holding the line on unnecessary spending, while ensuring that government is still able to deliver services to the American taxpayer.

While funding is increased by 4.1 percent over the 2007 enacted level, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee chose to invest heavily in critical life and safety and security measures for the Capitol complex.

The world changed on September 11, and we now know that the United States Capitol will forever be a target of a terrorist attack.

We owe it to our staff members, our visitors, our constituents, our distinguished guests, and to ourselves to ensure that the Capitol complex is as safe and secure as possible.

In a post-9/11 world, we cannot be too lax when it comes to securing the Capitol complex. Security enhancements are no longer an option. They are a necessity.

The Legislative Branch appropriations bill provides almost $50 million for security and lifesaving projects, including $5 million for new, interoperable police radios, $275,000 for utility, tunnel, health and safety process, $1.2 million for visitors escape hoods, $16 million for building security enhancements, $1 million for emergency exit signs and lighting in the Capitol, and $4.4 million in emergency lighting upgrades for the Rayburn Building.

The bill also provides a 7.7 percent increase for the Capitol Police Department and a 23 percent increase for the Office of Compliance so they can ensure health and safety of the Capitol complex.

Finally, Madam Speaker, one of the defining traits of the Democratic Congress has been increased government oversight. As such, this bill provides the tools Congress needs to hold the government accountable to the American taxpayer.

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee is determined to crack down on unnecessary spending by government agencies. The subcommittee held 11 agency budget hearings and is requiring government agencies to reexamine their needs based on priority, cost effectiveness, and fiscal responsibility.

The bill provides for additional staff at the Government Accountability Office to enable the GAO to better support congressional oversight efforts and address important issues such as health care, changing security threats, education, and continued audit work on the war in Iraq.

The Congressional Budget Office receives an increase in funding to better advise Congress on controlling runaway health care spending.

Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and I discussed CBO staffing in a colloquy during a Rules Committee hearing on Wednesday. We both agree that the current funding staff levels are insufficient to meet our needs. We'll work together with CBO Director Orzag to address the staffing and enhance this important agency's efforts in the future.

The bill increases support for the Inspector General overseeing the Capitol Police Department. It also establishes a statutory Inspector General at the Architect of the Capitol. It is absolutely essential that there is stringent oversight of the Architect's office to improve its financial and management practices.

The subcommittee is 100 percent committed to improving the oversight and completion of the Capitol Visitors Center. I have personally toured the Visitors Center, and it is a beautiful addition that, when finished, we will all be proud of. However, no Member of Congress is proud of how this edifice has been produced. The project has spiraled out of control due to an inexplicable lack of oversight and accountability in prior Congresses, resulting in unnecessary delays and massive cost overruns. This bill assures that there will no longer be a blank check and no questions asked.

The subcommittee has held, and will continue to hold, monthly hearings, and the Architect will be required to submit a detailed plan to the House and Senate before one cent can be spent.

Madam Speaker, this bill delivers on the promises that Democrats made. It's fiscally responsible. It focuses on life, safety, and security measures, and provides much needed accountability to the process.

I would like to thank Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee for all their hard work and thoughtful work that went into this legislation.

In particular, I want to thank the gentlelady from Florida, Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. She has been a true champion for the Democratic majority's efforts to bring efficiency, fiscal responsibility, accountability to the Federal Government, and to this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, this bill is well thought out, well crafted, and sets the right priorities. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this unnecessarily and uncharacteristically restrictive rule. On Wednesday night, despite the protests and objections of Republicans on the committee, the Democrat majority on the Rules Committee did its level best to solidify the committee's status as the Graveyard of Good Ideas in this House by passing out the most restrictive rule for a Legislative Branch appropriations bill in recent history.

Last year, when the Republicans ran the Rules Committee, we reported out a rule for consideration of the 2007 Legislative Branch in which we made in order all seven, that's seven out of seven, amendments submitted by Members of this body so that they could be considered and debated on this House floor. These amendments included four sponsored by Democrats and three sponsored by Republicans, making the rule and that process a completely inclusive and bipartisan product.

The year before that, the Republican-run Rules Committee, nearly half of the 11 amendments submitted in it were made in order under the rule, with both bipartisan and Democrat-

sponsored amendments allowed to be debated there on the House floor.

Madam Speaker, I wish I could claim to be stunned by the majority's enormous departure from the Republican-led precedent to increase inclusiveness and dialogue in the House on this particular appropriations bill which is, by convention, the only bill to come to this floor under a closed process.

However, rather than honoring this tradition, on Wednesday the Democrat Rules Committee produced the most restrictive and closed rule in recent history. Earlier this week, 24 Members of this body submitted thoughtful and earnest proposals to improve this legislation to the Rules Committee. Additionally, Members tried to have their constituent voices be heard also by the committee, but they were turned away at the door because their amendments were submitted shortly after the arbitrary deadline.

And out of these 24 amendments, only three were given the opportunity to be debated on the floor. In passing this rule, Democrats made a calculated decision not to make every single amendment in order like Republicans did the year before. They even voted to abandon the more relaxed standard of 2 years ago, when half of the amendments were made in order.

So instead of making 100 percent of their colleagues' amendments in order, or even 50 percent of the amendments in order, this rule makes only 12 percent of the amendments submitted in order. This seems pretty meager in comparison to the grand promises made during last year by Speaker PELOSI to run the ''most honest and open Congress'' in history.

Among the amendments rejected by the committee on Wednesday were two amendments offered by someone with more knowledge of the legislative appropriations than perhaps any other Member of this body, my friend and the former chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia, JACK KINGSTON; an amendment by a Member of the Democrat majority, Mr. CLEAVER of Missouri, that was made in order last year by the Republican majority, not this year; and a number of friendly taxpayer amendments by my good friend and colleague from Texas, the gentleman, Mr. HENSARLING, that would have reduced the overall cost of this bill to the taxpayer.

Madam Speaker, I do understand that the majority Democrats outnumber Republicans and have enough Members on the committee to win every single vote in the Rules Committee. And I understand that, as the majority, it is their responsibility to run the committee and the floor as they see fit. So all things being equal, I will not take exception to their new, heavy-handed approach to shutting down debate.

However, the second-ranking member of this body, the majority leader, Mr. HOYER, crowed to the media on December 5 that Democrats would ''have a Rules Committee that would give opposition voices and alternative proposals the ability to be heard and be considered on the floor of the House.''

Obviously, that is not happening. I believe every single Member of this body and, more importantly, the American people who send us here every 2 years have the right to know that when these grand promises are not being lived up to that those things will be noted on the floor. And they are, again, today.

So while my service in the Graveyard of Good Ideas in the House may prevent me from being surprised when these campaign pledges are broken on a daily basis by the Democrat majority on the Rules Committee at the direction of Democrat leadership, I hope that the American people are still shocked and appalled that promises delivered in November and December were promptly forgotten in January, and that they continue to be ignored today.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to send a message to this new Democrat leadership that this restrictive debate in the people's House is completely unacceptable. Join me in voting ''no'' on this rule so that the Rules Committee can live up to the standards set by the Democrat leadership and pass out a rule that allows for debate on the issues and ideas of every single Member of this body, not just the ones that the Democrat leadership find politically convenient.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I enjoy the comments and the colloquy that my colleague from Texas and I and the rest of the committee engage in. We seem to have this conversation quite a bit these days.

I'd like to remind the gentleman that, while it's true that we have made three amendments in order this year, two Republican and one bipartisan, last year there were four Democratic amendments made in order on this particular appropriations bill. The prior year, however, there were 11 amendments offered in committee, and only one Democratic amendment was offered in this bill.

Why I raise this number, I want to point out that this is not unusual for this Legislative Branch appropriations bill to be a structured rule in prior years. And, in fact, there's good reason for that. My distinguished colleague from California, Mr. DREIER, mentioned in committee yesterday, in fact, that there is potential for demagoguery on both sides of the aisle on this Legislative Branch appropriations bill, and that he has agreed in the past, and this year, on a structured rule.

Now, honorable men and women can disagree on the merit and the substance of particular amendments, the number of which are not as important as the fact that we are arguing about substantive language, about health and safety, about meeting our constituents' needs. And I think it's important that we talk about that substance, rather than just the number on the bill.

And so, Madam Speaker, I think that we've done a good job producing a fiscally accountable bill for the Congress. In fact, the President asked for $275 million more than our subcommittee is providing under this legislation. The President asked for a 15 percent increase in this appropriation, and Congress saw fit to only offer 4.1 percent. I think the subcommittee has done a good job crafting this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from San Dimas, California, the Honorable DAVID DREIER.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend from the Big D recognizing me, and I thank both of my friends for their management of this rule.

I have got to clear my throat, Madam Speaker, because it was last night and early this morning that we had a freewheeling, very passionate, vigorous debate that took place on the Foreign Operations appropriations bill, as we all know. And we are here this morning addressing an issue which traditionally has, in a bipartisan way, been recognized that, as a measure to avoid demagoguery, should be brought up under a structured rule. It is the only appropriations bill that both Democrats and Republicans alike have recognized all along that we should do, and I am happy to say that we are proceeding with the other appropriations bills under an open amendment process.

I will say that I am very, very troubled, very troubled, with the way that this has been handled. My friend from California has just said that this is a discussion that has been going on and on. We seem to have this same discussion back and forth. And I will tell my friend we could end it right here, we could end it right here if, in fact, as the gentleman from Dallas has just said, the promises that were made in last year's election were, in fact, kept. We don't have to continue to have this kind of debate over the rule if we would see the kind of compliance with the commitments that were made to the American people.

Now, let me just say what did happen in the past on the issue of the Legislative Branch appropriations bill. As Mr. SESSIONS has just said, 100 percent of the amendments that were proposed last year were, in fact, made in order. And the year before, the gentleman is absolutely right, there were 11 amendments submitted, but the gentleman said only 1 amendment was made in order. No. One Democratic amendment was made in order of the 11 amendments, but there were Republican

amendments proposed, too, and there were 4 amendments made in order. So what I am saying is that this notion that somehow 11 Democratic amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules and only 1 Democratic amendment made in order? That is wrong.

The fact of the matter is we have worked very hard to ensure that every Member who has come forward with a responsible, thoughtful amendment that should be debated on the legislative branch appropriations bill could, in fact, have that opportunity. And that is what has happened in the past. I am very proud to say that last year every single amendment submitted to the committee was made in order. This year 23 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee, 23 amendments. And how many were made in order? It is very sad. Only three amendments were made in order.

Now, let's look at some of the amendments that were denied, Madam Speaker. The distinguished chairman, former chairman, of the Legislative Branch appropriations subcommittee, Mr. KINGSTON, is here, and he came before the Rules Committee with some very thoughtful amendments.

Now, my friend from California has just talked about the issue of the Visitors Center. Mr. KINGSTON, who has consistently raised very important questions about that in the past, said that we don't need to put $16 million, which, as was said in the dissenting views on this issue, is the tip of the iceberg, creating a chance to spend well in excess of $50 million, at the minimum of $55 million, for another building with an additional 200,000 square feet behind the Ford Building over here.

Now, Madam Speaker, we are going to have an additional half a million square feet when we see completion of this Congressional Visitors Center. We all hope that it happens in our lifetime, but I will say that we are going to have an additional 500,000 square feet. And I know my friend from California said he has just been there.

And, by the way, I should extend congratulations to the gentlewoman from Florida for the great job that she has done in working closely with Mr. WAMP on this issue. She testified, Madam Speaker, before the Rules Committee, and I appreciate her diligence on this, and I suspect that she would be somewhat concerned as well that the opportunity for an amendment process like the one that we have had in the past is being denied to a number of our Members, both Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. KINGSTON, the former chairman of the appropriations subcommittee on the Legislative Branch, also offered an amendment calling for the Basic Pilot Program to be included, dealing with this notion that we impose on everybody else, Madam Speaker, the requirement that they comply with the Basic Pilot Program when it comes to this very serious issue of illegal immigration, and yet we are free of having to comply with that within the first branch of government. I think that is an absolute mistake, and that is what Mr. KINGSTON has been trying to address with his amendment.

One of the amendments that troubled me most that was not made in order came from a very distinguished Democratic Member of this institution. I am proud of the fact that he represents my parents in Kansas City, Missouri. It is Reverend EMANUEL CLEAVER, who came before the Rules Committee, Madam Speaker, and he said that he had been told by staff not to offer the amendment. He was very concerned about being there, and he said that he was somewhat confused, and, understandably, that does happen on occasion. I just told one of my staff members that the moment they tell me to do something, I automatically and instinctively do the opposite. But what happened in his case was that he felt somewhat concerned about coming before the Committee on Rules when so many people had told him not to do it.

I have never seen a situation like this, Madam Speaker. The Chair of the Rules Committee Ms. SLAUGHTER had to say to Mr. CLEAVER that he was welcome at any time to come before the Rules Committee and offer an amendment. I thought that that was just a right that every Member in this institution had. And, unfortunately, while we made Mr. CLEAVER's amendment in order in the last Congress, this new majority refused to allow Mr. CLEAVER the opportunity to even have his amendment heard, even have it debated here, Madam Speaker.

And that is why Mr. SESSIONS is going to offer an opportunity, if we can, to defeat the previous question, to take the Cleaver amendment, which deals with the very important priority that has been set forth by our Speaker that looks at the environmental standards for this institution. Mr. CLEAVER simply says that prospectively we should have flex-fuel or hybrid vehicles purchased through the Members' representational accounts. It is an issue that should be debated here on the House floor. Again, we made that amendment in order last year, and it has been denied the opportunity this year.

One other thing that I will say again that is very troubling about this so-called new era of openness. Our colleague from West Virginia, a very distinguished former member of the Committee on Rules, tried to submit an amendment to the Rules Committee, and SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO was denied that opportunity at the door to even submit her amendment, recognizing that she was a few minutes, I think right around 30 minutes, beyond the imposed deadline. I think the flexibility for Members is something that we always recognized, but has been denied here. But to have a former member of the Rules Committee denied an opportunity to even submit the amendment is, to me, Madam Speaker, undermining this entire spirit of openness.

So, Madam Speaker, let me say I am going to encourage my colleagues to support Mr. SESSIONS in his quest to defeat the previous question so that we can give EMANUEL CLEAVER an opportunity to offer the amendment that was denied him by the Rules Committee.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from California and I agree on one thing absolutely, and that is that Mr. CLEAVER is a great Member of Congress and offers thoughtful amendments.

The problem with his amendment was that it was simply unworkable. It required that vehicles be E85 ethanol-compliant. And, for example, in California, in Mr. DREIER's and my own State, there are only two gas stations that provide E85 fuel.

I drive a hybrid. I think it is an important thing for Members of Congress to lead on this issue, but the fact is that the amendment was unworkable. We discussed that in Rules Committee yesterday. I discussed that with Mr. CLEAVER, and, in fact, the committee did see fit not to make that amendment in order.

The gentleman raises a number of other points, but I would like to talk about the $16 million and the FDA building that the gentleman raised and the fact that the appropriations subcommittee is, in fact, bringing fiscal accountability and better standards to the construction process of the Capitol, and that this proposal that the gentleman from California refers to was actually initially brought to the House by former Speaker HASTERT. And, in fact, we are continuing the prior administration's priority in this area.

The subcommittee has changed the way this building will be managed and procured in that the GSA will manage the construction and retrofit of this new building that is being acquired in order to provide swing space and allow the operations of Congress to continue as we revamp other buildings here in the Capitol complex. The $16 million in security enhancements this bill provides for the FDA building are critical if we are to use the building for additional House office space. The project was originally approved, as I said, by former Speaker HASTERT and is now being carried forward in this bill. It is critical so that we can get the swing space ready for the House to use when we begin the badly needed renovations to the Cannon Building, which is nearly 100 years old, and to the Longworth Building, which is nearly 75 years old. We need flex space to move offices while those buildings are being renovated. The FDA building fits the bill.

GSA is ready to invest $150 million in the renovations of this building. This additional funding is to bring security from the generic government building level up to meet the requirements of congressional office space. This is a long-term investment. If we don't put

this money into getting the FDA building ready now, we will have to delay much-needed renovations to our existing buildings.

I would also say that I believe it is important for our staff to get the same kind of security that we would get as Members. We know that in the post-9/11 world, as we have talked about many times on the floor before, Members of Congress and this Capitol complex are targets, and it is imperative that we provide our staff with the same security that we ourselves demand.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

And let me, if I could, just respond to a couple of his points. First of all, the gentleman has offered some very thoughtful arguments on this issue, and I think that the fact that he has made these arguments underscores why the Rules Committee should have, in fact, allowed a debate on these issues to proceed.

He began by talking about how unworkable the amendment that Mr. CLEAVER has put forward by virtue of the fact that California has only two of these E85 stations. I know that the Cleaver amendment provides options, a hybrid vehicle, which the gentleman drives and obviously is able to get fuel very easily, and the option of looking at the flex-fuel vehicles. And, obviously, if it is a flex-fuel vehicle, it has the ability to use others. They don't have to go to those two stations that exist in California.

And I think that, again, that underscores the fact that we should be having this debate. We made it in order in the last Congress, and, unfortunately, they chose not to make it in order.

And on the issue of the additional building, he has raised a lot of interesting arguments about that. Mr. KINGSTON would simply like to have a chance, as a former chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to debate it.

I thank my friend for yielding, and I will just say that I wish we would have a chance to have a free-flowing debate on this.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I want to point out that this discussion is interesting, and, as Mr. DREIER has said to Mr. CARDOZA, it is worthy of debate.

I want to ask my friend, were you here during the anthrax threat?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARDOZA. I was not.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, it is important because there is a little history here, Madam Speaker, but during the period of time in which much of the Longworth office was shut down and evacuated right in the wake of 9/11, I don't know how many Members, and perhaps Mr. DREIER knows, but we all had temporary offices in a building downtown, and I do not remember which building that was. But it was interesting. That was a direct threat to the United States Congress, and some of the offices were closed down for maybe a couple of months.

□ 0945

I moved my entire staff off premises. And so to say now that we have to construct expensive, unnecessary swing space just to fill in a gap is ridiculous.

I want to point out that I think it's important for newer Members to realize there is a history, there is a precedent. And because of the Rules Committee shutting down this amendment and free speech, most Members won't know that we are trying to prevent something that we've already gone through before, and that is temporarily locating elsewhere in a secure premises.

I wanted to commend Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, the Chair, and the ranking member, Mr. WAMP, for what they have done on the CVC, the Capitol Visitors Center. It is a monstrosity; something we're all very disappointed in. When I was Chair of this committee, we tried our best to get our arms around it. One of the things that we all discussed is unfortunately it's kind of a bicameral problem. You don't have one head of the snake, one committee, one Chair who was fully responsible from alpha to omega.

I commend the committee on what they've done on this. I do think that with this FDA building we are creating another CVC boondoggle, as already outlined and debated in the committee. Since 2002, we've been debating this unnecessary additional office space, this swing space. And at the same time, the committee of the same government agencies are involved in it that have given us the CVC. So not to allow that amendment on the floor is something, in my opinion, is worth voting ''no'' on the whole rule debate.

The other amendment that I offered, among the many amendments that were turned down by the Democrats, it's very important to say the people who talked about sunshine so much are now denying it on the bill that tells this institution and the public so much about ourselves. No one gets elected or unelected on leg branch politics, except it does show what your culture of leadership is. If you don't allow sunshine, if you don't allow an open rule, if you don't allow open debate on your own piece of legislation that governs the House, then how can you go around and pontificate from coast to coast what an open government you're going to bring the United States people?

I know that the members of the Rules Committee and the members of the Appropriations Committee have somewhat been under a mandate, maybe even a gag order, by the leadership, but I would say there is huge hypocrisy and irony in this.

Another important amendment that I offered has to do with the Basic Pilot Program. And I'll ask you this: Do you think that people who do construction for the Federal Government should have legal employees, or should they be allowed to have illegal aliens? Well, we know and the Chair would be interested to know about the situation in California, because it's been such a hot debate out there, and the folks who have been building the fence, that the folks who are constructing the fence were busted for having illegal aliens to build a fence to keep illegal aliens out of the country. That is absurd. Similarly, we see this all over the place on Air Forces bases and Federal institutions, where contractors come in, and after close scrutiny we find they are hiring illegal aliens.

What the amendment would have done, which I believe would have wide bipartisan support, simply says that you need Social Security verification if you're going to do business with the Federal Government. No big deal, except for in this town and in this Chamber somehow that might offend some of our K Street friends, or should I say some other people's K Street friends. Because folks I know back home, they want Social Security verification. Unless you attack the job magnet, you're always going to have the attraction for illegals to come into the country.

This would give us an opportunity to lead by example to say we're not going to let you do business with the Federal Government unless you have verified Social Security. And the program is run by ICE, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency. It's called the Basic Pilot Program. Nothing controversial whatsoever. However, the Rules Committee is not even going to allow us to have a vote on it.

I cannot believe that the people one year ago, indeed, 7 months ago, were campaigning out there, telling Americans the Democrats are going to deliver open and honest government, because this rule is anything but that.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I will say that it seems ironic to me that they blame the Democrats for everything, yet this proposal that is being put forward by the gentleman from Georgia was originated under the speakership of Mr. HASTERT and was planned during that period of time. And, frankly, it was a good idea. It's something that needs to be done.

The other point I would just like to make at the outset of my discussion here.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARDOZA. No, I will not yield.

Mr. KINGSTON. I just want to know, is it in the Democrat budget?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. CARDOZA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I also want to point out that Mr. KINGSTON is talking about immigration and the lack of accountability with regard to illegal workers on government projects. I would like to remind the gentleman that it is his President that is in charge of enforcement, it is the administrative branch of government that is in charge of adjudicating and prosecuting illegal aliens, and that it is their Department that is awarding the contracts. And so if the gentleman is concerned about this, he should talk to his President down the street. And with a single conversation, he should be able to get the administration to do what he wants, since he is of the same party.

With regard to this building that we're talking about, when we had the anthrax scare here in Congress, I am aware that they actually had to displace Federal workers to house congressional employees in that building. That was only for a couple of weeks. To do this for months on end while a building is being renovated is simply unacceptable.

Further, Mr. KINGSTON's amendment was argued in the subcommittee and it was put forward in the subcommittee and it was rejected by the subcommittee on a bipartisan basis. We need this swing space to be able to do the renovation. And I think this goes back to a very simple thing that Mr. DREIER said, that this can be demagogued.

Clearly, we can have disagreements, but we need to do the right thing by the American people to provide for the safety of Congress. This $16 million appropriation is for Capitol security. Either you support security for Members, for the staff and for the general public, or you don't. You either support security or you don't. And I say that the bipartisan workings of the committee were the correct action and that the amendment that the gentleman offered was previously rejected in committee.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the gentleman now seems to want to duck what Republicans have done for 12 years, and that is, take responsibility for that, which they should do. The fact of the matter is we're here asking for and we're in the Rules Committee asking for the ability to be able to debate these. We're not blaming anybody, except to say that we believe there should be a debate, an open and honest debate that would be good for the American people, which would avoid the gentleman having to be concerned about who is blaming who.

Madam Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I want to thank my friend from Texas for his leadership on the Rules Committee and on this issue of wanting and demanding what the American people want, and that is an open process.

I oppose this rule because I believe, Madam Speaker, that it stifles the ability for Members of this House to represent their constituents. The reason that it stifles them is because it doesn't allow for the kind of debate and the kind of voting on issues that we've just heard about.

This is a good bill. I want to commend my classmate, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Representative WAMP for their work; but it's not a perfect bill. And so we ought to move in the direction of making it a more perfect bill by allowing amendments, other ideas from this House to come forward.

Madam Speaker, I'm sorry to say that this is just another example of what I have come to know and phrase as ''Orwellian democracy'' by this new majority. It's Orwellian democracy because they say one thing and they do exactly the opposite.

What did they say? Well, what they said is that they would assure a fair and open process. Before the last election, Speaker PELOSI said, ''Because the debate has been limited and Americans' voice is silenced by this restrictive rule, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.''

So what's different now, Madam Speaker? Is it political expediency, or is it a broken promise?

The chairman of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, said before, ''If we want to foster democracy in this body, we should take the time and the thoughtfulness to debate all major legislation under an open rule.''

So what's changed, Madam Speaker? What's different now? Is it political expediency, or is it a broken promise?

Mr. MCGOVERN, a member of the Rules Committee, said, ''I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if you want to show some bipartisanship, if you want to promote a process that has some integrity, this should be an open rule. All Members should have an opportunity to come here and offer amendments to this bill to improve the quality of deliberations on this House floor.''

So what's different now, Madam Speaker? Is it political expediency, or a broken promise?

Democratic Caucus Chair, Mr. EMANUEL, said before, ''Let's have an up or down vote. Don't be scared. Don't hide behind some little rule. Come on out here. Put it on the table. Let's have a vote. So don't hide behind the rule. If this is what you want to do, let's have an up or down vote. You can put your votes right up there, and then the American people can see what it's all about.''

So what's different, Madam Speaker? Political expediency, or a broken promise?

I offered an amendment that would be debated on this floor that would have reduced the amount of spending by 1 percent. It would have saved the American taxpayer $31 million. Now, $31 million may not seem like a lot in Washington, but back where I come from and across this Nation, $31 million is a lot of money. It would say to the American people this is a step in the right direction for fiscal responsibility. That was said before, what was said before by the now majority leader, STENY HOYER, who said, ''We want to get the budget deficit under control. We have said fiscal responsibility was necessary, but we're not going to be hoisted on the torrent of fiscal responsibility.''

Madam Speaker, rules aren't rules if you only follow them when you want to, and choosing when to do so is breaking a promise. An open promise shouldn't just be something that you talk about on the campaign trail.

Madam Speaker, Americans understand that promises made on the campaign trail and promises that aren't kept in the heat of debate on the House floor are broken promises. And the American people are paying attention.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I would just like to respond to the gentleman from Georgia by saying that, in fact, the Rules Committee did offer Mr. JORDAN's amendment from Ohio that one-ups the gentleman from Georgia. In fact, the gentleman from Georgia said he wanted to cut overall the entire operations in Congress and legislative branch by 1 percent. Mr. JORDAN offers a 4 percent cut. And so we made that in order so that the Congress can have the debate that Mr. PRICE from Georgia has indicated that he wants to have on the House floor.

It is a very open process. And, in fact, I will tell you that this is a very bipartisan bill. Mr. WAMP and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ came to the Rules Committee and indicated absolutely that they had worked on a bipartisan basis on this bill and that they thought that they had done a good job working on a bipartisan basis.

We have, in fact, offered the debate. We will, in fact, have a debate on cutting overall administration. In fact, this is a responsible bill in that we have cut $275 million from the President's request, 11 percent less than the administration asked for the operations of the legislative branch. This is a fiscally responsible bill. The committee has worked together to craft it in a bipartisan way, and I think that we in fact have a very good piece of legislation before the Congress today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

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

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, I do rise as the ranking member of the subcommittee in reluctant opposition to the rule. I say that because I am very

grateful for the work that the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) have done on protecting the Appropriations Committee's prerogatives in this bill, particularly with, I think, the important recommendation to name the largest space in the new Capitol Visitors Center Emancipation Hall. We will talk more about that during general debate.

But I am in opposition because only three amendments were ruled in order; that is, three out of 23, which is 13 percent. Last year it was 100 percent; the year before last it was 45 percent. And that is not enough. Therefore, I am actually going to support the amendments that are offered.

But I am going to support the bill. We did work in a bipartisan manner. This is a good bill. I am going to support the bill, but the rule is just not quite enough, to be honest with you. We should have had these amendments ruled in order. I say that respectfully because I think it is important that we try to open this up as much as possible.

The structured rule is not a problem, but only three amendments being ruled in order is a problem. So I reluctantly rise in opposition to the rule. I look forward to the general debate. I look forward to the passage of the bill with the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Mr. CARDOZA. I would just like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) for his hard work on the bill. Clearly he and our chairwoman, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ of Florida, have done a good job working together on a bipartisan basis to craft a bill that will work for Congress and work for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, we are quite open about what we wanted today. We wanted the rule to match the promise that the new Democratic majority had made. They asked for the ability to lead this country and to make this the most open, honest Congress in history. Yet we find at this time that the Rules Committee does not do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say I am somewhat concerned with the whole tenor of this debate. My California colleague has stood here through the entire debate not yielding time to a single Member, talking about the fact that we are going to have this freewheeling debate. I asked him to yield to me, when he obviously has a great load of time. Madam Speaker, he chose not to yield. That is clearly his right. But if we are interested in at least a modicum of civility in the debate, I always try my darnedest to yield to any colleague who asks me to yield during debate, because I think that is what we should do around here.

I was simply going to respond when my friend said that Mr. PRICE was here decrying the fact that his amendment was not made in order, which had a more modest cut than the one that has been made in order under the Jordan amendment, that maybe some Members would determine that the $275 million figure to which my friend referred earlier, being below the President's request, is not quite enough, but that maybe the Jordan amendment is too much.

Mr. PRICE simply wanted to have a chance, Madam Speaker, to say, gosh, maybe a little more modest cut than the one that is in the Jordan amendment should be considered.

So, I just want to say that I, again, as Mr. PRICE said so well during this debate, promises were made about a new sense of openness. It is very, very unfortunate that those promises have not been kept, Madam Speaker.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I would just like to remind my friend, the gentleman from California, that I, in fact, did yield to him earlier in the debate for quite some period of time and let him speak on my time prior. So, with that, I think we have, in fact, worked on a bipartisan basis. I am also willing to work and discuss with my colleagues.

But, in fact, as the gentleman said, this legislative branch appropriations bill is one where you can, in fact, have shenanigans, or I think his word was ''demagoguery,'' and, in fact, we have a structured rule so that we limit that. We are, in fact, trying to have the most open process. I think we have succeeded in doing a better job than happened in the prior Congresses.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. If I could inquire of the time remaining on both sides, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes. The gentleman from California has 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the Republicans are here today to say we believe the process should equal what the Democrats had said they would do. It did not.

Secondly, we have problems with the bill because of the more than 7-percent increase in spending over last year's level. We believe that that is excessive, at a time when we thought both sides agreed that fiscal sanity would be in order, especially in dealing with this body. So, the Republican Party is here today to say we think that is too much money.

Madam Speaker, I will be urging my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that I may amend the rule to make in order the very thoughtful amendments of my Democratic colleague from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), which was made in order by the Republican-controlled Congress in the Republican Rules Committee last year.

The amendment would encourage House Members to lease hybrid and other more economical vehicles. In this time of high gas prices and our need, the national desire, the need to reduce the reliance on foreign sources of energy, this House should have at least have the opportunity to debate such a thoughtful amendment.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and the extraneous material printed just prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, at this point I would like just to yield briefly to our distinguished chairwoman, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, to respond.

Mr. SESSIONS. If the gentleman will yield, we were advised that the gentleman did not have any additional speakers.

Mr. CARDOZA. The gentleman is correct. I will yield him additional time to respond.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate that.

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I just want to address my comments to the remark by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) where he indicated that there is a 7-percent increase in the legislative branch appropriations bill. That is factually inaccurate.

If you take into consideration the $50 million rescission that we had in the CR for 2007, we are actually at a 2.4-percent increase. Not taking that $50 million rescission, which came out of the Library of Congress, we are actually at a 4.4-percent increase in this bill. So that is factually inaccurate. I want to make sure that we are dealing with facts. My colleague is incorrect.

We have really made an effort, both Mr. WAMP and myself, at being fiscally responsible, recognizing that we are in a difficult fiscal situation and constraining our spending, but at the same time making sure we can focus on life, safety and security needs, and the protection and oversight responsibilities that we need to make sure we can do in this institution.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, without getting into an argument with the gentlewoman, we would just state the facts of the case. It is over $4 billion additional spending, this year over the last, and $4 billion is a lot of money to run this ship.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would simply like to ask my friend, if a $4 billion increase

is, in fact, a 6.76-percent increase over last year's funding level, which does round out to be a 7-percent increase in the spending over last year's funding level, I just ask my friend from Dallas if that, in fact, is correct?

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I believe it to be correct, but the fact of the matter is, whether it's a 6-percent increase or a 4-percent increase as the gentlewoman subscribes to, we believe that is not the proper way to grow this government.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to, again, say that I hope very much that my friends on both sides of the aisle will join in supporting Mr. SESSIONS in trying to defeat the previous question so that we can make in order the very thoughtful, environmentally sound amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, there were several misstatements of fact in the last statements that were made here on the floor by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

This bill actually does not provide $4 billion for legislative branch appropriations, as the gentleman indicated, but $3.1 billion for the legislative branch. The actual spending for fiscal year 2007, including the supplemental but not rescissions, this bill is a $122 million increase, which is 4 percent of that amount. If the $50 million rescission in the fiscal year 2007 CR is included, the bill is only $73 million, or 2.4 percent, above the prior year.

We have provided in this measure fiscal responsibility, accountability, and security and life safety for the Members of Congress, for the general public and for our staff.

I would also like to make a point that this bill represents a $276 million reduction from the Republican administration's request on this matter.

Madam Speaker, three principles guided the development of the underlying legislation: fiscal responsibility, security and life safety, and accountability.

This bill makes smart decisions with taxpayer dollars. It provides the necessary resources for Congress to carry out its constitutional oversight responsibilities, something we saw sorely lacking in the last Congress. It ensures the Capitol complex is safe and secure. Most importantly, it allows Members of Congress to represent and serve our constituents in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 502 OFFERED BY REP. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 4 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Cleaver of Missouri or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''House of Representatives—Salaries and Expenses—Members' Representational Allowances'' may be used directly to provide any individual with a vehicle which is not powered in whole or in part by alternative fuel (as defined in section 301(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13211(2)), except under a lease in effect prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chanc to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information form Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's'agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 179, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—217

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)

Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—179

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—36

Baker
Barton (TX)
Bonner
Boucher
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Clyburn
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Doolittle
Everett
Gillibrand
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Israel
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
McGovern
McHenry
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Oberstar
Ortiz
Paul
Platts
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Young (AK)

□ 1033

Messrs. TIBERI, GARY G. MILLER of California, and MANZULLO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. WEINER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. UPTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE HONORABLE GUY VANDER JAGT

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I regret to inform the House today of the passing of Guy Vander Jagt, who died this morning. He served 18 years in this body representing most of west Michigan, a longtime member of the Ways and Means Committee, a very good friend of all of us, both in the Congress and after he left.

I talked to his wife Carol last week. This was his cancer's second occurrence. He also leaves a beautiful daughter, Jinny, and I yield to Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my dear friend for yielding.

This is a great loss to the country. Our friend, Guy Vander Jagt, was a distinguished Member of this body, a great public servant, and a friend of most of us here.

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RANGEL. The tear that you hear in the voice of the gentleman from Michigan is felt by everybody that knew Guy Vander Jagt. I was with him on Tuesday morning with his beautiful wife Carol, and I would want everybody who knew this man to know that there was a big smile on his face, that wonderful voice of his was resonant, and even though he did not stay lucid for long periods of time, the only thing, the only thing that he talked about was his House of Representatives.

I really sincerely hope that those Members, Republican and Democrats, that had an opportunity to see a true Republican with the compassion and sensitivity and understanding that it takes all of us to make this Congress and this country work, that maybe those of us who knew Guy would make some kind of special effort to be tolerant with each other, which is what he was talking about, in hopes that new Members that never had the opportunity to enjoy that type of camaraderie will move in that direction.

We will miss him, but those who knew him, we have a constant reminder that when things get rough for us on this floor, there was a guy like Guy Vander Jagt, and as strong as a Republican as he was, that he cared enough about this House to care for all us.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I would ask that we stand for a moment of silence in honor of Guy Vander Jagt.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 179, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

AYES—222

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher

Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—179

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—31

Baker
Barton (TX)
Bonner
Boucher
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Doolittle
Everett
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Radanovich
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1045

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2771, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 502 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2771.

□ 1046

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2771) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Ms. BALDWIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Chair and members of the Committee, I am pleased to present the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch appropriations legislation for the fiscal year 2008.

The Legislative Branch bill is unique in that it appropriates funding for the entire Capitol Building and Grounds as well as nine legislative branch agencies and the 435 Members of this body and their offices. As a new member of the Appropriations Committee serving as a subcommittee Chair, I recognize the tremendous responsibility that comes along with being steward of this great institution, and I am honored by the confidence and trust that Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, and my colleagues have placed in me.

Historically, the Legislative Branch bill has enjoyed the bipartisan spirit that has come to define the Appropriations Committee and my experiences in working with the ranking member have been consistent with that spirit. Over the past several months, I have worked with Ranking Member WAMP, the gentleman from Tennessee, and other members of the committee from both parties to shape and determine the appropriations for the people's House. We held 14 oversight hearings prior to developing this bill, and I am very proud of our accomplishments.

I want to thank the members of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee for their help and input, Vice Chair LEE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. GOODE. The vast majority of our committee is new to the full committee, and we approached our task with zeal and with dedication.

I would particularly like to thank Ranking Member WAMP for his work on this bill. He has been a good partner, and I appreciate his cooperation and friendship. While we have not agreed on every issue, we worked in partnership to address our differences; and notwithstanding a few issues, they were resolved. I would also like to thank Chairman OBEY for his guidance during this process and Ranking Member LEWIS for his efforts as well.

Madam Chair, the bill provides $3.1 billion for the legislative branch, not including Senate items. That's an increase of $122 million, or just 4 percent, over the actual spending level in fiscal year 2007. This reflects a $276 million reduction in the total amended budget request, and I think that's an important point that Members should note. We are bringing this bill in under the original request.

We used three guiding principles to develop this bill: fiscal responsibility, security and life safety, and accountability.

In terms of fiscal responsibility, we've emphasized that we need to keep this bill tight with a view towards the long term. We've funded the must-haves over the nice-to-haves and have focused on critical investments. We've held the actual spending increase in this bill to only 4 percent, $122 million, compared to the 13 percent, or $398 million, which was the increase that was requested.

In terms of security and life safety, we've made sure this bill makes the Capitol complex as secure and safe as possible. To this end, the bill includes $50 million worth of critical security and life safety projects, including, at the suggestion and urging of my good friend from Tennessee, interoperable radios for the Capitol Police. It also provides substantial increases to agencies with a direct role in the health/safety of the complex. The Capitol Police receive an 8 percent increase, while the Office of Compliance, which ensures that we protect our visitors and our employees in a safe environment, receives a 23 percent increase.

Finally, in terms of accountability, we've crafted this bill to provide Congress with the resources it needs to perform its constitutional oversight role and hold agencies accountable. We've fully funded House committees and included resources to bulk up GAO to better support our congressional oversight efforts. We've also beefed up

the Capitol Police IG office and established a statutory IG office at the Architect of the Capitol to improve oversight within those two organizations.

In closing, we've kept this bill tight so that we're fiscally responsible. We've done so by prioritizing investments for critical life safety and security needs while providing Congress with the tools it needs to hold the government accountable to the American taxpayer.

Madam Chair, we have a wonderful staff. I'd like to thank my committee staff, my personal staff, and Mr. WAMP's staff: Ms. Tracie Pough and Ian Rayder on my personal staff; Mr. Tom Forhan, our clerk; Rob Nabors, the full Appropriations Committee clerk; Chuck Turner; David Marroni; and Mr. WAMP's staff, Jeff Shockey and Liz Dawson, for their assistance. They have assisted both myself and Mr. WAMP as a new Chair and ranking member with our learning curve and worked countless hours to help produce this product.

Finally, I want to thank, Madam Chair, my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their guidance, patience, understanding and encouragement as we endeavored to craft a bill that was fiscally responsible with an eye toward ensuring that our employees and visitors have a safe and secure environment in which to function, as well as make sure that Congress has adequate resources to engage in our oversight responsibilities.

Madam Chair, it is an honor to serve in this role.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2008 (H.R. 2771)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Salaries and Expenses					
Payment to widows and heirs of deceased Members of Congress	330	---	---	-330	---
House Leadership Offices					
Office of the Speaker	4,614	4,761	4,761	+147	---
Office of the Majority Floor Leader	2,108	2,188	2,188	+80	---
Office of the Minority Floor Leader	3,953	4,090	4,090	+137	---
Office of the Majority Whip	1,813	1,894	1,894	+81	---
Office of the Minority Whip	1,358	1,420	1,420	+62	---
Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities	487	499	499	+12	---
Republican Steering Committee	915	943	943	+28	---
Republican Conference	1,562	1,631	1,631	+69	---
Republican Policy Committee	310	325	325	+15	---
Democratic Steering and Policy Committee	1,232	1,295	1,295	+63	---
Democratic Caucus	1,555	1,604	1,604	+49	---
Nine minority employees	1,459	1,498	1,498	+39	---
Training and Program Development:					
Majority	290	290	290	---	---
Minority	290	290	290	---	---
Cloakroom Personnel:					
Majority	438	460	460	+22	---
Minority	438	460	460	+22	---
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices	22,822	23,648	23,648	+826	---
Members' Representational Allowances Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail					
Expenses	554,716	610,616	581,000	+26,284	-29,616
Committee Employees					
Standing Committees, Special and Select	124,406	129,662	133,000	+8,594	+3,338
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	25,866	27,113	29,800	+3,934	+2,687
Subtotal, Committee employees	150,272	156,775	162,800	+12,528	+6,025
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Clerk	21,676	22,881	22,881	+1,205	---
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	6,295	7,024	7,024	+729	---
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	106,064	120,612	116,891	+10,827	-3,721
Office of the Inspector General	4,016	4,457	4,457	+441	---
Office for Emergency Planning, Preparedness and Operations	4,010	4,242	3,111	-899	-1,131
Office of General Counsel	968	1,202	1,202	+234	---
Office of the Chaplain	163	166	166	+3	---
Office of the Parliamentarian	1,778	1,828	1,828	+50	---
Office of the Parliamentarian	(1,415)	(1,455)	(1,455)	(+40)	---
Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives	(363)	(373)	(373)	(+10)	---
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House	2,472	3,046	3,046	+574	---
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House	7,025	7,406	7,406	+381	---
Office of Interparliamentary Affairs	724	752	752	+28	---
Other authorized employees	548	170	170	-378	---
Office of the Historian	408	596	459	+51	-137
Subtotal, Salaries, officers and employees	156,147	174,382	169,393	+13,246	-4,989

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2008 (H.R. 2771)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	4,704	3,688	3,688	-1,016	---
Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House	410	410	410	---	---
Government contributions	226,904	239,447	237,410	+10,506	-2,037
Capitol Visitor Center	3,410	2,308	2,308	-1,102	---
Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery	17,631	23,065	17,200	-431	-5,865
Emergency appropriations	6,437	---	---	-6,437	---
Miscellaneous items	703	703	703	---	---
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses	260,199	269,621	261,719	+1,520	-7,902
Total, Salaries and expenses	1,144,486	1,235,042	1,198,560	+54,074	-36,482
Total, House of Representatives	1,144,486	1,235,042	1,198,560	+54,074	-36,482
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Economic Committee	4,308	4,398	4,398	+90	---
Joint Committee on Taxation	8,773	9,416	9,416	+643	---
Office of the Attending Physician					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances	2,520	2,820	2,820	+300	---
Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office	8,524	10,876	4,448	-4,076	-6,428
Statements of Appropriations	30	30	30	---	---
Total, Joint items	24,155	27,540	21,112	-3,043	-6,428
CAPITOL POLICE					
Salaries	217,135	---	224,500	+7,365	+224,500
General expenses	38,500	---	61,500	+23,000	+61,500
Salaries and expenses	---	299,070	---	---	-299,070
Emergency appropriations	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Total, Capitol Police	265,635	299,070	286,000	+20,365	-13,070
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE					
Salaries and expenses	3,103	4,106	3,806	+703	-300
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	35,204	37,972	37,805	+2,601	-167
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
General administration	77,128	87,714	81,733	+4,605	-5,981
Capitol building	23,886	29,480	24,567	+681	-4,913
Capitol grounds	7,577	10,225	9,310	+1,733	-915
House office buildings	59,896	50,621	66,151	+6,255	+15,530
Capitol Power Plant	79,847	119,226	91,017	+11,170	-28,209
Offsetting collections	-6,534	-8,000	-8,000	-1,466	---
Emergency appropriations	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant	123,313	111,226	83,017	-40,296	-28,209
Library buildings and grounds	27,692	42,788	31,638	+3,946	-11,150
Capitol police buildings and grounds	11,768	18,816	16,109	+4,341	-2,707
Botanic garden	7,697	9,707	8,310	+613	-1,397

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2008 (H.R. 2771)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Capitol Visitor Center	43,758	---	---	-43,758	---
CVC Project (cost-to-complete)	---	20,000	20,000	+20,000	---
CVC Operations	---	13,884	7,545	+7,545	-6,339
Total, Capitol Visitor Center	43,758	33,884	27,545	-16,213	-6,339
Total, Architect of the Capitol	382,715	394,461	348,380	-34,335	-46,081
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses	387,597	467,452	401,000	+13,403	-66,452
Authority to spend receipts	-6,350	-6,350	-6,350	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	381,247	461,102	394,650	+13,403	-66,452
Rescissions	-49,549	---	---	+49,549	---
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses	58,420	51,562	49,827	-8,593	-1,735
Authority to spend receipts	-35,758	-35,373	-44,224	-8,466	-8,851
Subtotal, Copyright Office	22,662	16,189	5,603	-17,059	-10,586
Congressional Research Service, salaries and expenses	100,786	108,702	104,518	+3,732	-4,184
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, Salaries and expenses	53,614	75,623	67,741	+14,127	-7,882
Total, Library of Congress	508,760	661,616	572,512	+63,752	-89,104
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Congressional printing and binding	87,954	109,541	87,892	-62	-21,649
Office of Superintendent of Documents					
Salaries and expenses	33,096	45,613	35,434	+2,338	-10,179
Government Printing Office Revolving Fund	1,000	26,825	2,450	+1,450	-24,375
Total, Government Printing Office	122,050	181,979	125,776	+3,726	-56,203
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	488,627	530,314	510,838	+22,211	-19,476
Emergency appropriations	374	---	---	-374	---
Offsetting collections	-7,931	-7,510	-7,510	+421	---
Total, Government Accountability Office	481,070	522,804	503,328	+22,258	-19,476
OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER					
Payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund	13,860	14,400	6,000	-7,860	-8,400
STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE					
Stennis Center for Public Service	430	430	430	---	---
Grand total	2,981,468	3,379,420	3,103,709	+122,241	-275,711

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2008 (H.R. 2771)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
House of Representatives	1,144,486	1,235,042	1,198,560	+54,074	-36,482
Joint Items	24,155	27,540	21,112	-3,043	-6,428
Capitol Police	265,635	299,070	286,000	+20,365	-13,070
Office of Compliance	3,103	4,106	3,806	+703	-300
Congressional Budget Office	35,204	37,972	37,805	+2,601	-167
Architect of the Capitol	382,715	394,461	348,380	-34,335	-46,081
Library of Congress	508,760	661,616	572,512	+63,752	-89,104
Government Printing Office	122,050	181,979	125,776	+3,726	-56,203
Government Accountability Office	481,070	522,804	503,328	+22,258	-19,476
Open World Leadership Center	13,860	14,400	6,000	-7,860	-8,400
Stennis Center for Public Service	430	430	430	---	---
Grand total	2,981,468	3,379,420	3,103,709	+122,241	-275,711

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chair, I want to start by saying that it's an awesome feeling being in my 11th year as a member of the House Appropriations Committee to be standing here as the ranking member offering our first bill and to congratulate our chairwoman from Florida on her first product. It is a joyous occasion for each of us, and I am grateful for this opportunity.

Let me also say that while I do not support and we do not support the overall spending that the Appropriations Committee is recommending for the year, we certainly do support this bill. This bill is a fiscally responsible product. We did work in a bipartisan way. We kind of went through waves where we could do better at times, but towards the end we really came together, and especially on the critical issues, in a bipartisan way. I commend the gentlelady from Florida on that cooperative spirit. I think we both learned a lot along the way about how to work with each other and how to reach out to our members and we do have a good subcommittee on both sides of the aisle.

I too want to thank this outstanding staff: Jeff Shockey and Liz Dawson on the minority side; Tom Forhan, Chuck Turner and David Marroni on the majority; particularly Melissa Chapman and Amanda Schoch on my personal staff for all the work that they've done. We're new, we're learning, but we are working together and we're grateful for that.

I want to point out a few things in this bill that I think are very noteworthy. As the chairwoman said, the Inspector General of the Architect of the Capitol is a very important move. Former chairman and now ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LEWIS, began this initiative in the '07 bill. For the chairwoman to go forward with it I think is incredibly important. We've learned a lot. Unfortunately, a lot of lessons learned from the CVC, but clearly they need the oversight of the Inspector General.

I also want to commend her on responding to the needs of the Capitol Police. If we are not state-of-the-art in communication on Capitol Hill, then in the whole country we've got a problem with security. They need the money for interoperable communications. It is now in this bill and we're grateful for that.

One caution, and we talked about it some during the rules debate, is this FDA building, the swing space, the whole issue of are we in the wake or behind the CVC going to go into another major capital improvement project and is that necessary or even wise at this time to go forward with that. We're going to talk more about that, but my view is we need sweeping procurement reforms in the way the AOC operates. I know that this is not necessarily an AOC directly driven project, but the whole supervision of how we procure capital improvements, renovations and do it is not efficient.

Frankly, we saw the Botanical Gardens a few years ago, we didn't learn enough lessons from that. We went into the CVC. It's gotten out of hand. We need reforms before we go forward. I look forward to discussing that more as the morning goes.

The Green the Capitol Initiative falls under the category of the prerogative of the majority but the responsibility of the minority to question, is this real substantive. I think there's widespread bipartisan support for environmental improvements on Capitol Hill and across the country. I'm the cochairman of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus. The gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the House Administration Committee, will speak in a few minutes with concerns about the Green the Capitol Initiative. He's one of the leaders, as am I, on renewable energy and energy-efficiency technologies, but does this end up being somewhat window dressing, not as much substance as we would like. It's not a large budget issue, but we have the obligation to ask these questions.

One of the questions would be, we have an E–85 pump coming but we don't yet have these fleet vehicles or leased vehicles running off of E–85. So we've got to connect the dots and make this work, but we're respectfully asking these questions with the same desire as the majority, to green the Capitol and frankly be as environmentally responsible across the board as we can.

Let me also say another disappointing aspect is that we're still in my view not doing enough for the blind and physically handicapped. The digital talking books program does still receive a reduction even though we made some improvements at the full committee. I want to advocate for doing all we can along the way.

And then let me just say a word about something that's in this bill that thankfully the Rules Committee allowed to stay in this bill and it's the naming of the hall which some say that this subcommittee or even the full committee should not take action on, but I disagree. Because time is of the essence. This new Capitol Visitors Center is the 600-pound gorilla that we've been trying to get our arms around and frankly we've both taken a lot of ownership in this. We inherited this problem, as did the Acting Architect, Mr. Ayers, inherit the cost overruns in this very large project, which is unprecedented. We haven't done it in the history of the Capitol, something this large, 580,000 square feet, $592 million, over twice the original cost; but frankly the planning overlapped September 11. $170 million in cost overruns are for enhanced security improvements in the wake of September 11. But there is a 20,000 square foot space in the middle of this new Capitol Visitors Center, and it's going to be the largest congregate space in the Capitol. Unfortunately, through, I think bad communication, this hall was called the Great Hall, which is exactly the same name as the main hall in the Library of Congress for over 100 years. The Great Hall is this beautiful, ornate room at the Library of Congress. Early on, there was bipartisan agreement at our subcommittee that both of these halls on each end of a tunnel should not be called the Great Hall.

So we took action and I think carefully thought through and felt through some of the options, and the most glaring omission in the history of the Capitol is the irony that the people that built the Capitol were, in large part, slaves who never were honored in any way, shape or form for the work that they did building this Capitol. There were even periods of time where the people working on the dome were Union soldiers and slaves, at the same time, building the dome during the Civil War. What an unbelievably awesome thought that the people who were fighting for their freedom were working side by side with these slaves.

Listen, this is our opportunity to truly honor them in a way that transcends our service, our existence, individuals. And so the naming of this 20,000 square foot hall Emancipation Hall is something that is ripe with life and tradition and time-honored work for all of us. I'm pleased that it was left in the bill, and I'm pleased that our Senate counterparts took action on this yesterday by introducing legislation.

The power to convene is greater than the power to legislate. Sometimes we forget that things like this may seem to be symbolic, but it means so much more. I've taken 1,700 groups through the Capitol over the last 13 years. I give these tours and it inspires young people to a life of service. What greater way to honor freedom than to walk people through this new 20,000 square foot hall and say, this is Emancipation Hall, a great lesson of history.

□ 1100

We gained our national character by the mistakes that we learned from, never to repeat again. That's where we get our character. That's why this is so important.

Some people say we shouldn't spend the money to change the name of the signs. We should never have printed the signs. Let's not make another mistake by not rectifying this first mistake.

I really appreciate the bipartisan spirit in which we have worked on this particular issue.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I wanted rise not to speak on the issue that gentleman just spoke so passionately about, but just to say a word about the two new leaders of this committee.

I have had opportunity of serving in this House for some period of time.

When I first came here, shortly thereafter, Vic Fazio, Congressman Fazio and Congressman LEWIS, who is now the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, handled this responsibility that DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ZACH WAMP are now handling. For almost at least a decade, Liz, I think they handled that responsibility. And they handled it in an absolutely bipartisan way to reflect the fact that 435 Members representing the 300 million people in this country care about this institution working well to their benefit, and to the benefit of our country.

I want to congratulate certainly DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who, in her third year, has become a cardinal, in large part because of her energy and her focus and her talent and her experience in the State Senate in Florida and the House in Florida, and what she brings to this institution. She is an institutionalist.

We are also fortunate with ZACH WAMP from Tennessee, with whom I disagree from time to time and maybe a lot of times when we vote on substantive legislation, but who is a good friend of mine. We are blessed that the two of them are working on this bill.

I mentioned Liz Dawson, who has been, really, mothering this bill, I was going to say husbanding this bill, but for a very significant period of time, since she was a very young girl, and who cares a great deal about this institution. I want to thank her as well for her leadership.

But I think we ought to all feel fortunate that we have two people like DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ZACH WAMP trying to make the accommodations for this institution to work well to represent our people. This is the people's House. To the extent that we have the resources to represent our people in a way that will reflect credit on this House and a positive result for our people, our country will be better. So I wanted to say that and congratulate Mr. WAMP and DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished vice chair of the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, first let me also thank our chair for your leadership, for your very focused work, and for your commitment not only as chair and to this bill, but to this entire institution.

I also want to thank our Ranking Member WAMP for your leadership and your expertise and, really, your ability to work together in a bipartisan way to make the committee truly a bipartisan committee, which is what all of our committees are striving for.

So it's a pleasure to serve as vice chair on this committee. I am very proud of the product which we are presenting today.

I rise in strong support of this legislative branch appropriations bill, and really want to just take a moment to thank all of the staff who really, as a result of their vigilance and their expertise and their hard work, they were the ones who really helped us put this all together. I want to especially acknowledge Chris Lee on my staff, because this is one of his very first legislative initiatives, and he did a phenomenal job in keeping me pointed on looking at the goals of what we were trying to accomplish in this legislation.

This bill also seeks to improve the working conditions of dedicated staff who are a vital and integral part of this legislative process. This bill also commits the House of Representatives to set an example to the Nation on how to reduce the environmental impact of the workplace by beginning the greening of the Capitol complex. How exciting this is.

This bill also begins to address the pattern which, unfortunately it is, but it's a pattern of exclusion that has gone on for too long in contracting and procurement in the House of Representatives. For too long businesses owned by women, minorities and the disabled have not had a seat at the table. It was appalling, with what we learned at the hearings about the exclusion of such a large segment of our qualified business community. For too long we have operated without written formal policies and reliable reporting on compliance without the crucial data that the committee cannot know if real progress is being made or if additional action should be required.

Well, naming the great hall Emancipation Hall in recognition that the great Capitol had been built by the expertise, the blood, sweat and tears of slaves is appropriate and timely as we also now go beyond the name to include the descendants of slaves in the economic vitality and opportunity of this Capitol. So we have included in this bill language that requires specific contracting with minorities, with women and the disabled.

We required contractor and vending opportunities and access to equal opportunities for our disadvantaged businesses and for promoting their hiring and development as well.

We also include language that requires GAO to adopt a formal affirmative action plan. They may be doing the right thing, but we don't know that. We know that they do need an affirmative action plan, so we would require that in this bill.

We also make sure that there is accountability in this bill, but let me just say I am very proud of the fact that for the first time we will have requirements now, with our own Capitol contracting opportunities, as well as with the Visitors Center, to not exclude minorities and women and the disabled, but to include them in the economic opportunities that this bill provides.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you very much.

Madam Chairman, to ZACH WAMP, I want to express my feelings about your work on this bill in a couple of ways.

First, those of us on the committee who have watched this process go together, Chairwoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ZACH WAMP working together, frankly, seeing people develop a relationship in a job that involves the real business of the House. It is the bill that funds our appropriations process. While it's not the largest bill, it's very important to the fundamentals here.

But I have never been quite so impressed as I watched them working with our very fine professional staff, to see them also bring along Members of the Appropriations Committee addressing this bill in a very special way. I wish the entire House could have observed the Appropriations Committee as we discussed Emancipation Hall the other day.

JESSE JACKSON was magnificent. The interplay between he and the chairwoman and ZACH WAMP was worthy of the Appropriations Committee, but very much a reflection of the very best of this House. I couldn't have been prouder than I was observing that conversation within appropriators.

With that I want to congratulate you very much for this product. It's a tremendous reflection of our work.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Chairwoman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the chairwoman.

Madam Chairwoman, thank you for your leadership on this bill; In particular, for your support and leadership of the Green the Capitol Initiative, which accounts for the House's global impact on global warming.

Also, I want to thank the ranking member Mr. WAMP, Speaker PELOSI and Chairman BRADY as well.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to congratulate Mr. WELCH for his initiative in moving this issue forward.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. By making my office carbon-neutral earlier this year, my hope was to be able to take a small, but meaningful, step towards addressing the impact of my own congressional activity on global warming.

May I clarify my understanding that the committee report on the bill directs the Chief Administrative Officer to purchase carbon financial instruments to offset carbon produced by all House operations, and that these offsets will be fully transparent, verified, American, project-based offset credits?

I yield.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, that's correct. As written in the report, the committee believes it is important to offset the greenhouse gases generated by the House, which is why we have directed the CAO of the House to purchase carbon offsets at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and credits to successfully offset carbon produced by all House operations.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. It's my understanding through conversations with Dan Beard, the CAO, that he has agreed to develop a plan to deliver a report to your committee in a timely fashion for accounting the balance of congressional offices' carbon footprints. This plan would expand the Green the Capitol Initiative to be inclusive of all Member official travel in district office operations.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is the intent of the subcommittee to eventually encompass all House operations, including travel and district operations. I would welcome this report from Mr. Beard and encourage his recommendations on how we will offset the remaining carbon footprint of the House.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Thank you, Madam Chair; thank you, Ranking Member WAMP. We all really appreciate the way you have worked on this bill together. You make us all proud.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. WELCH.

I look forward to working together on this important issue.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, let me just underscore what Mr. LEWIS said about the work of JESSE JACKSON, Jr., on the work on Emancipation Hall, but also the support from JOHN LEWIS, JIM CLYBURN and Ms. NORTON, who is in the Chamber this morning, and all the people who have any jurisdiction or involvement in this particular issue.

Ms. KILPATRICK and the Congressional Black Caucus support his bill, in large part because of JESSE JACKSON, Jr.'s, leadership. He is extraordinarily bright. He was so articulate and passionate about this issue. Frankly, it wouldn't have been done to this point. We are not complete without him. I just want to underscore that recognition.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman of Pennsylvania, a member of the full committee, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their bonding of bipartisanship. We could use a lot more of that around here. I think it has been great.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for accepting my amendment in full committee that was a GAO study on the implications of changing our fuel source from coal to natural gas. That's a symbol for America to listen to our carbon imprint, so we will go to the clean, green fuel, natural gas.

I see universities doing it. I see State governments doing it already. As our symbol, if that happens in all agencies, State, local, education, we will have a huge impact on the need of affordable, clean natural gas in this country.

My concern is we have a body here who is very much opposed to the production of clean, green natural gas.

One point, on Green the Capitol, I have not been able to find a window that was Energy Star. I have not been able to find a window that was not a single-pane glass that is a great transfer of heat out and cold in. It seems like we ought to be using fuel-efficient first. Maybe that's our next objective.

We're going to be accepting an amendment in a few minutes, and I am not going to protest it, I will not debate it, on light bulbs. It's going to mandate energy-efficient Star-rated light bulbs.

I have them in my home. I have a large home. We have a lot of lights going, and I try to put them where I burn them all the time. But they are not very bright. They are not good for reading. My wife has replaced the one in her reading chair. They buzz sometimes, they just buzz like a transformer, so they are not exactly what we are used to.

Oh, by the way, next year at this time, every light bulb in the Capitol will be made in Communist China, will have mercury in it, and the incandescent light bulb industry that's left in this industry, and I have two plants, those good union jobs will be leaving quicker, not later.

I am not saying Americans shouldn't switch, but we need to know what we're doing.

□ 1115

I believe we need to have a much more thoughtful approach and look at where the jobs are in America in that we are transferring jobs to China. We're putting mercury into the workplace, and we're eliminating some of the best jobs that we have back in our districts. We need to think about that.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise to engage the subcommittee chairwoman, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, in a colloquy to express my concerns regarding the Comptroller General's implementation of the Human Capital Reform Act of 2004 and the resulting unionization effort at the Government Accountability Office.

For the past 18 months, the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia, which I chair, has been investigating certain personnel actions taken by the Comptroller General.

Our investigation culminated in a joint House and Senate hearing on May 22, where CRS's legal division and the General Counsel for the GAO's Personnel Appeals Board testified that, based on current statute, GAO did not have the authority to deny over 300 employees who met and, in some cases, exceeded expectations, their 2006 and 2007 annual across-the-board increase.

GAO says that it took this action based upon a compensation-based study conducted by Watson Wyatt. However, when the subcommittee's staff, working with experts in market-based pay, reviewed the documentation, they were unable to validate that the employees who did not receive their across-the-board increase were overpaid, as asserted by GAO.

In addition to meeting their performance expectations, these employees were among the most experienced, with over 25 years of service to GAO.

The workforce at GAO has been severely disrupted by these personnel actions. In reaction to them, a majority of GAO's 1,500 analysts filed a petition with the GAO's Personnel Appeals Board to be represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers.

Unfortunately, GAO has responded by hiring the law firm Venable, LLC, to represent it before the PAB. It is uncommon for a Federal agency to use taxpayers' dollars to hire private sector counsel for such purposes. In addition, GAO is asserting that one-third of the petitioners are supervisors and, therefore, cannot unionize.

Furthermore, GAO has indicated that if its challenge is successful, and it can show that the alleged supervisors were involved in the solicitation of authorization cards for the remaining eligible employees, it will not commit to recognize and bargain with the employee group.

I yield to the chairwoman to ask what steps has the Appropriations Committee taken to address Member and employee concerns about the situation at the GAO.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you for yielding, Chairman DAVIS. Like you, I am very concerned about the Comptroller General's actions and have personally spoken to him to express my concerns.

I am committed to doing all we can to ensure that the Comptroller General does not put up obstacles to workers' rights to organize. In particular, I am dismayed the GAO, as a legislative branch agency, has retained outside counsel, rather than use its own attorneys to represent it before the Personnel Appeals Board. This action is unnecessarily costly and will likely delay the process of determining the outcome of the petition.

The committee has reiterated these points in report language in this bill. We will be closely monitoring the progress of the Comptroller's review of

eligibility, and we are requiring weekly reports on progress in these areas.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Chairman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. My committee will continue to closely monitor this situation as well. I look forward to working with your subcommittee on this matter in the future.

Representatives WYNN, VAN HOLLEN, and Majority Leader HOYER regret that they could not be here to speak on this issue. However, I have statements from them, and will submit them for the RECORD, along with a letter dated June 21, 2007, from the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers to Comptroller General David Walker alleging unfair labor practices.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS, AFL–CIO & CLC,
Silver Spring, MD, June 21, 2007.

Hon. DAVID M. WALKER,
Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. WALKER: Enclosed is an unfair labor practice charge against you. Accept this letter and enclosure as your 30 day advance copy of the charge pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1§15(b). We request that you review the allegations, and to prevent any future violations we urge you to cease any activity related to those described herein. Further, we trust that you will instruct all other Agency officials that such improper conduct will not be permitted.

We anticipate an informal resolution of this charge pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1§15(b). However, if this matter cannot be resolved informally within the next 30 days, the charge will be filed with the GAO Personnel Appeals Board Office of General Counsel and further action will result.

Sincerely,

GREGORY J. JUNEMANN,
President.

Personnel Appeals Board/Office of General Counsel U.S. Government Accountability Office **UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE**	**FOR PAB/OGC USE ONLY** Case No. Date filed

See instructions on the back of this form and the PAB regulations governing unfair labor practices at 4 CFR §28.120 *et seq.* Attach additional sheets if needed, numbered according to the item to which they pertain.

1. **Charging Party (Individual or Labor Organization)**

Name/Contact	*Address*	*Phone and Fax*	*Email*
Julia Akins Clark International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers	8630 Fenton St, Suite 400 Silver Spring, MD 20910	Phone: (301) 565-9016 Fax: (301) 565-0018	*jclark@ifpte.org*

2. **Charged GAO Component or Agent**

Name/Contact	*Address*	*Phone and Fax*	*Email*
Hon. David M. Walker Comptroller General of the United States	Government Accountability Office 441 G Street, NW Washington, DC 20548-0001	Phone: (202) 512-5500 Fax: (202) 512-5507	

3. Identify any subsection(s) of GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a) that you believe that GAO and/or its agent(s) has violated.

GAO Order 2711.1 § 12(a)(1) and (8)

4. Describe precisely the actions taken by GAO and/or its agent(s) that you believe violated the provisions identified in #3. Identify the date, location and individuals (with titles) involved in the alleged unfair labor practice.

See Attachment 1

5. Have you or anyone else raised this matter in any other procedure? _X_ No ____ Yes If yes, explain in detail how, when and where this matter was raised.

6. I DECLARE THAT I HAVE READ THIS CHARGE AND THAT THE STATEMENTS IN IT ARE TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF. I UNDERSTAND THAT WILLFULLY MAKING FALSE STATEMENTS CAN BE PUNISHED BY FINE AND IMPRISONMENT PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. §1001.

Julia Akins Clark		6/20/07
Type or print your name	Your signature	Date

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILING AN UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Use this form if you are charging that the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) or its agents committed an unfair labor practice under GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a). File an original signed copy of the charge with the Personnel Appeals Board, Office of General Counsel (PAB/OGC) at 820 1st St. NE, Suite 580, Washington, D.C. 20002. If filing a charge by fax (202.512.7522), you must promptly submit the signed original to the PAB/OGC. You may, but are not required to, submit evidence or documents supporting the charge. If you choose to do so, these materials must be delivered, not faxed, to the PAB/OGC.

LINE BY LINE INSTRUCTIONS

1. Give the full name, mailing address, phone and fax numbers, as well as email address, of the Charging Party. If a union, give both national affiliation (if any) and local designation. If an employee, identify the component of GAO at which you are employed.

2. Identify the GAO official alleged to have committed the unfair labor practice(s) by full name, mailing address, phone and fax numbers as well as email address (if known). Provide the name of a contact person if the charged party is GAO or a component of GAO.

3. Identify which of the following provisions of GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a) that you allege was violated:

(a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for the GAO to

(1) interfere with, restrain, or coerce any employee in the exercise by the employee of any right under GAO Order 2711.1;

(2) encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization by discrimination in connection with hiring, tenure, promotion, or other conditions of employment;

(3) sponsor, control, or otherwise assist any labor organization, other than to furnish, upon request, customary and routine services and facilities if the services and facilities are also furnished on an impartial basis to other labor organizations having equivalent status;

(4) discipline or otherwise discriminate against an employee because the employee has filed a charge, complaint, affidavit, or petition, or has given any information or testimony under GAO Order 2711.1;

(5) refuse to negotiate in good faith with a labor organization as required by GAO Order 2711.1;

(6) fail or refuse to cooperate in impasse procedures and decisions as required by GAO Order 2711.1;

(7) enforce any rule or order, other than a rule or order implementing 31 U.S.C. 732(h)(2), which is in conflict with any applicable collective bargaining agreement if the agreement was in effect before the date the rule or order was prescribed; or

(8) otherwise fail or refuse to comply with any provision of GAO Order 2711.1.

4. Be concise, complete and factual. Tell what happened in chronological order.

5. State whether this same matter has already been raised as all or part of a claim brought elsewhere, e.g., the GAO Office of Opportunity and Inclusiveness or grievance procedure.

6. Type or print your name. Date and sign the statement attesting to the truth of the statements contained therein.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

ATTACHMENT 1

Item (4):

Comptroller General David M. Walker has made remarks regarding the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (''IFPTE'') and its efforts to assist employees of the Government Accountability Office (''GAO'') in their organizing activities, which violate the requirement that management, especially the Comptroller General as head of the Agency, maintain strict neutrality during a union organizing campaign. GAO Order 2711.1 (defining a management action which interferes with protected Union activities as an Unfair Labor Practice). See GAO Order 2711.1 12(a) (requiring management not to ''interfere with, restrain, or coerce any employee in the exercise by the employee of any right'').

It is well established pursuant to Federal Labor Relations Authority (''FLRA'') precedent that the prohibition on interference with protected Union activities means that an Agency must remain neutral during a Union organizing campaign. See also 5 U.S.C.§7116(e) (providing that management can only make expressions of personal view, argument, opinion or statements relating to cc representation elections that: (1) publicize the fact of a representational election and encourage employees to vote; (2) correct the record with respect to any false or misleading statement made by any person; or (3) inform employees of the Government's policy relating to labor-management relations and representation as long as these statements do not contain threat or reprisal or promise of benefit and are not made under coercive conditions).

The objectionable remarks are summarized below:

In a January 23, 2007 article on www.govexec.com. (See Rutzick, Karen, ''GAO Employees Move Toward Vote on Union Representation'') Comptroller General Walker: (1) Characterized the union movement as coming from a ''handful'' of employees; (2) Stated that, ''a few employees are trying to do something''; and (3) Stated that, ''there are pros and cons'' of the organizing effort that ''[he] would have to present to [his] employees''.

During the May 9, 2007 quarterly Health Care Team meeting at GAO, held the day after the representation petition was filed Comptroller General Walker: (1) Stated that having a union can seriously impact the decision-making process within an agency, and could ''dramatically'' slow things down; (2) Stated that he wanted employees to ''have all the information'' before deciding on whether or not to bring such a change to GAO; and (3) Stated that some employees are concerned that the workplace is ''not fair'' and ''those that think it is not fair do not understand the situation.''

Similarly during the June 6, 2007 IT Team staff meeting at GAO, Comptroller General Walker: (1) Stated that, ''[t]he people who want a union are the vocal minority in GAO''; and (2) Stated that ''[d]ue to union organizing efforts, labor law prevents [him] from helping employees unilaterally. Both of [my] hands are tied due to the union organizing efforts''.

Comptroller General Walker's above-referenced statements to the media and in his addresses to GAO staff meetings are a breach of his obligation to remain neutral regarding the employees' union organizing effort, and constitute a violation of GAO Order 2711.1 §12(a)(1) and (8).

On June 19, 2007 the agency circulated a memorandum to GAO employees. The document: (1) Is titled ''Union Update.'' The title of the document is confusing and implies that it is from the Union rather than the Agency; (2) Stated that IFPTE filed the representation petition when in fact the name of the petitioner is GAO Employees Organization, IFPTE; (3) Withholds the fact that in its May 16, 2007 letter to the PAB the employer agreed to the exclusion of PDP employees, and changed its stance during the meeting between the parties on June 13, 2007; (4) Withholds the fact that GAO's offer required the union to waive the right of Band IIB employees to be union represented, in consideration for GAO's agreement to hold the union election in July. Further, GAO withheld the fact that the union offered to hold the election during the summer, and resolve GAO's IIB supervisory challenge post-election, in order to expedite the election; and; (5) States that a hearing will be held this summer. The agency has no basis for that assertion, since no hearing date has been set.

These statements contained within the memorandum are inaccurate and misleading. As noted above, the June 19, 2007, ''Union Update'' contains numerous factual errors and omissions which, in and of themselves constitute violations of Section 2711.1 §12(a)(1) and (8). In addition, however, section 2711.1 §12(e) specifies the conditions in which the Agency may provide information about the organizing/election process. The information in the Agency's ''Union Update'' goes well beyond the matters specified. The Agency is not permitted to provide periodic self-serving, spinning of facts related to the ongoing procedures of the union organizing process, and then send these to a captive audience via intranet. Accordingly, the contents of the ''Union Update'' itself constitute a ULP in violation of 2711.1 (a)(1) and (8). Moreover, the inaccuracies in the document interfere with employees' free choice and are impermissible pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1 §12(e) and inconsistent with 5 U.S.C. §7116(e). Thus, the document constitutes a violation of GAO Order 2711.1 §12(a)(1) and (8).

PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD/OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL, U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE,

Washington, DC., June 21, 2007.

REQUEST TO PROCEED

The undersigned requests the Personnel Appeals Board to proceed with the above-captioned representation case notwithstanding the alleged violation(s) of GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a) filed directly with the charged party pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1, §15(b) on June 21, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIA AKINS CLARK.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chair, before recognizing the ranking member of the House Administration Committee, Mr. EHLERS of Michigan, I want to just point out that the Comptroller General of the GAO, David Walker, has stated that he ''supports the right of GAO employees to organize if they so choose.'' And I also recognize the presence on the floor today of the chairman of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. BRADY, a friend of mine.

But to speak eloquently on this bill is a man who knows as much about the House as anyone here, a person who I work with very well. I yield 9 minutes to Mr. EHLERS of Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Chair, I'd like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me to speak on this legislation.

First of all I'd like to respond to his comments earlier about greening and also the comments of the subcommittee Chair. I have been involved

in environmental issues even before the first Earth Day. And I also, with all the discussion about fluorescent lights, it's more than 15 years ago that we installed fluorescent lights in the most heavily used parts of our house. We have saved immense amounts of energy and, above all, have avoided having to change light bulbs very often. It's certainly a good thing to do, and we should do it here.

Also, in connection with the comments made about the carbon footprint of the House, let's recognize the most important thing to do is to start by conserving energy, and that is key. You can gain more energy and greater results by increasing efficiency of the use of energy than any other single thing you can do, not just in the Capitol but, frankly, anywhere. And every reduction in a kilowatt of energy is a reduction in carbon emissions. So you can do two things at once.

And I applaud the emphasis on the carbon issue, but that's part of it. Include energy too, that's a very important part. So I encourage the full view. Simply buying credits from someone, if we ever do, and I don't think we should, is not really the answer. We have to reduce the amount we use, and there are many, many ways we can reduce the use of energy in this complex. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) for the compliment on that issue.

The main reason I rise today is to express my concerns with many of the administrative provisions in this bill that infringe on the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration. These could hamper our ability to provide meaningful and effective oversight of the offices and operations within our purview.

I recognize full well I am no longer the chairman of the committee, but I am the ranking Republican. And Mr. BRADY, whom I think very highly of, is in total agreement on these issues.

Initially, when I saw these, I thought of taking the route of moving points of order against these issues, but I'd prefer to work this out with the Chair and ranking member of the subcommittee.

Let me share just a few of the matters that have raised concern among members of the Committee on House Administration. I have also shared these with Mr. BRADY and with Mr. WAMP, and I know that Mr. BRADY shares my concern.

In the section titled ''Legislative Branch-wide Matters,'' the report language states in regard to policies governing contracts with women and minority-owned businesses that ''all agencies shall provide a copy of policies to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate within 60 days of enactment of this act.''

It goes on to say that ''the committee further directs all agencies provide an annual report of their compliance with this policy.'' One of the key reforms in the last decade or so has been giving the Committee on House Administration authority governing use of accounts within the House. The oversight provided by the House Administration Committee was designed to prevent financial abuses and also extended to the creation of procurement guidelines, since procurements are made from House accounts.

Those reforms were put in place to guarantee open competition in the procurement process and to ensure that the House would get the best value for the taxpayers' dollars.

This bill essentially creates a reporting relationship to the Appropriations Committee that circumvents the Committee on House Administration and damages our committee's ability to perform the vital oversight function that is within our jurisdiction.

And I would appreciate it if I could have the attention of the Chair because I'm going to ask a question about this in a few minutes.

In the section titled ''Culinary School Students,'' the Appropriations Committee requests that the Chief Administrative Officer contact culinary schools and explore the possibility for culinary school students to enhance their skills and make appropriate arrangements for the students to participate on a rotational basis among the participants in an on-the-job training or similar program.

While I certainly appreciate the interest of the Appropriations Committee in training students and creating a more enjoyable dining experience for Members and staff, the House Administration Committee has already tried to do this in the past and found that no culinary schools were interested because of the unpredictable hours of operation. Again, by circumventing our committee's authority, the Appropriations Committee has added another layer of bureaucracy, created a duplication of work for the CIO, and created a conflict of oversight authority.

Similarly, in the section titled ''Disability Access,'' the language includes a directive to the Chief Administrative Officer of the House, with the assistance of the Architect of the Capital, Government Accountability Office, and the Office of Compliance, where necessary to do a comprehensive assessment of the Capitol complex regarding disability access.

In fact, as required by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, the Office of Compliance conducts biennial ADA inspections of the legislative branch. Most, if not all, of the corrective actions to be taken are under the purview of the Architect of the Capitol. The AOC works closely with the OOC to develop abatement plans and includes cost estimates for that abatement in their annual budget submissions. The CAO is not equipped to conduct this type of study and does not have authority to examine the entire Capitol complex.

Just to conclude, while each of these issues are troubling on their own, together with the other concerns I have addressed with Chairman BRADY, they carry even greater significance as a symbol of an emerging pattern whereby report language is being used to establish administrative policy that was never intended to be a matter before the Appropriations Committee. If continued, this creates a duplicative oversight function, threatens to severely hamper the oversight ability of the House Administration Committee.

We've often heard the term ''the power of the purse strings,'' but in this case the power's being used to grant oversight authority to the Appropriations Committee in a manner that will create additional bureaucracy and cause undue harm, particularly to the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration.

I would like to yield time to the Chair of the subcommittee to respond to this. I hope that we can resolve this amicably, and that's why I did not make an issue offering points of order to strike language, et cetera. I don't want to make a do-or-die issue of this, but I would appreciate assurances from the Chair of the subcommittee that we can amicably resolve these jurisdiction issues between ourselves and perhaps with the help of the Parliamentarian.

And I know that Mr. BRADY shares my concern. I believe he's had some conversations with you as well.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the hard work of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

□ 1130

I appreciated as a freshman his assistance during the orientation process and want to assure the gentleman, as I have in conversations with Chairman BRADY, that the language in our report, specifically as it relates to the culinary language, is simply a request for the GAO to take a look at that issue so that we can incorporate culinary students in an instructional way in the preparation and delivery of food in the Members dining room. In addition, the disability language, while it is a directive, it was intended to make sure that we could keep the safety and security focus of our legislation.

I do look forward to working very closely with the chairman and the ranking member of the House Administration Committee so that we can make sure that we cover those needs that we have in the House of Representatives and the legislative branch agencies.

And I appreciate the gentleman's kind words.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for the assurance.

I just want to state I have been on that committee virtually since I came to the Congress. I have worked very, very hard on this committee to establish a good working administrative system. We have clarified jurisdiction

over the years, and even though I am no longer chairman but the ranking member at this point, I just want to ensure that the committee continues to enjoy a good relationship with the subcommittee.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chair of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I just want to say a few quick things.

We had a problem in House Administration when Chairwoman MILLENDER-MCDONALD passed away. There was a void. But taking over as chairman, I have a great working relationship with my ranking minority member, Mr. EHLERS. I have a great working relationship with the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, ZACH WAMP. I also have tremendous respect for and a great working relationship with the chairwoman.

We have had some conversations that we did not need to discuss here. I have been assured and am extremely comfortable with the fact that we will be together working out our jurisdictional problems. I thank the gentlewoman for stepping in at a time when it was needed. Again, with my ranking minority member, we have a great relationship. We probably have the best committee in that we get along all the time. We are going to continue to do that. I thank, again, the ranking member.

I look forward to working with you, and I have your assurance that we will be doing that.

Madam Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for the work of the gentlelady from Florida to craft the FY08 appropriations bill for the Legislative Branch. As we are well aware in the Committee on House Administration, working on this bill may not be very glamorous, but it is essential to keeping the House running.

The Committee on Appropriations has done a good job of balancing the many needs of the House—paying our employees, keeping the physical plant running, and operating the various agencies that serve Capitol Hill.

I am particularly pleased to see in this bill an additional $5 million toward upgrading the radio systems of the Capitol Police. Establishing a secure communications system for our police force is essential to the security of the Hill.

I also appreciate the Committee's commitment of funds for the "Green the Capitol" initiative. According to the House Chief Administrative Officer's calculations, we can eventually recoup these costs from savings on our utility bills when we make the House more energy-efficient.

I look forward to continuing our strong working relationship in the future.

Finally, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I urge the Members to reject the amendment by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. FLAKE]. It is essential that the Congressional Printing and Binding Appropriation be funded at least at the level recommended by the Appropriations Committee. The Government Printing Office must have enough resources to provide Congress with the printing and digital services fundamental to our legislative process.

The congressional printing account has been flat-funded since 2005. As a result, in order to deliver what we require to do our jobs in Congress, GPO has had to reach into its own working capital. When GPO depletes it working capital, it consumes funds otherwise available to keep pace with technology, train employees, even to maintain plant and equipment.

GPO receives no salaries-and-expenses appropriation for its printing operations. GPO runs just like a business, and the Congressional Printing and Binding Appropriation is Congress' prepayment for its own orders. As a GPO customer, like many other Federal agencies, Congress has to pay its way and cannot expect GPO to underwrite printing needs, especially as we increase congressional activity in this 110th Congress. If Congress continues to underfund its own printing, GPO will eventually face a financial crisis that we caused, threatening its ability to operate for any of its agency customers. Let's reject the Flake amendment to keep that from happening.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I thank her for her excellent work on her maiden voyage as chair.

I have come to say a few words that I think need saying about the performance of GAO with respect to the grand experiment that our committee allowed on pay for performance. We allowed it. We have not tried to interfere with it. But the actions taken by the Comptroller General where you would at least have expected it has produced nothing short of a revolution within, of all places, the GAO workforce.

They were chosen for this grand experiment because they were a fairly upscale part of the Federal workforce. And what have we got? How would you feel if you had worked at or above performance, and yet you were among 300 employees of, what is it, 2 million Federal employees who did not receive the across-the-board pay increase that everybody else receives? Well, some of you might have sued or filed a claim with the Personnel Appeals Board within the GAO. And those employees, all 12 of them, have received their COLA, have been promoted, and have had their retirement fixed.

But there are 300 employees from 2006, 130 from 2007 who have been punished as to their pensions and pay because the Comptroller did not keep his promise with the Congress, which was that nobody's across-the-board pay would be affected. In fact, what he did was to insert a market-based study without informing the subcommittee, an unvalidated study, and now he has a whole racial claim on top of it because the African Americans have been disproportionately affected by his action.

If the Comptroller wanted some help, he could have gone to the OPM. Instead, he used a market-based study from a consultant. If he wanted to know how to deal with unionization which is now upon him, he could have gone to the OPM. He could have gone to the Federal Labor Relations Authority. Instead, he is spending taxpayer funds in order to try to beat a union within the Federal sector, the first time ever. If we allow taxpayer funds to be used that way, then it seems to me we ought to be called to account.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 2771, the legislative branch appropriations bill. I want to thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ranking Member WAMP, and the appropriations staff for their hard work in crafting this fiscally responsible bill.

The bill on the floor today is "lean and mean," providing just the resources that we need to serve the people in an honest, transparent manner.

I strongly believe that as our Nation's elected leaders, we have a responsibility here in the people's House to lead the Nation in creating an environmentally friendly workplace. This is why I crafted two amendments for today's bill that would have directed the Architect of the Capitol to take small but significant steps toward "greening" the Capitol complex.

I am pleased that Subcommittee Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ shares my support for the Speaker's Greening of the Capitol Initiative. Since she has enthusiastically agreed to consider them during conference, I won't be offering them today.

But I would like to draw the House's attention to these two initiatives because they demonstrate how small investments can reap large rewards.

Both initiatives were drawn from the Greening of the Capital report recently

completed by the Architect of the Capitol, and both are endorsed by the American Society of Landscape Architects.

The first initiative would study the feasibility of constructing a ''green roof'' on the Ford House Office Building. A green roof is a rooftop that is carefully planted with vegetation. It can be anything from a simple plot of grass to a park-like setting.

Green roofs have proved to be tremendous economic and environmental benefits. They are great insulators, reducing heating and cooling costs often by as much as 25 percent. And they save on maintenance costs as well since they are more protective than traditional roofs. Green roofs cool the surrounding neighborhood by reducing the amount of heat that is reflected back into the surrounding atmosphere, the so-called urban heat island effect. Vegetation on green roofs celebrates our natural heritage and also absorbs rainwater, reducing contaminated runoff.

Even with all these benefits, green roofs have not caught on. They are not very popular yet in the United States. And as Members of Congress, we now have the opportunity to lead by example. A successful demonstration of the economic benefits of green roofs right here in the Capitol Complex can help promote green roofs across the Nation.

My second proposal concerns the planting of more trees around parking lots in the Capitol Complex. My colleagues who closely follow environmental issues already know that trees have a remarkable ability to reduce the air temperature in our urban areas. Trees remove carbon from our atmosphere, shade our buildings and cars, and even reduce asthma by filtering out air pollutants. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, this proposal would even save the taxpayers money.

Without action this year, many of the Speaker's Greening of the Capitol Initiatives, including the two I have just discussed, won't get funding until 2009 or 2010. These proposals would get us started modestly but promptly and don't require additional funds.

I look forward to working with Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ to incorporate these projects into the legislative branch's plans for 2008.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership on environmental issues and look forward to working with her on continuing the Speaker's leadership on the Green the Capitol Initiative, both in terms of planting of the trees and the greening of roofs, and I look forward and appreciate her input.

At this time, Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, this place, this House is always at its best when Members of the United States Congress work together. And I want to congratulate the chairwoman of this committee and the ranking member of this committee for working together.

Most people don't understand that the legislative branch creates an atmosphere of hospitality in this place. As I look and see the number of visitors that we have, your responsibility is to secure them and to welcome them. Let me thank you personally for the task that you have undertaken.

I want to thank you for the increase in the House Child Care Center, and I hope that our community does not criticize the fact that we are family friendly so that employees have the opportunity to have child care.

I want to thank you for supporting the Speaker's Green Initiative because we, too, must do what we ask Americans to do.

And, of course, the brave men and women that serve us, I welcome the increase in the Capitol Police, and I also look forward to their continuing to address the questions of discrimination and equality as they increase the numbers of police.

Let me join in the words of Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and hope that we will challenge, if you will, the GAO to be responsible in its dealings with its employees and unionization.

But I came today to be able to offer to the American public the sense of pride and the sense of humbleness that I am now experiencing because of your grand leadership and that of the Appropriations Committee. And my good friend Congressman JESSE JACKSON and, of course, members of the Congressional Black Caucus signed a letter, which I was proud to sign, because this picture reflects something that is near and dear to Texas.

My good friend comes from Tennessee. He knows that we have a lot of continuity or connection between Tennessee and Texas and the good State of Florida.

But we celebrated this week the Emancipation Proclamation. We celebrated, in particular, Juneteenth. Those of us in the South remember Major General Gordon Granger coming 2 years late to indicate that we might be free. Isn't it wonderful that now we will name the Visitors Center, and we hope for our good friends in the other body to be as reasonable, the Emancipation Hall.

I went through the hall just outside this door before I came to the floor, and I saw the name of William Jennings Bryan. I saw the name Wheeler of Alabama, Huey Pierce Long, Lew Wallace, Sequoyah, Sam Houston.

□ 1145

I met a woman who told me about her grandfather, Levi Coffin, who had helped slaves in the Underground Railroad. Her name was Ms. Holt. She was just standing there talking to me.

That's what naming the Emancipation Hall means to America. It reflects the wholeness of America, the wonderment of our history, the dignity of our history. Yes, slaves built this place, but all Americans will be able to go into Emancipation Hall, and it will symbolize the freedom of this Nation. I am so grateful that we have come to this place at this time.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, Emancipation Hall.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2771, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2008 and to commend Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her leadership in shepherding this bill though the legislative process. This legislation funds the House, Senate and various entities in the legislative branch, including the Library of Congress, the Capitol Police, the Government Accountability Office, and the Government Printing Office.

But it does more than that, Madam Chairman. The bill provides funding for ''Greening the Capitol'' to reduce carbon emissions from the operations of House buildings and the Capitol. It makes the necessary investments for critical health and safety needs by funding security upgrades and addressing health hazards and safety requirements in law. In short, this legislation demonstrates a commitment by the new Democratic majority to increased oversight, accountability and fiscal responsibility.

H.R. 2771 appropriates $3.1 billion for legislative branch entities, including $1.2 billion for House operations and $1.9 billion for legislative branch agencies and other offices. The total provided is $275.7 million (8 percent) less than requested by legislative offices and agencies and only $122.2 million (4 percent) more than comparable FY 2007 funding. Nearly 25 percent of this increased funding is directly attributable to costs associated with the 2008 presidential election and subsequent inauguration.

Following the long-established practice that each house of Congress determines its own housekeeping requirements without interference from the other body, the bill contains no funding for Senate operations. The bill appropriates $1.2 billion for operations of the House of Representatives, which is $36.5 million (3 percent) less than requested, but $54.1 million (5 percent) more than current funding.

The total for the House includes $581 million for members' offices, also known as MRA's, 5 percent more than current funding, but 5 percent less than requested and $162.8 million for House committees, 8 percent more than current funding and 4 percent more than requested. The bill also provides $169.4 million for the various House officers and employees, including the Clerk of the House, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), 8 percent more than current funding, but 3 percent less than requested.

H.R. 2771 provides $21.1 million for joint House-Senate items, 13 percent less than current funding and 23 percent less than requested, when the recent June 8 supplemental request for the Capitol guides is taken into account. The appropriated amount includes $9.4 million for the Joint Committee on Taxation, 7 percent more than current funding.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 2771 provides a total of $1.9 billion for other offices and legislative branch agencies that directly or indirectly support congressional operations. This funding is $71.2 million (4 percent) more than current levels but $232.8 million (11 percent) less than requested. Among the agencies this bill funds are the Architect of the Capitol; the Capitol Police; the Library of Congress; the Government Printing Office, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Government Accountability Office.

For the Architect of the Capitol, the bill provides $348.4 million, 9 percent less than current funding and 12 percent less than requested. Included in the bill is $27.5 million for the Capital Visitors Center. I cite with particular approval that the bill renames the center's Great Hall as "Emancipation Hall" in remembrance of the slave labor that created this mighty edifice.

Earlier this week, the House passed H. Con. Res. 155, which recognized the historical significance of June 19, 1865, or "Juneteenth," the oldest known celebration of the ending of slavery. On June 19, 1865, Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, landed at Galveston, TX, with news that the war had ended and that all slaves were now free. But this was 2½ years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation—which had become official January 1, 1863.

Madam Chairman, I suppose it may just be another irony of life that the U.S. Capitol was rebuilt during the Civil War and completed around the time of Juneteenth. This magnificent symbol of democracy, freedom, and equality could not have been brought in to being without the blood and sweat and unrequited toil of slave labor. For much of our history the contributions to our country by slaves and their descendants has not been fully acknowledged. But in renaming the Great Hall to the Capitol Visitor Center as "Emancipation Hall," we begin to rectify this error. It is a wonderful thing we are doing.

The bill also provides $3.9 million to implement the "Green the Capitol" initiative, including $2.7 for shifting from coal to natural gas for heating in the Capitol power plant, and the report requires the House CAO to purchase carbon credits. The bill also requires the hiring of an inspector general.

The bill provides the Capitol Police $286 million, which is $13.1 million (4 percent) less than requested, but $20.3 million (8 percent) more than current funding. The Library of Congress is slated to receive $572.5 million, $63.8 million (13 percent) more than the current level, but $89.1 million (13 percent) less than requested. There is $125.8 million for the Government Printing Office; $37.8 million for the Congressional Budget Office (CBO); and $503.3 million in net funding for the Government Accountability Office (GAO). The bill does not contain any earmarks as defined under House rules.

To conclude, Madam Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 2771 because it makes the necessary investments for critical health and safety needs by funding security upgrades and addressing health and safety hazards. I support this legislation because it reflects the commitment by the new Democratic majority to increased oversight, accountability and fiscal responsibility.

I thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her fine work in bringing this exceptional legislation to the House floor where it should receive an overwhelmingly favorable vote.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, with the understanding that the distinguished Chair from Florida will close, I would like to yield myself 1 minute before yielding the balance of our time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

I congratulate our chairwoman for just working really hard, having a lot of hearings, digging in, learning a lot, and then finding a way to work together through the process, and I'm grateful.

Also, I want to say, with regard to the GAO issue and outside counsel, using outside counsel is actually commonplace; even the House itself has used it, the legislative branch agencies have used that. And then also to say about the greening of the Capitol issue, what we've heard today should remind us to use great caution because we are all for greening and environmental efficiency, but we need to be careful that the Congress itself is not a guinea pig to try a whole lot of things just to see how they work.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia, the former chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. KINGSTON.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thank you, Mr. WAMP. And I thank the Chair and congratulate both of you on your work for this bill.

I want to say, however, I do not support it. I am very disappointed that after the bill left the Appropriations Committee and went to the Rules Committee, a funny thing happened. All this transparency and all this promise of open government and open rules seemed to fade away in a dark corner room up on the third floor of this building, because there were 23 amendments offered, and yet only three of them were accepted.

We talk about bipartisanship and we talk about sunshine in the process, and yet this is the very bill that basically funds and perhaps even governs our own body, our own congressional branch, and yet it has the closed rule. And 20 amendments won't get the sunshine, will not get the debate because of the Rules Committee under Democrat leadership. I would say you need to go back to your campaign brochures and look at all the promises that you made before you pass another rule like this.

One of the casualties of this closed process was an amendment that I offered that deals with contractors who deal with the Federal Government, who work for the Federal Government. I'll give you some examples. December 2005, 22 Mexican nationals were found illegally working in Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque, New Mexico. January 27, 2001, illegal aliens were found working at Fort Benning, Georgia. March 2007, the Golden State Fence Company was actually fined because, in building a border security fence, they had hired 10 illegal aliens.

It doesn't stop there. In Louisiana, December 2005, a local company was busted working on a Veterans Administration hospital because they had illegal aliens. This is absurd. Now, I've heard from many people the theme of "leading by example." Perhaps one thing we could do and absolutely should do is require that if you are contracting for the Federal Government, that you have a Social Security verification process going in your business, more than the sham, more than the, Yeah, but we have an I–9 kind of approach that we're seeing. And this would actually say you need to be in the ICE, which is the Customs and Immigration Enforcement Service, you need to be in the ICE Basic Pilot Program, which is a way to know that your employees have correct and legal Social Security numbers. That's all the amendment would have done.

I would predict that this amendment would get lots of bipartisan support because we see that the biggest issue facing America, besides Iraq and perhaps energy, is the issue of illegal immigration. And here was an opportunity for us to make a definitive statement, to have a significant amendment added to the bill, and the Democrats said no.

I hope they'll reconsider on future legislation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I think it's unfortunate that the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished former chairman of this committee, has chosen this opportunity as a message opportunity, as opposed to working together in a bipartisan way, like the ranking member and I have done, to make sure that we can provide for the safety and security of the facilities of this institution.

He knows full well that the Capitol Visitors Center and the employees of the subcontractors that have been engaged to build that facility, while moving entirely too slowly, and we certainly have decried the cost overruns, are required to hire people who legally may work in this country and are required to ensure that a background check and a security check has been done on them. So his remarks are unfortunate, but everybody makes their own choices.

In conclusion, Madam Chair, I am really proud of the work that the subcommittee and I have engaged in. We offer this legislation to the House and ask for their support. We have endeavored to make sure that this bill is fiscally responsible, provides for the life, safety and security of the needs of the people who work here as well as the people who visit us here, and make sure that we can engage in Congress's oversight role and provide for accountability for the American people.

I look forward to continuing to work with Mr. WAMP from Tennessee on making sure that we can consistently

provide those initiatives for the American people.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chairman, I rise today to express concerns about GAO's response to GAO employees' petition for a union election, which was filed on May 8 of this year. As a legislative branch agency it is imperative that GAO conduct its labor relations in a manner that is a model for all Federal agencies.

I am particularly concerned by GAO's decision to challenge the eligibility of one-third of the employees covered by the union petition. GAO is asserting that these employees are not eligible for representation because they perform a supervisory role.

The facts of their employment status at GAO strongly suggests otherwise. If these employees are in fact determined to be supervisors, then they are supervisors in name only because they are prohibited from performing supervisory functions. Moreover, GAO would have a 1:3 ratio of supervisors to nonsupervisors. That would be one of the smallest ratios in any public or private organization.

I am deeply concerned that GAO's challenge is an attempt to delay balloting until the end of the year, one that will entail a considerable expenditure of resources that will only distract the agency from carrying out critical investigatory and oversight work for the U.S. Congress.

I strongly urge GAO to reconsider its challenge, which will be costly, undermine agency morale, and distract it from its mission.

Mr. WYNN. Madam Chairman, today I rise to express my concerns with Government Accountability Office, GAO, management's response to the GAO employees' petition seeking a union election.

It should be noted that applicable law strictly prohibits the GAO management from expressing any personal view, argument, opinion, or statements relating to a union election except to: publicize election and encourage employees to vote; correct the record with respect to any false or misleading statement; or inform employees of the Government's policy relating to labor-management relations and representation as long as these statements do contain a threat or reprisal or promise of benefit and are not made under coercive conditions.

Despite these restrictions, Comptroller General Walker was quoted in a January 23, 2007 publication as stating that he ''will present to the employees [his] views on the advantages and disadvantages of unionization.''

Shortly after this statement was published, attorneys for the union sent a letter advising Comptroller General Walker of his obligation to remain ''neutral'' during the employees' deliberations regarding unionization.

The GAO's General Counsel responded acknowledging GAO management's legal obligation to maintain strict neutrality during a union organizing campaign.

Further, the Comptroller General met with me shortly before I sent a letter to him regarding his response to the union organizing activities.

In that meeting, the Comptroller General tried to discourage me from sending the letter, and promised not to interfere with the unionization effort. I informed Mr. Walker that I appreciated his assurances but that would be sending the letter all the same.

I have the letter dated February 23rd of this year, and signed by a bipartisan group of 19 House Members and 3 Senators with me and wish to submit it for the RECORD.

I am sorry to say that despite these assurances, and since the union filed the election petition on May 8, 2007, the Comptroller General has made additional statements that are at odds with his obligation to remain neutral.

I am very concerned that I have received reports from GAO employees that Mr. Walker has used his staff meetings to make statements that are seen by employees as a breach of GAO management's neutrality obligation.

For example, they report that Mr. Walker has urged employees to ''get all the facts'', that a union could ''make things different . . . seriously impact agency decision-making'', and ''slow things down.''

He refers to the GAO employees who seek to form a union as a ''vocal minority in GAO'' and that ''[d]ue to union organizing efforts, labor law prevents [him] from helping employees unilaterally. Both of [my] hands are tied due to the union organizing efforts. . .''

By implication, Mr. Walker asserts that if employees reject union-representation, Mr. Walker will ''help'' them.

Mr. Walker's statements are not neutral. I find it hard to believe that GAO analysts need to be reminded to ''get all the facts'' and the very purpose of a union is to ''impact'' the employer's decision-making.

Further, it cannot be clearer that the reference to potentially ''slowing things down'' is intended as a negative reference about unionization.

I rise today not only to call on Mr. Walker to stop interfering with GAO employees' right to organize and petition for a union election, but to call on my colleagues to stand together with these GAO employees who serve Congress and the public.

Let us do all we can to help these dedicated public servants get a vote on their union election petition this summer.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to add my voice of support to our valued public servants at the Government Accountability Office, GAO. Just as Congress relies on the GAO for the gold standard of fair and even-handed analysis, so too must we ensure that our GAO workforce receives that same standard of fairness and even-handedness when it comes to matters of their own employment.

The issues that gave rise to the language in today's underlying Legislative Branch Appropriations bill are not new to the Government Oversight Committee on which I sit, or to the Federal employee community I am privileged to serve. Like many of my colleagues on the committee, I have received reports expressing concern about the process surrounding the recent Band II Restructuring Project, as well as the methodology used in the 2004 Watson Wyatt Worldwide, WWW, compensation study. In that regard, I am particularly troubled that the WWW study is being cited as the reason over 300 hard-working GAO employees who met or exceeded their performance expectations have been denied annual cost of living adjustments, notwithstanding public commitments to the contrary.

As a majority of GAO analysts have now exercised their employment rights to organize a union, it is critical that the requisite election process go forward expeditiously and without interference. I thank my colleagues for this opportunity to voice my support for the GAO workforce and the rest of our valued Federal employee community.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, I want to begin by taking the time to congratulate Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her excellent work on this bill as well as in the subcommittee the past couple of months. It has been a pleasure to work with you and I look forward to working with all other Members as we continue to address the concerns of all people working in and visiting the Nation's Capitol.

I would also like to commend Ranking Member WAMP for his work. Together the chairwoman and ranking member have fostered a collegial bipartisan atmosphere.

The bill before us is a good bill, a bill that brings us necessary security upgrades, that shows a commitment to increased oversight, and does it in a fiscally responsible manner.

Among the bill's many important provisions is funding for the Greening the Capitol Initiative. This initiative will enable us to start switching from coal to cleaner burning natural gas for the running of the Capitol powerplant. Pages live in the shadow of the Capitol powerplant. It will allow us to purchase energy efficient light bulbs, and will allow us to begin other energy savings operations throughout the Capitol Complex.

The bill includes necessary funding for the Office of Compliance, which will allow that office to conduct oversight of the utility tunnel improvement efforts and health and safety issues. During hearings in the subcommittee, I have raised concerns, along with several of my colleagues, about the utility tunnels and workers and I am pleased to see that the Office of Compliance will receive the resources it needs to oversee the ongoing situation.

This bill also includes funding for the Library of Congress and several of its extremely important programs, such as the Books for the Blind Program, which provides services to blind and physically handicapped patrons including the production and distribution of books and magazines in Braille and electronic media.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ranking Member WAMP for the efforts they have put in to the subcommittee this year to ensure that the Capitol Complex and various agencies around us are run well and efficiently.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2771

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, namely:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, $1,198,560,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, $23,648,000, including: Office of the

Speaker, $4,761,000, including $25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, $2,188,000, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, $4,090,000, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, $1,894,000, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, $1,420,000, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, $499,000; Republican Steering Committee, $943,000; Republican Conference, $1,631,000; Republican Policy Committee, $325,000; Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, $1,295,000; Democratic Caucus, $1,604,000; nine minority employees, $1,498,000; training and program development—majority, $290,000; training and program development—minority, $290,000; Cloakroom Personnel—majority, $460,000; and Cloakroom Personnel—minority, $460,000.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, $581,000,000.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, $133,000,000: *Provided,* That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2008.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, $29,800,000, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed: *Provided,* That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2008.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, $169,393,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not more than $13,000, of which not more than $10,000 is for the Family Room, for official representation and reception expenses, $22,881,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages, and including not more than $3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $7,024,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, $116,891,000, of which $6,269,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, $4,457,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Emergency Planning, Preparedness and Operations, $3,111,000, to remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, $1,202,000; for the Office of the Chaplain, $166,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian, $2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, and not more than $1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $1,828,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, $3,046,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, $7,406,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, $752,000; for other authorized employees, $170,000; and for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Historian, $459,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, $261,719,000, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, $3,688,000; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, $410,000; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, $237,410,000; supplies, materials, and other costs relating to the House portion of expenses for the Capitol Visitor Center, $2,308,000, to remain available until expended; Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery, $17,200,000, of which $5,408,000 shall remain available until expended; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, $703,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives Child Care Center, such amounts as are deposited in the account established by section 312(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (2 U.S.C. 2112), subject to the level specified in the budget of the Center, as submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. (a) REQUIRING AMOUNTS REMAINING IN MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES TO BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION OR TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts appropriated under this Act for ''HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES—MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES'' shall be available only for fiscal year 2008. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for fiscal year 2008 shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction (or, if there is no Federal budget deficit after all such payments have been made, for reducing the Federal debt, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''Member of the House of Representatives'' means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

SEC. 102. CONTRACT FOR EXERCISE FACILITY.—(a) Section 103(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 3175), is amended by striking ''private entity'' and inserting ''public or private entity''.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2005.

SEC. 103. DEPOSITS.—(a) The second sentence of section 101 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 (2 U.S.C. 117j) is amended by striking ''deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts'' and inserting ''deposited in the Treasury for credit to the account of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer''.

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 104. HOUSE SERVICES REVOLVING FUND.—(a) Section 105(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2005 (2 U.S.C. 117m(b)) is amended by striking ''the Chief Administrative Officer'' and inserting the following: ''the Chief Administrative Officer, including purposes relating to energy and water conservation and environmental activities carried out in buildings, facilities, and grounds under the Chief Administrative Officer's jurisdiction,''.

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 105. ADJUSTMENT.—The first sentence of section 5 of House Resolution 1238, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to December 22, 1970 (as enacted into permanent law by chapter VIII of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1971) (2 U.S.C. 31b–5), is amended by striking ''step 1 of level 6'' and inserting ''step 7 of level 11''.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, $4,398,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, $9,416,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including: (1) an allowance of $2,175 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of $725 per month each to four medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician; (3) an allowance of $725 per month to two assistants and $580 per month each not to exceed 11 assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and (4) $2,023,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, $2,820,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE AND SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office, $4,448,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the statements for the first session of the 110th Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriations bills as required by law, $30,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to supervise the work.

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For salaries of employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, and Government contributions for health, retirement, social security, professional liability insurance, and other applicable employee benefits, $224,500,000, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, the awards program, postage, communication services, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and not more than $5,000 to be expended on the certification of the Chief of the Capitol Police in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $61,500,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for a radio modernization program, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2008 shall be paid by the Secretary of Homeland Security from funds available to the Department of Homeland Security.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1001. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2008 for the Capitol Police may be transferred between the headings ''SALARIES'' and ''GENERAL EXPENSES'' upon the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 1002. EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 908 of the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2002 (2 U.S.C. 1926, Public Law 107–117; 115 Stat. 2319), as amended, is further amended in subsection (c) by striking ''$40,000'' and inserting ''$60,000''.

SEC. 1003. ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Capitol Police is authorized to make advanced payments for obligations when it has been determined that making such payments is in the best interest of the government.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), $3,806,000, of which $780,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance may, within the limits of available appropriations, dispose of surplus or obsolete personal property by interagency transfer, donation, or discarding: *Provided further*, That not more than $500 may be expended on the certification of the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance in connection with official representation and reception expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1101. LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS.—(a) The Executive Director of the Office of Compliance shall have the authority to make lump-sum payments to reward exceptional performance by an employee or a group of employees.

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2007.

SEC. 1102. TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR PERSONNEL. (a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 4122. Training for employees of the Office of Compliance

''(a) The Executive Director of the Office of Compliance may, by regulation, make applicable such provisions of this chapter as the Executive Director determines necessary to provide for training of employees of the Office of Compliance. The regulations shall provide for training which, in the determination of the Executive Director, is consistent with the training provided by agencies under the preceding sections of this chapter.

''(b) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall provide the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance with such advice and assistance as the Executive Director may request in order to enable the Executive Director to carry out the purposes of this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 4122 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

''4122. Training for employees of the Office of Compliance.''.

SEC. 1103. REIMBURSEMENT.—(a) Section 415 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1415) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—

''(1) NOTIFICATION OF PAYMENTS MADE FROM ACCOUNT.—As soon as practicable after the Executive Director is made aware that a payment of an award or settlement under this chapter has been made from the account described in subsection (a), the Executive Director shall notify the head of the office to which the payment is attributable that the payment has been made, and shall include in the notification a statement of the amount of the payment.

''(2) REIMBURSEMENT BY OFFICE.—Not later than 180 days after receiving a notification from the Executive Director under paragraph (1), the head of the office involved shall transfer to the account described in subsection (a), out of any funds available for operating expenses of the office, a payment equal to the amount specified in the notification.''.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to payments made under section 415 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary for operation of the Congressional Budget Office, including not more than $4,000 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $37,805,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for surveys and studies in connection with activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol; for all necessary expenses for the general and administrative support of the operations under the Architect of the Capitol including the Botanic Garden; electrical substations of the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol; including furnishings and office equipment; including not more than $5,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle, $81,733,000, of which $400,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

CAPITOL BUILDING

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol, $24,567,000, of which $8,790,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, $9,310,000, of which $500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, $66,151,000, of which $25,400,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, $83,017,000, of which $4,945,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012: *Provided*, That not more than $8,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2008.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, $31,638,000, of which $10,140,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

CAPITOL POLICE BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, AND SECURITY

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of buildings, grounds and security enhancements of the United States Capitol Police, wherever located, the Alternate Computer Facility, and AOC security operations, $16,109,000, of which $2,500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

BOTANIC GARDEN

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, $8,310,000: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, the Architect may obligate and expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance, care and operation of the National Garden established under section 307E of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 2146), upon vouchers approved by the Architect or a duly authorized designee.

CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

For an additional amount for the Capitol Visitor Center project, $20,000,000 to remain available until expended, and in addition, $7,545,000 for Capitol Visitor Center operation costs: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol may not obligate any of the funds which are made available for the Capitol Visitor Center project without an obligation plan approved by the Committees on

Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1201. ROSA PARKS STATUE.—(a) Section 1(a) of Public Law 109–116 (2 U.S.C. 2131a note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Joint Committee may authorize the Architect of the Capitol to enter into the agreement required under this subsection on its behalf, under such terms and conditions as the Joint Committee may require.''.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of Public Law 109–116.

SEC. 1202. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—There is established in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol the Office of the Inspector General, headed by the Inspector General of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Inspector General'').

(b) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Inspector General shall be appointed by the Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of integrity and demonstrated ability in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, or investigations.

(2) TERM OF SERVICE.—The Inspector General shall serve for a term of 5 years, and an individual serving as Inspector General may be reappointed for not more than 2 additional terms.

(3) REMOVAL.—The Inspector General may be removed from office prior to the expiration of his term only by the Architect of the Capitol. Upon such removal, the Architect shall promptly communicate the reasons for the removal in writing to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(4) SALARY.—The Inspector General shall be paid at an annual rate equal to $1,500 less than the annual rate of pay in effect for the Architect of the Capitol.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) APPLICABILITY OF DUTIES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH ESTABLISHMENT.—The Inspector General shall carry out the same duties and responsibilities with respect to the Architect of the Capitol as an Inspector General of an establishment carries out with respect to an establishment under section 4 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 4), under the same terms and conditions which apply under such section.

(2) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—The Inspector General shall prepare and submit semiannual reports summarizing the activities of the Office of the Inspector General in the same manner, and in accordance with the same deadlines, terms, and conditions, as an Inspector General of an establishment under section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 5). For purposes of applying section 5 of such Act to the Inspector General, the Architect of the Capitol shall be considered the head of the establishment.

(3) INVESTIGATIONS OF COMPLAINTS OF EMPLOYEES.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—The Inspector General may receive and investigate complaints or information from an employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol concerning the possible existence of an activity constituting a violation of law, rules, or regulations, or mismanagement, gross waste of funds, abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to the public health and safety.

(B) NONDISCLOSURE.—The Inspector General shall not, after receipt of a complaint or information from an employee, disclose the identity of the employee without the consent of the employee, unless the Inspector General determines such disclosure is unavoidable during the course of the investigation.

(C) PROHIBITING RETALIATION.—An employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority, take or threaten to take any action against any employee as a reprisal for making a complaint or disclosing information to the Inspector General, unless the complaint was made or the information disclosed with the knowledge that it was false or with willful disregard for its truth or falsity.

(4) INDEPENDENCE IN CARRYING OUT DUTIES.—Neither the Architect of the Capitol nor any other employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol may prevent or prohibit the Inspector General from carrying out any of the duties or responsibilities assigned to the Inspector General under this section.

(d) POWERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General may exercise the same authorities with respect to the Architect of the Capitol as an Inspector General of an establishment may exercise with respect to an establishment under section 6(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 6(a)), other than paragraphs (7) and (8) of such section.

(2) STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General may appoint and fix the pay of such personnel as the Inspector General considers appropriate. Such personnel may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, regarding appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no personnel of the Office (other than the Inspector General) may be paid at an annual rate greater than $500 less than the annual rate of pay of the Inspector General under subsection (b)(4).

(B) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Inspector General may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title.

(C) INDEPENDENCE IN APPOINTING STAFF.—No individual may carry out any of the duties or responsibilities of the Office unless the individual is appointed by the Inspector General, or provides services procured by the Inspector General, pursuant to this paragraph. Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to prohibit the Inspector General from entering into a contract or other arrangement for the provision of services under this section.

(D) APPLICABILITY OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL PERSONNEL RULES.—None of the regulations governing the appointment and pay of employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol shall apply with respect to the appointment and compensation of the personnel of the Office, except to the extent agreed to by the Inspector General. Nothing in the previous sentence may be construed to affect subparagraphs (A) through (C).

(3) EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES.—The Architect of the Capitol shall provide the Office with appropriate and adequate office space, together with such equipment, supplies, and communications facilities and services as may be necessary for the operation of the Office, and shall provide necessary maintenance services for such office space and the equipment and facilities located therein.

(e) TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.—

(1) TRANSFER.—To the extent that any office or entity in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol prior to the appointment of the first Inspector General under this section carried out any of the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Inspector General under this section, the functions of such office or entity shall be transferred to the Office upon the appointment of the first Inspector General under this section.

(2) NO REDUCTION IN PAY OR BENEFITS.—The transfer of the functions of an office or entity to the Office under paragraph (1) may not result in a reduction in the pay or benefits of any employee of the office or entity, except to the extent required under subsection (d)(2)(A).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1203. FLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULES.—For purposes of subchapter II of chapter 61 of title 5, United States Code, during fiscal year 2008 the Office of the Architect of the Capitol shall be treated as an agency under section 6121(1) of such title.

SEC. 1204. TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION.—(a) Section 5721 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (G) and (H) as subparagraphs (H) and (I); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following new subparagraph:

''(G) the Architect of the Capitol;''.

(b) Section 521(1)(B) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8241(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''(B) through (H)'' and inserting ''(B) through (I)''.

SEC. 1205. EASEMENTS.—(a) Subject to subsection (e), the Architect of the Capitol may grant easements upon such terms and conditions as he considers advisable (including the payment of monetary consideration) for rights-of-way over, in, and upon the grounds of the United States Capitol or the grounds of any other facility under the jurisdiction and control of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol to any person for—

(1) railroad tracks;

(2) gas, water, sewer, and oil pipe lines;

(3) substations for electric power transmission lines and pumping stations for gas, water, sewer, and oil pipe lines;

(4) canals;

(5) ditches;

(6) flumes;

(7) tunnels;

(8) roads and streets;

(9) poles and lines for the transmission or distribution of electric power;

(10) poles and lines for the transmission or distribution of communications signals (including telephone and telegraph signals) and structures and facilities for the transmission, reception, and relay of such signals; and

(11) any other purpose that the Architect considers advisable.

(b)(1) No easement granted under this section may include more land than is necessary for the easement.

(2) In lieu of, or in addition to, any monetary consideration provided in exchange for granting of an easement under this section, the Architect may accept in-kind consideration with respect to the easement for—

(A) maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvement, or restoration (including environmental restoration) of property or facilities which are subject to or affected by the easement;

(B) construction or acquisition of new facilities;

(C) provision of other property or facilities;

(D) support for facilities operation; and

(E) provision of such other services as the Architect considers appropriate.

(c)(1) There is established in the Treasury a special account for the Architect of the Capitol into which the Architect shall deposit all of the funds which are paid as consideration for the granting of easements under this section, and all other proceeds received pursuant to the granting of easements under this section.

(2) Subject to paragraph (3), amounts in the special account established under this subsection shall be available to the Architect, in such amounts provided in appropriations acts, for the following purposes:

(A) The maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvement, or restoration (including environmental restoration) of property or facilities.

(B) The construction or acquisition of new facilities.

(C) Support for facilities operation.

(3) Any amount paid as consideration for the granting of an easement, or received pursuant to the granting of an easement, which is deposited in the special account established under this subsection may not be used by the Architect for any purpose which is not related to the same property or facility over which the easement was granted unless such use is approved—

(A) in the case of an amount paid as consideration for the granting of an easement with respect to property under the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives, by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(B) in the case of an amount paid as consideration for the granting of an easement with respect to property under the jurisdiction of the Senate, by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(C) in the case of an amount paid as consideration for the granting of an easement with respect to any other property, by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Architect of the Capitol may terminate all or part of any easement granted under this section for—

(1) failure to comply with the terms and conditions under which the easement was granted;

(2) nonuse of the easement for a two-year period; or

(3) abandonment of the easement.

(e) The Architect of the Capitol may grant an easement under this section upon submission of written notice of the intent to grant the easement (including notice of the amount or type of consideration to be received in exchange for granting the easement) to, and approval of the notice by—

(1) in the case of an easement proposed to be granted with respect to property under the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives, the House Office Building Commission;

(2) in the case of an easement proposed to be granted with respect to property under the jurisdiction of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate;

(3) in the case of an easement proposed to be granted with respect to any other property, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the House Office Building Commission; and

(4) in the case of an easement proposed to be granted with respect to any other property, the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(f) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 1206. DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACTS.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Architect of the Capitol may use the two-phase selection procedures authorized in section 303M of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253m) for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work in the same manner and under the same terms and conditions as the head of an executive agency under such section.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 1207. ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—During fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year, the Architect of the Capitol may make payments in advance for obligations of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol for subscription services if the Architect determines it to be more prompt, efficient, or economical to do so.

SEC. 1208. CASUALTY AND OTHER INSURANCE FOR EXHIBITS AND WORKS OF ART.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Architect of the Capitol may use funds made available to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol during a fiscal year to acquire insurance against the loss of or damage to any exhibit or work of art which is loaned or leased to the Architect for the United States Capitol, the Capitol Visitor Center, or the Botanic Garden.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 1209. CVC MAINTENANCE.—Any expenses for the maintenance of the Capitol Visitor Center shall be treated as expenses for the maintenance of the Capitol under the heading ''Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Building'', and shall be subject to the same financial management and reporting requirements applicable to amounts under such heading.

SEC. 1210. LEASING AUTHORITY.—(a) Section 1102(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2004 (2 U.S.C. 1822(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Committee on Rules and Administration'' and inserting ''Committees on Appropriations and Rules and Administration'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the House Office Building Commission'' and inserting ''the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the House Office Building Commission''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', for space to be leased for any other entity under subsection (a).''.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2004.

SEC. 1211. (a) The great hall of the Capitol Visitor Center shall be known and designated as ''Emancipation Hall'', and any reference to the hall in any law, rule, or regulation shall be deemed to be a reference to Emancipation Hall.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Library's catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, $401,000,000, of which not more than $6,000,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2008, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150) and not more than $350,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2008 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database and activities related thereto: *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $6,350,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $16,451,000 shall remain available until expended for the partial acquisition of books, periodicals, newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including $40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than $12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $4,010,000 shall remain available until expended for the digital collections and educational curricula program: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $600,000 shall remain available until expended, and shall be transferred to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission for carrying out the purposes of Public Law 106–173, of which $10,000 may be used for official representation and reception expenses of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $6,500,000 shall remain available until expended for the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, $49,827,000, of which not more than $29,826,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2008 under section 708(d) of title 17, United States Code: *Provided*, That $10,000,000 shall be derived from prior year unobligated balances: *Provided further*, That the Copyright Office may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under such section, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That not more than $4,398,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2008 under sections 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 803(e), 1005, and 1316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections and unobligated balances are less than $44,224,000: *Provided further*, That not more than $100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an ''International Copyright Institute'' in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for

the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than $4,250 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute and for copyright delegations, visitors, and seminars: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of chapter 8 of title 17, United States Code, any amounts made available under this heading which are attributable to royalty fees and payments received by the Copyright Office pursuant to sections 111, 119, and chapter 10 of such title may be used for the costs incurred in the administration of the Copyright Royalty Judges program, with the exception of the costs of salaries and benefits for the Copyright Royalty Judges and staff under section 802(e).

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, $104,518,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), $67,741,000, of which $20,704,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, $650,000 shall remain available until expended for telecommunications services for the blind.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1301. INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM.—Of the amounts appropriated to the Library of Congress in this Act, not more than $5,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the incentive awards program.

SEC. 1302. REIMBURSABLE AND REVOLVING FUND ACTIVITIES. (a) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2008, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed $122,529,000.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

(c) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—During fiscal year 2008, the Librarian of Congress may temporarily transfer funds appropriated in this Act, under the heading ''LIBRARY OF CONGRESS'' under the subheading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' to the revolving fund for the FEDLINK Program and the Federal Research Program established under section 103 of the Library of Congress Fiscal Operations Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–481; 2 U.S.C. 182c): *Provided*, That the total amount of such transfers may not exceed $1,900,000: *Provided further*, That the appropriate revolving fund account shall reimburse the Library for any amounts transferred to it before the period of availability of the Library appropriation expires.

SEC. 1303. AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—Section 207(e) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1998 (2 U.S.C. 182(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) AUDIT.—The revolving fund shall be subject to audit by the Comptroller General at the Comptroller General's discretion.''.

SEC. 1304. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2008 for the Library of Congress may be transferred between any of the headings for which the amounts are appropriated upon the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (section 902 of title 44, United States Code); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, $87,892,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under section 906 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 2-year limitation under section 718 of title 44, United States Code, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act or any other Act for printing and binding and related services provided to Congress under chapter 7 of title 44, United States Code, may be expended to print a document, report, or publication after the 27-month period beginning on the date that such document, report, or publication is authorized by Congress to be printed, unless Congress reauthorizes such printing in accordance with section 718 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, $35,434,000: *Provided*, That amounts of not more than $2,000,000 from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 to depository and other designated libraries: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

For payment to the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund, $2,450,000 for workforce retraining and restructuring, information technology development, infrastructure, and facilities repair: *Provided*, That the Government Printing Office may make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided further*, That not more than $5,000 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than 12 passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings ''OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS'' and ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' may not be used for contracted security services at the GPO passport facility.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Government Accountability Office, including not more than $12,500 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with section 3324 of title 31, United States Code; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), (6), and (8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), (6), and (8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries, $503,328,000: *Provided*, That not more than $5,413,000 of payments received under section 782 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for use in fiscal year 2008: *Provided further*, That not more than $2,097,000 of reimbursements received under section 9105 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for use in fiscal year 2008: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided $2,500,000 shall remain available until expended for technology assessment studies: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall

be available to finance an appropriate share of either Forum's costs as determined by the respective Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants: *Provided further,* That payments hereunder to the Forum may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 1401. ANNUITY OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—(a) Section 772 of title 31, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) Title 31, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In section 735(a), by striking ''772, 775(a) and (d)'' and inserting ''or 775(b)''.

(2) In the second sentence of section 773(a), by striking ''or, if an election is made'' and all that follows and inserting a period.

(3) In section 774(b)(2), by striking ''or while receiving an annuity under section 772 of this title''.

(4) In section 775—

(A) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (a) through (d);

(B) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking ''sections 772 and 773'' and inserting ''section 773'', and

(ii) by striking ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)'';

(C) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subsection (c) or (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (a) or (b)''; and

(D) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking ''sections 772 and 773'' and inserting ''section 773'', and

(ii) by striking ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''.

(5) In section 776(d)(1), by striking ''section 775(d)'' and inserting ''section 775(b)''.

(6) In section 777(b), by striking the first sentence.

(c) The table of sections for subchapter V of chapter 7 of subtitle I of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 772.

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any individual who is appointed as Comptroller General after the date of the enactment of this Act.

OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND

For a payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund for financing activities of the Open World Leadership Center under section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), $6,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 1501. (a) TRANSFER OF OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE.—On October 1, 2008, there shall be transferred (1) to the Department of State, the Open World Leadership Center established by section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151) and all functions, personnel, assets, and obligations of the Center; and (2) to the Secretary of State, all authority of the Board of Trustees and the Library of Congress under such section 313.

(b) MAINTENANCE AS DISTINCT ENTITY.—Following the transfer under subsection (a), the Open World Leadership Center shall be maintained as a distinct entity within the Department of State and, except as otherwise provided in this section, the provisions of section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151) shall continue to apply to the Center.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of State shall consult with the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center to plan and implement the transfer required by subsection (a).

JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund established under section 116 of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1105), $430,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. MAINTENANCE AND CARE OF PRIVATE VEHICLES.—No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 202. FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION.—No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2008 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

SEC. 203. RATES OF COMPENSATION AND DESIGNATION.—Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 (46 Stat. 32 et seq.) is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided,* That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 204. CONSULTING SERVICES.—The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued under existing law.

SEC. 205. AWARDS AND SETTLEMENTS.—Such sums as may be necessary are appropriated to the account described in subsection (a) of section 415 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1415(a)) to pay awards and settlements as authorized under such subsection.

SEC. 206. COSTS OF LBFMC.—Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed $2,000.

SEC. 207. LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE.—The Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the District of Columbia, is authorized to maintain and improve the landscape features, excluding streets and sidewalks, in the irregular shaped grassy areas bounded by Washington Avenue, SW on the northeast, Second Street SW on the west, Square 582 on the south, and the beginning of the I–395 tunnel on the southeast.

SEC. 208. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

This Act may be cited as the ''Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008''.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 110–201. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. INGLIS OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110–201.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase light bulbs unless the light bulbs have the ''ENERGY STAR'' or ''Federal Energy Management Program'' designation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 502, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I thank the gentlelady.

I rise with the support of several Members of this amendment. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the gentlelady from California (Ms. HARMAN), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and I are offering an amendment that would require that light bulbs purchased in the Leg Branch appropriations would comply with the ENERGY STAR and Federal Energy Management Program identifications. The idea here is to save some money easily and to save a lot of energy, and of course energy is money.

Most Americans are still using, and most of the light bulbs in my house are incandescent bulbs that Thomas Edison invented more than 100 years ago. But only 10 percent of the energy of those light bulbs turns out to be light; 90 percent is wasted as heat. So we've got something better. And like many, I'm switching to CFLs. Those lights provide much more efficient lighting. And it's amazing to think that if every American just switched one incandescent bulb to an energy-efficient alternative, we would collectively save more than $8 billion in energy costs, prevent the burning of 300 billion pounds of coal, and remove 2 million cars' worth of greenhouse gas emissions from our atmosphere.

This small step in this amendment is part of something else that Mr. LIPINSKI and I are working on, which is a Bulb Replacement in Government and High Efficiency Technology, BRIGHT we call it, Energy Savings Act, along with Representative HARMAN, that would require GSA to replace burned out light bulbs with more efficient options like compact fluorescent lighting.

The BRIGHT Act has 82 cosponsors, and we look forward to its adoption. This amendment is a good step toward that goal.

Madam Chair, I am happy to yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and commend him for the role that he is playing on a bipartisan basis to assure that existing standards, the ENERGY STAR standards and the Federal Energy Management Program standards are adhered to. This effort that we're making on every appropriations bill will ensure that our practice complies with our law.

I agree with him that CFLs offer much more efficiency. There are also LEDs. And hopefully the incandescent bulb makers in America will adjust their own manufacturing so that they produce efficient light bulbs as well.

Another bill that we're all cosponsoring that's pending in the Energy Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce will provide incentives to U.S. manufacturers to produce more efficient lighting and set proper goals.

Finally, I want to say that bipartisanship has been hailed all morning. It takes 270 Members of Congress and 60 Members of the Senate and hopefully one willing President to change the light bulb policy, and I think we're proceeding that way this morning.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. I would just like to compliment the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. HARMAN. We are seeing efforts move. And we've learned already that if everyone did this across the country, we would save 65 billion kilowatts of energy, which is the equivalent of 80 coal-fired plants. Obviously this is something we want the Federal Government to do.

I compliment Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member LEWIS on the floor for allowing us to proceed without a lot of debate, knowing that we have strong support for this. I look forward to having this adopted.

Mr. WAMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. I just want to commend the authors, commend the ENERGY STAR Program. This is the kind of greening initiative that actually resonates. We will accept the amendment.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Chair, we appreciate very much the committee's willingness to accept this amendment. It is a good step forward.

Mr. MICA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chair, I'm pleased to see we're doing something about this, but the Members should be aware of the procedure in the House of trying to change a light bulb. I tried to change one. It took filling out forms. This is to get an energy efficient one. Then two people appeared several days later, one with a form, one with a light bulb; an incredible waste of time, energy and taxpayer money to put in one fluorescent light bulb. I hope the procedure improves in the House.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman. I certainly hope that we can improve that procedure.

In the meantime, we're improving the bulbs, making us more energy efficient here in the Capitol, and hopefully throughout these appropriations bills in this season.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition even though I am supportive of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, very briefly, I fully support this amendment and appreciate the bipartisan cooperation that was endeavored in moving it forward.

I do want to express some concern about how the light bulbs will be adapted to the historical lighting that we have in this facility, in the Capitol complex.

I look forward to working with the sponsors of the amendment as we move this legislation through conference to ensure that that occurs.

Ms. HARMAN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. We do have language in our bill that I just described, the one pending in the Energy and Commerce Committee to exempt historical lighting from the new goals. Hopefully we can invent light bulbs for historical lighting that are more efficient too, but we're trying to be reasonable here.

In response to earlier comments by Mr. PETERSON, the goal is to help the domestic industry be able to produce efficient lighting. And the goal is also to set tough enough standards so that we save the enormous amount of energy that Mr. UPTON was just mentioning.

Mr. UPTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. We just want to be on the record for this. Working with the Parliamentarians to make sure that the amendment is germane, we were not able to use the words ''or equivalent'' when we said ''ENERGY STAR or equivalent.'' We would like to see that happen in the conference, but we know that that is legislating on an appropriation bill.

We would also like to have a provision for historical lighting. Again, that needs to happen in conference, it cannot happen on the House floor, and that's why we proceeded in that way. We look forward to working with all parties to make sure those concerns are addressed.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Reclaiming my time, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I think that, as Ms. HARMAN just pointed out and as the Chair of the committee has pointed out, there are some issues involving the aesthetics. You've got to choose the right light bulb, that's for sure. We've heard some discussion this morning about how they glow moon glow, or whatever. Well, if you pick the wrong kind, they do glow moon glow. I've got some in my garage, and it's a really freaky kind of look in there. But I've got some in the house that look yellow and nice.

So you've got to pick the right bulbs. And of course in the historical context we have to pick the right bulbs. And we do have to deal with the recycling of these. Just like we don't have a sufficient program for recycling lead batteries around, we toss those in the trash, we have a problem with the mercury in these. But we can get there. We start by saving an awful lot of money and a lot of energy.

□ 1200

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Chairman, I did not mention earlier and would like to say that the Speaker's initiative, her Green Initiative, does also address this issue of trying to move away from inefficient incandescent bulbs. One more time, our goal would be to make incandescent bulbs, as well as other bulbs, more efficient.

We are not choosing winners in this effort. But surely, everyone must understand that it takes 18 seconds to change a light bulb. This is something all of us can do quite quickly, except you have to comply with the House procedures that we just heard about.

I am very excited about the notion that we are setting an example in this House and in this Congress about more efficient lighting.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues and Mr. WAMP as we move through the conference process and commend them, as well as Speaker

PELOSI, for including the shifting from the light bulbs we use now to energy-efficient and environmentally friendly light bulbs as part of the initiative of the greening of the Capitol.

I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110–201.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

In the item relating to ''Government Printing Office—Congressional Printing and Binding'', insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $3,200,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 502, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

I brought with me today a stack of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. All of us are familiar with these. We used to use them quite a bit, but today not so much. Today most of us just simply go on the computer and have a searchable version that is much faster, searchable back to 1989. With the click of a button, you can find what you are looking for. So we don't use these as much. Unfortunately, we haven't caught up with the times.

These are just a few of the thousands and thousands that are delivered that are never read. This was just from one office, the Legislative Research Center in the Cannon Building near my office. These are those that are just going to be thrown away today. One office that collects a few of these will throw these away just today.

This year alone these records will cost the American taxpayer over $25 million. Recently my office did an informal survey of about 100 offices. We went in and said, ''What do you do with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that comes?'' Virtually all of them, nearly every one of those 100 offices, said, ''We throw them away. We wish they would stop delivering them.'' We had some offices say that they had requested that they stop being delivered. They are still delivered.

So they stack up. They are thrown away. They fill up landfills. I believe the figure is something like 57 tons of paper each year are thrown away just here.

Before the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was put on line, as I mentioned, they were useful, but they are not now. We obviously do have to have some paper copies. We simply don't need so many.

Our amendment would simply do this, and I should add, this amendment was offered by myself and Mr. BLUMENAUER 2 years ago and was accepted by the then majority. It was simply taken out in the conference. I think we would do well to accept it again today.

This amendment would simply save $3.2 million annually by instructing the Government Printing Office to print only half as many copies. Today only 5,600 are printed. Half would do us just fine. That amendment would not reduce the funding for preparation, data collection or other aspects of the RECORD. It would simply reduce the ink-and-paper copies for half of what we print. So those who might oppose this amendment might say that it is going to cut deep and cut personal and others. It won't as long as fewer records are printed. The costs will go down.

This is simply a good way to save taxpayer money. It will show the country that we are interested ourselves in cleaning up our own house, making sure that we move ahead in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. WAMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman.

You know, when we were in the majority, we supported and accepted this approach. I believe this is part, or should be part, of the Speaker's Green the Capitol Initiative. This is a lot of trees. It is a space efficiency issue. They are storing all this paper. It is a government efficiency issue.

Why don't we, Madam Chair, just accept this amendment, as we have in previous years, address this issue in conference, move right along and get Members on their way this afternoon?

I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. I certainly support it.

Mr. FLAKE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment for a number of reasons.

While I support the gentleman, who is from the same generation that I am, in his endeavor to make sure that we can communicate and receive information in an electronic format, the approach that the gentleman is taking is absolutely inappropriate and won't accomplish his goal.

We have crafted a tight and fiscally responsible bill. As I outlined in general debate, we have held the bill to a 4.1 percent increase. We actually held it to $276 million below the total request.

In their traditional views, the minority agreed. They said that, on balance, the funding provided in this bill to operate the legislative branch agencies is fiscally responsible. This amendment would add to existing shortfalls. It would add to what is already a growing funding shortfall in this account.

To be fiscally responsible, we have had to make some tough choices, including funding levels for GPO. The bill already, our colleagues should know, holds congressional printing and binding $62,000 below what was provided in fiscal year 2007. GPO is expecting an $8 million shortfall in this account in fiscal year 2007 in addition to a $3 million shortfall in fiscal year 2006. These shortfalls are due to the flat funding provided to this account since fiscal year 2007, in spite of increasing costs and workloads. These shortfalls will continue in fiscal year 2008. Eventually they are going to have to be paid.

This amendment would make that situation even worse. Most of the appropriation for congressional printing and binding goes towards Congress' printing requirements. I want to point out that the gentleman is incorrect when he states that there is a statute. While there is a statutory number in the Code that the GPO is told to print, they only print the number that is requisitioned. In other words, they only print, on a daily basis, the number that they are asked for. We have a deficit in the account that allows them to print the number that is asked for. GPO has no control over those requirements. It's required by law to produce the information.

If the gentleman is concerned about the number of printed materials being produced, he should take it up with the authorizing committee, the Joint Committee on Printing, and seek reductions in the amount of material that GPO is required to print in the Code.

Simply gratuitously cutting out and leaving people with the impression that we are doing something, when we are not, and all we are doing here is cutting $3.2 million when GPO will still be required to print the Code, is the wrong approach. The suggestion that this amendment was accepted previously but then cut out in conference also leads people to believe that we have done something when we have not.

I refuse to be disingenuous when it comes to being forthright with the American people. We do need to make sure that in the future the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is produced electronically. This is not the right way to do it. It is irresponsible. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. May I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman controls 1½ minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Before yielding 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon, let me point out, here is the Code. The Code states that we are supposed to print 30,000 a day, yet we only print 5,600. So, it is not the case that the GPO has to follow what the statute says. They are

required to do by demand. And they already do under; they can simply do less and save a lot of money.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the opportunity to join with my colleague again in this effort to try and reduce this output. I respect my friend, the chairwoman of the subcommittee, but I do think it is time for us to take a more aggressive action to reduce what is a gratuitous waste of resources and is a signal, I think, for us all to find ways to be able to deal with the electronic era.

This is a holdover. We have attempted in the past to be able to scale it down. I have also checked with legislative counsel to find out what we need to repeal. But I have been told that simply by enacting our amendment today, we will, in fact, achieve that objective in terms of reducing the number of unnecessary printed copies.

□ 1215

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I just want to point out that the amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE does not say anything about reducing the number of copies printed of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It simply cuts $3.2 million out of the Congressional Printing and Binding account. It provides no direction. It simply cuts that funding. There is no assumption that any of what the gentleman is suggesting would occur. It would simply further add to the deficit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Will the gentlelady yield, since I am out of time?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I believe the gentleman has his own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. How much time do I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman controls 1½ minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you. I appreciate the courtesy.

Let me point out, just as with any program that is not an entitlement, everything is subject to appropriation. The Government Printing Office is not bound, no pun intended, to print as many copies as they think they need. They can print as many as they have money for. We were very careful in taking $3.2 million, to take only the printing costs for half of the number that are printed already. I think that is reasonable.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I really believe that we should approach this in the appropriate way. If we want to change the statute and go to electronic production of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that is what we should do. We should not simply hamstring the GPO by requiring them to print a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and not ensuring they have adequate funds to do that, when they are already in a deficit situation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple: by instructing the Government Printing Office (GPO) to print half the number of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS daily, we will save $3.2 million in taxpayer dollars and 57 tons of paper annually.

An unofficial survey of House offices revealed that many swiftly discard their daily copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And why shouldn't they? The full, easily searchable text of the RECORD is available online back to the year 1989. As electronic viewing of this resource becomes more widespread, we must continue to adjust the number of printed copies accordingly. In fact, since 1995 we have reduced the number of daily printed CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS from 18,000 to 5,600 per day.

We have an opportunity to save millions of dollars by taking advantage of paperless technology and pushing House operations into the 21st Century. I commend Speaker PELOSI in her recent effort to "Green the Capitol" and this is a common-sense amendment that is consistent with that initiative.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110–201.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION.—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 4 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 502, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the Chair.

I want to thank the Chair of the committee and the ranking member for their good work and the committee's work. I know for the Chair in particular, I want to congratulate her on the first bill coming through her subcommittee, a very important subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. So I appreciate the fine work done there and the oversight of the visitors center. The passion with which the ranking member spoke about Emancipation Hall I thought was right on target. So I appreciate the work done.

This amendment, just like the amendment I offered last night to the Foreign Operations bill, simply says this: instead of increasing spending by 4 percent, let's hold the line. I articulated reasons last night in the long debate that this body had over why that is appropriate, why that makes sense. Because there is in fact a crisis looming for this country if we don't get control of the spending here in the United States Congress, in the United States Senate and the United States Government.

It is important that we recognize that. I articulated last night too, don't take my word for it. Yesterday's Washington Post talked about this growing problem that is coming in the very near future, and it is important we understand that.

I won't go through all the arguments again here, because I know we have had a long debate and people want to get on their way and get back to their district.

I will just say this: ever-increasing spending inevitably leads to ever-increasing taxes. The American families, the American people are overtaxed because our government spends too much. It has been a problem for both parties. We need to get it under control.

Millions of families, millions of families across this country are going to live on last year's budget. It is not too much to ask the United States Government, in particular the United States Congress, to do the same.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, this is a fiscally responsible bill. Again, we have held the bill to a 4.1 percent increase, only $122 million over actual spending in fiscal year 2007, and if you take into consideration the $50 million rescission in the CR, we are at a 2.3 percent increase. That is $276 million below the total budget request.

Again, I want to point to the minority views, where the minority agreed this bill is fiscally responsible. They say, "On balance, the funding provided in this bill to operate the legislative branch agencies is fiscally responsible."

This bill funds the must-have's, not the nice-to-have's, by targeting increases towards keeping the agencies running, providing Congress with the tools it needs to perform its oversight responsibility, and funding critical security and life safety projects.

The amendment, if adopted, would eliminate $50 million worth of critical health and safety and security projects that we would be unable to fund if a 4 percent across-the-board reduction were adopted.

This amendment would eliminate funding for things like the $5 million we have in this bill to ensure that the Capitol Police have interoperable radios. According to the new police chief, a new radio system is their number one priority. The existing radio system is 20 years old. It is antiquated and outdated. It is not encrypted nor secure, and it is not interoperable. Hurricane Katrina showed the importance of interoperable communications during a crisis.

It also would eliminate funding potentially monitoring the utility tunnel abatement. We had tunnel workers who were subjected to horrendous conditions and have been exposed to asbestos, and we are endeavoring to make sure that we can make up for that and provide the funding for the abatement. That would be impossible if this amendment were adopted.

We provide $1.2 million for escape hoods for our Library visitors, $1 million for emergency exit signs and lighting in the capital, and emergency lighting upgrades in Rayburn.

The amendment would also impair our agency's work. It would put the legislative branch agencies back to a fiscal year 2006 funding level since there was no increase in 2007.

In practical terms, the impact of this would be less capability on the part of GAO to assist Congress in its oversight responsibilities; fewer and less timely products from CRS to assist Members in their legislative duties, a further reduction in CBO's ability to score Member bills, which was pointed out in the Rules Committee as already being a problem; elimination of the digital talking book conversion program for the blind; a reduced ability for the Office of Compliance to pursue health safety issues around the Capitol complex, even as we get ready to add new space with the approaching opening of the CVC; the Architect's operations would be strained to keep up with increases in utility costs; and, finally, since 77 percent of this bill is labor costs, as is most of the increase, this amendment would surely result in a reduction in our workforce.

It is irresponsible. Mr. WAMP and I have endeavored to put forward a bill that is fiscally responsible, fiscally tight, and ensures the life, safety and security needs of the people who work and visit here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. WAMP. I wasn't going to say anything, but I just want to say that because we have not accepted commonsense amendments like the previous amendment, and because the Rules Committee only granted three amendments in order, we are losing a lot of support for this bill on this side of the aisle unnecessarily because I do think we worked hard to make it fiscally responsible. But they are making a strong case, and we have closed the process down instead of opening it up.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank him for his outstanding leadership on the issue of fiscal responsibility, coming to the floor and offering this series of amendments.

I do want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member. Certainly relative to many other appropriations bills that we have seen and will see on this floor, relatively speaking, this is a more fiscally responsible bill.

But we can never forget that this is not our money; this is the people's money. And every time we are increasing some aspect of the Federal budget, we are taking it away from some family budget. We are taking it away from some family that had a dream of having a down payment on their first home. We are taking it away from some family who was putting that money away for college tuition for one of their children.

So contrary to the debate we hear and the rhetoric about cuts, what this amendment does is say, you know, let's lead by example. In the big scheme of the Federal budget, I know this isn't a huge amount of money. But when you think about having to save us from the single largest tax increase in history that the Democrat majority put in their last budget, shouldn't we lead by example? Is this apocalyptic vision that we hear, is this going to happen if we give the legislative branch the same money they had last year? Somehow there are families all across America who are having to make do on the same income they had last year.

Now, again, relative to other bills, this is more fiscally responsible. But it comes down to a simple choice: Do you want to put us on the path for the largest single tax increase in American history that would impose $3,000 of additional tax burden on American families, or do you want to put us on the path of fiscal responsibility? We should support the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman controls 2 minutes. The gentleman from Ohio controls 1 minute.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would ask that he speak for 1 minute and then we will close in opposition.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I will be brief and just point out this: we heard some of the terrible things that are going to happen if we keep the spending at the same level we had last year.

The American people need to understand this, Madam Chair: $3.1 billion is what this bill spends. My amendment would say $3 billion, $3 billion to run the United States Congress. You ask American families that, they would probably say, you know, that is probably enough. They can probably get by on $3 billion versus $3.1 billion. That is all this does. As the gentleman from Texas pointed out, in the course of the appropriation bills we have been dealing with, this is fairly fiscally responsible. But $3 billion is enough to run the United States Congress.

That is all this amendment would do, keep us where we are right now. Things are working fine now. Why can't we do that in the future?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the former ranking member of this subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank the Chair, and I particularly want to congratulate Chairman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, because she took on a very difficult responsibility and she has performed in a conscientious, extraordinarily fiscally responsible manner.

This is a bill that all of the Members have an interest in, and all of the Members have issues within this bill that they would particularly like to see increased, and some decreased. But it is a difficult one.

She has told me how much she appreciates the ranking member, Mr. WAMP, and I hope Mr. WAMP is listening, how much she appreciates Mr. WAMP's cooperation in coming up with a bill that was acceptable to the overwhelming number of the full Appropriations Committee members when they reported it out to the floor.

Now, this bill is $276 million below the President's request. That is extraordinary, and it is the first time that the Legislative Branch appropriations bill has reflected that deep a cut versus the President's request. So if you are looking for fiscal responsibility, you will find it in this bill, more than any other appropriations bill. We congratulate Mr. WAMP, as well as the chairwoman, for coming up with a bill that accomplishes that kind of fiscal responsibility.

But if anybody else wants to cut another $100 million, which this amendment would do, below that, then it is concomitant upon the proponent of that amendment to say exactly where you would make those cuts. Because this is the result of a lot of give and take, a lot of compromise, a lot of very conscientious investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 191, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

AYES—218

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Stearns
Taylor
Terry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hare
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—28

Baker
Bonner
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fortuño
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Wicker

□ 1251

Messrs. BAIRD, CHANDLER, MEEHAN, MEEK of Florida, CARNAHAN and RUSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. EHLERS, CRENSHAW, MAHONEY of Florida, LATOURETTE, ELLSWORTH, Ms. HARMAN and Mr. PORTER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 545. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on agreeing to the Flake of Arizona amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 231, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

AYES—177

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Mitchell
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOES—231

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—29

Baker
Bonner
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fortuño
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Pryce (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Wicker

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Two minutes left in this vote.

□ 1259

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 546. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on agreeing to the Jordan of Ohio Amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Ms. BALDWIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2771) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 502, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1300

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KINGSTON. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kingston moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2771, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 16, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $16,000,000)''.

On page 16, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $16,000,000)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I offer this amendment to bring something to the Members' attention that I think is very important.

We are about to create a fourth building for the House of Representatives. We have Cannon, we have Rayburn, we have Longworth. We are about to put on another 200,000-square-foot building. I think you should know about it, and I think we deserve a vote on it.

Number one, this is an earmark. Now, we have been talking weeks and weeks and months and months about transparency and ending earmarks. Yet if you will look in the report on page 20, there is a $16 million earmark for a new House office building. There is no explanation of the project, no total cost, there have been no hearings and no oversight, and it is not in the Democrat budget. It was not requested by the Architect of the Capitol, and, yet, it's in the bill.

Now, looks like a duck, walks like a duck, could be an earmark. That's where we are on this.

Number two, I think Members have the right to vote on a fourth office building. As former chair of this committee, one of the big frustrations I have about the Capitol Visitors Center is none of us owned the project. There wasn't one person that you could say it's his or her fault. It was all diluted and by committee. We never had a vote on it.

Indeed, when I was a chairman of this committee, a staffer put in $18 million to renovate the House floor, which none of us knew about. I took the money out of it, as did Chairman LEWIS last year.

But things get stuck in the bills that we don't know about that we deserve a vote on. This gives you an opportunity, unlike the CVC, which started out as a $260 million project, with partial private funding, and now is up to $600 million.

This motion to recommit gives you the opportunity to vote on something and say no to something that has already cost this House $140 million. This is a 200,000-square-foot building. That's the size of 15 House floors. It's the size of four White Houses. It's five football fields big. This isn't incidental swing space.

What is this needed for? In case we renovate the Cannon House Office Building. Now, don't you want to vote on that? I haven't had a debate on renovating the Cannon Office Building, but I want to know about it. This is a big building of substance, and you deserve a vote.

Incidentally, this isn't going to be the only new building. We are adding 580,000 square feet in the form of the Capitol Visitors Center.

This building is huge. To move forward, it's going to cost us not the $16 million that's in the bill, but actually $56 million, and then another $12 million to lease it, plus $18 million for furniture for it.

Think about it. How many times have we heard from some Members in a rather preachy fashion, we need to control our carbon footprints? Ladies and gentlemen, all of those of you who want to reduce our carbon footprint, here is your opportunity. Say ''no'' to a 200,000-square-foot boondoggle which we are about to put in.

This has not had the proper oversight, it has not had the proper hearings. The contracts have all been verbal. That's why we are all in the situation.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I want to point out and remind my colleagues that Mr. WAMP and I are proud to report to you that we have brought the legislative branch appropriations bill in at $276 million below the request. The easiest thing in the world to do is jump on the table and to cry waste.

I want to also point out that this is a security upgrade, funding for security upgrades requested by former Speaker HASTERT and continued by Speaker PELOSI so that we can ensure that we provide swing space for our very cramped space so that we can properly renovate the Cannon and Longworth House Office Buildings.

I ask my colleagues to come over and look at these pictures of the deterioration of our facilities. These are pictures of the 100-year-old Cannon House Office Building. If you take a look at the deterioration and life, safety and security upgrades that this facility needs, we can no longer wait to make these upgrades, and to make sure that we can protect the people who work here and the people who visit us. They are deteriorating and badly in need of renovation.

What the gentleman from Georgia's motion to recommit would do is delay for years, if not make it impossible, for us to begin renovation and repairs on our aging House facilities.

My colleagues, this committee does not deal with the sexiest of subjects that confront us every day, and I have only been here for 2 years and the chair of this subcommittee for the last 5 months. You don't earn a reputation as an institutionalist in that short period of time, but it is my hope to be able to do that over time.

We are stewards of this great institution, but we are also stewards just as much of these facilities. My colleague on the Appropriations Committee, JOSÉ SERRANO of New York, recently made a wonderful suggestion to remind us of the history embedded even in what may seem mundane, the space we occupy each day. He suggested that we each have plaques in our offices with the names of our predecessors in Congress who occupied that space before us. My own office, I was thrilled to learn, was once occupied by former Congressman Lyndon Johnson.

My point is they may seem like buildings and office space to the outside world, but we know better. How many of us countless times have found ourselves approaching this beautiful building we are now in and marveling privately to ourselves, wow, I work here, what an incredible privilege.

But with privilege comes responsibility. We must think about the institution, but we must also think about our hard-working staff. The number of hours they toil in these facilities is mind-boggling. You might be surprised to learn that the average work space for each of our staff is about 36 square feet. And I want to show you what 36 square feet is. This is 36 square feet. That is how much space that we allot, on average, to our employees.

GSA recommends an average of 100 square feet of space per employee. We need to renovate so that we can make sure we are not cramming our staff into unreasonable boxes for hours on end. Our staff make incredible sacrifices to serve the public, our constituents, and they help us do our job. We must make sure that we keep these facilities, the place they work every day and night, safe for them. We must make sure we keep these facilities safe and in good condition for our constituents and our successors.

Mr. KINGSTON's amendment is well-meaning, but it is not responsible, and it is not an eye toward the future with respect for our past. I strongly urge you to vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. It was my understanding you indicated this is the initiative of Speaker HASTERT; am I accurate?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes, it is. It is an initiative from former Speaker HASTERT.

I strongly urge you to vote against the motion to recommit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 217, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

AYES—181

Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—217

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Campbell (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords

Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—34

Akin
Baker
Berman
Bonner
Boyd (FL)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Everett
Fossella
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
Linder
Lofgren, Zoe
McGovern
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Pryce (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Wicker

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on this vote.

Members are advised that this vote will close precisely when time has expired.

□ 1326

Mr. McDERMOTT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FOSSELLA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 547, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 547. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on the motion to recommit on H.R. 2771, Legislative Branch Appropriations for FY 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 176, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

YEAS—216

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Chandler
Clarke
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—176

Aderholt
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Holden
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—40

Akin
Baker
Berman
Bonner
Boyd (FL)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Castor
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Doggett
Doyle
Emerson
Everett
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hulshof
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
Linder
Lofgren, Zoe
McGovern
Meehan
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Pryce (OH)
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Wicker

□ 1332

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 548. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on passage H.R. 2771, Legislative Branch Appropriations for FY 2008.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, on June 22, 2007, I was unable to be present for all rollcall votes due to an unexpected delay. If present, I would have voted accordingly on the following rollcall votes: roll No. 543—"nay"; roll No. 544—"nay"; roll No. 545—"aye"; roll No. 546—"aye"; roll No. 547—"aye"; roll No. 548—"nay".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall votes 547 and 548.

Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have cast the following votes on H.R. 2771: to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for the Legislative Branch. Madam Speaker, had I been present for the motion to recommit with instructions, roll No. 547, I would have voted "no." On passage roll No. 548, I would have voted "yes".

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2764, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008; AND H.R. 2771, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2764 and H.R. 2771, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section number and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H.R. 2829, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–207) on the bill (H.R. 2829) making appropriations for financial services and general government 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.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend the majority leader for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for next week.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

On Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour business and at 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes rolled until 6 p.m.

I want to reiterate that, as we did the other day. It will be 6 p.m. I would hope that the offices that are covering the floor, that they remind their Members 6 p.m. on Monday will be the votes. The congressional baseball game is at 7:30, and we want to give Members time to get to the game. It is a fun event and a collegial event, and we are going to accommodate that by accelerating by half an hour the votes on Monday at 6 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of those bills will be announced later today.

On Tuesday the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour business and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m., and on Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m. We will consider the following fiscal year 2008 appropriations bills: Interior and Environment; Financial Services.

I will say to my friends that those two bills will be considered, and we will obviously, consistent, hopefully, with our agreement, try to enter into unanimous consent agreements in terms of the amendments and the timing of those amendments. And we will see how the balance of the schedule goes Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for that information.

And from the fact that you said we will see how the week goes Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, I think that anticipates that at least there is a chance that with the State-Justice-Commerce bill's not being next week, we may be able to be done on Thursday, and the Members can start their work period on Friday. Would that be one of the options that would be a possibility at least?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

The answer to that is yes. Again, we are going to complete those two bills at least. There may be some other legislative business. We don't know whether there will be conference reports. As you know, there is a conference on the 9/11 bill and some other conference reports on other items that may come forward. But the answer to your question, I think, is essentially yes. If we can complete the work that we have before us prior to Friday, there may not be a need to meet on Friday.

Mr. BLUNT. Reclaiming my time, a couple of other thoughts. I thank you for that information.

On the conference reports that are upcoming, the 9/11 conference report is there.

Mr. HOYER. Lobbying disclosure is the other.

Mr. BLUNT. I was going to ask about lobbying reform, if you thought there was a chance for that. Water Resources or the competitive science bills, do you have a report on where those might be?

Mr. HOYER. I really don't. But because I don't have a report, my speculation is that there is not anticipation that those conferences will be completed in time to consider conference reports next week. We don't have any report on that.

I am looking at the person who knows so much on my staff, Mr. Cogorno, to make sure that I am making a correct representation, but that is accurate.

Mr. BLUNT. I would also ask, I believe we announced last week, Madam Speaker, we thought that we were going to have the Science-State-Justice-Commerce bill up next week, and now we are not. Is there any particular reason for that that you can share with me on that?

I yield for a response.

Mr. HOYER. Yes, there is. We had a lot of discussion about this. As Mr. OBEY has represented, because of the reforms that have been adopted and the transparency that we want to effect, but also the certification that is necessary for the legitimacy of projects, the time frame necessary to do the State-Justice-Commerce was more than could be accomplished within the time frame that the staff had available. As you know, they had to deal with the Interior and the Financial Services as well. Science-State-Justice-Commerce was such that they simply could not get it done in time. Regrettably, therefore, it, too, as the other four bills, one of which was already scheduled for July, the defense appropriations bill, had to be moved to July.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for that. And I do believe that the protracted discussion we had and the agreement we made on transparency on these bills is a good thing.

Next week's being a week where we will be leaving for a district work period, we won't have a chance for this colloquy, and I am wondering if you have any sense yet of where we will be the week we come back after the Independence Day break. Should we anticipate any appropriations bills that week or do you have other work that we might get to that week?

And I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Madam Speaker.

It is our expectation that the first week back, which will be the week of July 9, I believe, Tuesday, the 10th, at 6:30 p.m., we will not have appropriation bills that week. There will be legislation that week, and we will give notice of that next week so that one can anticipate it for the week that we come back from the July break. But we do not expect appropriation bills to start until the following week, the week of July 16.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate that. And I appreciate also that generally that is the way that it usually works out on a week where we are coming back from being in our districts the week before.

Last week you said that we should anticipate an announcement on an omnibus energy bill by the Fourth of July recess. I am wondering if you have any more information on that.

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Yes. What I said was it is my expectation that at the end of next

week, there will be an announcement. The Speaker has made it very clear that this is a priority, energy independence, and addressing the issue of global warming is a priority item for our caucus and, therefore, for the Congress, and that we will be addressing what we intend to do in July prior to leaving here for the July break.

Mr. BLUNT. And would that also include a sense of when that bill would actually be on the floor when we make that announcement prior to the Fourth of July break?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't know that it will be specific, but certainly it is our hope and belief that it will be the month of July.

Mr. BLUNT. And what I believe would be my last question is on the related Ways and Means energy tax bill that I believe in that committee has about $16 billion of tax increases in it as part of the energy package. Would that come up earlier than the rest of the energy package, or do you expect that to be on the floor at essentially the same time?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. That decision has not been made, but my thought would be it would come up in close proximity, whether before, just after, but it would be considered in very close time frame to the consideration of the other pieces of the energy legislation.

Mr. BLUNT. And I believe the gentleman said that you really don't have a sense whether these bills would be on the floor in July or not, and if they are not on the floor in July, then we would look at sometime later in the year; is that correct?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. No. As I said, it is my expectation that we will have these bills on the floor in July.

And if I can, it has been somewhat complicated, as you can understand, by the fact that we now have four appropriation bills that we anticipated in June now scheduled for July. So to that degree, I want to be somewhat careful about what I represent, because we are still in the process of determining the scheduling of all of those bills.

Mr. BLUNT. That was not a question designed to go back and try to in any way create a problem. I think I did not hear what you said properly the first time.

Mr. HOYER. July is the expectation.

Mr. BLUNT. That is helpful to me, and I appreciate the information.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE HON. WESLEY E. BROWN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and give recognition to the life and continued service of the honorable Wesley E. Brown, United States District Court judge for the District of Kansas.

Since Judge Brown's appointment to the Federal bench by President John F. Kennedy in 1962, Judge Brown has served his beloved State of Kansas and this Nation with great distinction. And after 45 years of service on the bench, Judge Brown continues to serve as a senior judge, coming in each morning and carrying a full caseload. In fact, the Federal courthouse in Wichita could not manage its caseload without Judge Brown's service and his commitment.

Prior to his judicial appointment by President Kennedy, Judge Brown managed to work his way through law school by taking classes at night in Kansas City while working during the day assembling model A cars for the Ford Motor Company. After losing his job at Ford during the Great Depression, he served as Reno County Attorney in Kansas and later enlisted in the United States Navy to serve in World War II as a lieutenant, stationed at Commander Philippines Sea Frontier.

Today I have the honor of introducing a House resolution which not only recognizes Judge Brown's distinguished service to our Nation as the longest-serving Federal judge in Kansas, but also celebrates his 100th birthday today.

Judge Brown, your State of Kansas and this Nation wishes you a very happy birthday today and thanks you for your continuing service.

□ 1345

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLESTON'S FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects, and I know the respects of all others in this House, to the nine Charleston, South Carolina, firefighters who lost their lives this week while fearlessly and courageously discharging their duties, and offer my condolences to the families and friends who lost loved ones in this great tragedy: Captain Billy Hutchinson, Captain Mike Benke, Captain Louis Mulkey, engineer Mark Kelsey, assistant engineer Brad Beaity, assistant engineer Michael French, firefighter James Drayton, firefighter Brandon Thomas and firefighter Melven Champaign. They made a commitment to one of our Nation's highest callings, a calling to service in the face of great danger, and a call to honor a tradition of heroes.

These fallen firefighters, Mr. Speaker, represented more than 100 years of service to the people they swore an oath to protect. And the dedication with which they lived their lives is something our Nation will not soon forget.

John Kennedy once said: ''The courage of life is often a less dramatic spectacle than the courage of a final moment, but it is no less a magnificent mixture of triumph and tragedy. A man does what he must, in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures, and that is the basis of all morality,'' Kennedy concluded.

In their final moment, Mr. Speaker, these nine men taught us what true morality is really all about, a love and heartfelt concern for one's neighbors that provides the strength to rush into the breach while others are rushing from it, and a sense of responsibility that will not allow a man to stand idly at times when his help is most needed.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the thoughts and prayers of a grateful Nation are with the families and friends of these nine courageous men, firefighters, heroes. May their legacy of valor, gallantry, and service be something that lives on in our country forever.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE WESTERN BALKANS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–42)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERMAN) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice

to the *Federal Register* for publication stating that the Western Balkans emergency is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2007. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on June 23, 2006, 71 FR 36183.

The crisis constituted by the actions of persons engaged in, or assisting, sponsoring, or supporting (i) extremist violence in the Republic of Macedonia and elsewhere in the Western Balkans region, or (ii) acts obstructing implementation of the Dayton Accords in Bosnia or United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999, in Kosovo, that led to the declaration of a national emergency on June 26, 2001, in Executive Order 13219 and to amendment of that order in Executive Order 13304 of May 28, 2003, has not been resolved. The acts of extremist violence and obstructionist activity outlined in Executive Order 13219, as amended, are hostile to U.S. interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to the Western Balkans and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE *June 22, 2007*.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4303, 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 Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University:

Ms. WOOLSEY, California
Mr. LAHOOD, Illinois

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), 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 Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
Mr. CUMMINGS, Maryland
Mr. KLINE, Minnesota
Mr. WICKER, Mississippi

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

DEDICATION OF VILLAGE HOMES OF WAYZATA, MINNESOTA

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a special day in our community of Minnesota. Tomorrow is the day we welcome four very special new families to our community. Tomorrow is the day we dedicate and cut the ribbon at Wayzata Village Homes, an affordable housing complex built by Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity.

As we dedicate these beautiful new homes and welcome our new neighbors, I'm feeling deeply grateful to live in a community of compassionate, caring and committed people, people who care deeply about people suffering the ravages of poverty, homelessness and hunger, people who reach out to meet the housing needs of people in need, people like John and Nancy Berg.

John and Nancy Berg started a family foundation several years ago to meet the affordable housing needs in our community and have contributed so generously time after time after time. People like Steve and Geri Bloomer, who donated the land for Wayzata Village Homes. People like Wayzata Mayor Andrew Humphrey, the members of the Wayzata City Council and the Wayzata Housing Authority, all of whom have a progressive, enlightened and generous approach to expanding access to affordable housing.

I am also deeply grateful to all the sponsors, donors and other partners, as well as LaDonna Hoy, Jill Kohler and Kim Vohs, and all the staff and volunteers at Interfaith Outreach and Community Partners. Interfaith Outreach and Community Partners is truly the conscience of our community. I am also deeply grateful to Sue Haig, Tony Beckstrom, and all of those with Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity. Habitat is truly the conscience of our entire Nation in meeting the huge need for affordable housing in our country.

In 1961, on the steps right here at the Capitol, in his celebrated inaugural address, President John F. Kennedy said: ''Here on Earth, God's work must truly be our own.'' In Wayzata, each of these wonderful people answered President Kennedy's call. They helped make Wayzata Village Homes a reality. They answered our community's call. And tomorrow we will celebrate this great affordable-housing success story.

Tomorrow, we will celebrate four new families in our community and extend a special welcome to the proud new residents of Village Homes.

Nobody will give a more special welcome than Rachel Poss. Rachel is a fifth grader at Birchview School in Plymouth. Rachel certainly touched my heart this week with her community service project, which was written up in the Minneapolis Star Tribune, of providing baskets of household items to the new families of Village Homes.

Thank you, Rachel, and to all who made this Habitat project a reality. You showed us what public service is all about.

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

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

CONGRATULATING THE MILLERS ON 50 YEARS OF MARRIAGE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mr. Tom and Mrs. Lois Miller on the occasion of their 50th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, the institution of marriage is one of the most sacred and effective traditions in civilized society which organizes, holds together and perpetuates continuation of civilized humanity. And to many it is both a civil and religious act. And whereas Tom and Lois Miller have shared 50 years of holy matrimony, I am pleased to pause and wish them well.

Tom and Lois met in McCool, Mississippi, while teenagers and were married after coming to Chicago by Reverend Daniel A. Williams on January 14, 1957. Tom worked at CELO Steel, and later went to the R.C. Cola company, where he retired after a long, satisfying and productive career.

Lois pursued a career in cosmetology, became one of the best in her field, and subsequently owned her own business, the L & L Beauty Salon, which has been in existence for 47 years.

Mr. Speaker, Tom and Lois Miller became and still are pillars of their community. They've raised four daughters, have four grandchildren and two great grandchildren. Ever since their marriage they have been rocks of the Greater Zion Missionary Baptist Church, where they have both displayed tremendous leadership, with Tom Miller becoming chairman of the deacon board.

They were founding members of the 4,500 West Congress Block Club in Chicago and have been active in many other civic and social endeavors, and for the past 10 years have lived in Westchester, Illinois, where they have immersed themselves in community life.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years is a long time. And when you can spend those 50 years in a state of peace, happiness and productive engagement, you have been

truly blessed. And just as you have been blessed, you have also blessed others. I've been told that ''to those to whom much is given, much is expected in return.''

The Millers have been fortunate to have a great family, great children, great grandchildren, friends and relatives. Their children, grandchildren, other relatives and friends have been fortunate to have the Millers in their lives. And I wish all of them a great day as they gather for a tremendous celebration on Sunday.

And so I close my comments, Mr. Speaker, with congratulations to Tom and Lois Miller, wish them well and trust that they will have many more years of happy and blissful marriage and that this relationship will continue until the end of time.

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

□ 1400

EDUCATION

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to bring information before this body about the current status of education in our Nation.

I had the distinct pleasure of speaking before the Committee on Education recently during Members Day regarding No Child Left Behind, NCLB, and its reauthorization. But I felt compelled to come to the floor as well to join with my other colleagues and reiterate my concern with the current state of education in this country and what I hope to see come out of this year's reauthorization.

Now, I share with all my colleagues here in Congress the ultimate goal of providing a high-quality education for every child in America.

Surely, we can do better than what has been done so far. What, then, should we do? I have looked at past reauthorizations of ESEA, and I noticed a troubling trend. With every reauthorization, now problems are identified with American schools. With every reauthorization, the solution proposed by Congress is for the Federal Government to become more involved with education.

So, with this reauthorization before us, I have to ask, what has this interference wrought? Back in 1983, a famous report entitled ''A Nation At Risk'' said that America had fallen dangerously behind the rest of the world in education. Today new studies say many of the exact same things.

According to the National Center For Education statistics, for example, in 2003, U.S. fourth graders were outperformed by their peers in 11 countries, including four Asian countries and seven European countries. U.S. eighth graders were outperformed by their peers in nine countries. Yet, as a percentage of GDP, we spend more money now on education than at any time in our Nation's history. In fact, we spend more in the United States on K through 12 education than the Philippines, Saudi Arabia or Sweden spend on everything in their countries.

Our problem is this: We have increased Federal paperwork which requires increased taxpayer dollars to pay for increased administrative staff. But we have decreased teacher flexibility. We have decreased accountability to parents and decreased student performance.

So for this year's reauthorization, I am proposing something different. Very soon, I will be dropping in legislation that will allow a State to in essence opt out of the majority of the requirements of NCLB, but at the same time, allow those taxpayers in the States to keep their education funding through what we call a refundable tax credit.

I understand this is very different than what some other Members were proposing. But I feel that only by allowing the States and local governments to bear the burden of education accountability, accountability on that level, will we ever, as a Nation, make the progress that we need to make in the classroom so that we can stay competitive in the twenty-first century.

I recently held a town hall meeting back in my district about No Child Left Behind. Every person in that room had something negative to say about the administrative requirements in the program in general. At one point in the meeting, I asked how many people there had contacted and met with a local teacher or principal or school board member regarding their problems? Nearly everyone in the room raised their hand.

I then asked the question, how many of the people in the room here met with somebody in the State capital or in the New Jersey Department of Education about their concerns? About half the people raised their hands. I then asked, well, how many of you have had contact with someone from the U.S. Department of Education in Washington? Only one person raised their hand.

My point is this: By transferring the requirements for NCLB in Washington, we are moving the accountability for education further away from the parents, the teachers, the school boards, to where it belongs. It belongs close to the parents, the students and the educators in the local school boards.

In addition, the reporting requirements under NCLB have created basically a confusing system, a system that ends up punishing our best schools. One of the high schools in my district is consistently cited in publications in the State as one of the top-performing schools in my State. This very same school was placed on an early warning list 2 years after NCLB was instituted.

This was not an underperforming school. Every year, nearly 100 percent of the kids graduate and they attend college. The average combined SAT score for the students in that school was around 1,100. Fourteen AP courses and tests were offered and so on. So it is a great school. And, yes, it is on the warning list.

So I worry that while trying to meet the requirements of NCLB, students attending this high school will actually be held back by burdensome regulations rather than pushed to excel at already high standards that the school had previously set for them.

I am certain there are many other schools in my counties in my district in my State and across the country, which is why we need a change to NCLB.

CALLING FOR A TIMETABLE TO REDEPLOY FROM IRAQ

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

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, a little over 5 years ago I was on the ground in Afghanistan and then returned with an Aircraft Carrier Battle Group. I then took that Aircraft Carrier Battle Group into the Persian Gulf for the precursor operations just before we began that war.

After that war had commenced, I returned to the ground in Afghanistan 18 months later for a short period of time and saw what had not been done. We had accomplished so little compared to what might have been because we diverted our attention and our resources from our Civil Affairs Forces to our Special Operations Forces to the tragic misadventure in Iraq.

I speak of Afghanistan because as it becomes prey to terrorists and as the Taliban has moved back into the southern provinces, it is a poster child for why I believe we must bring about a timetable for the end of the war in Iraq.

That war has hurt U.S. security throughout this globe as well as here at home, yet not one Army unit, Active, Reserve or Guard is in a state of readiness that it could deploy anywhere in the world if another contingency were to occur. Never mind that we are failing to engage properly from the Western Pacific to Southeast Asia to the Middle East.

There is a change in our strategy that can bring about an end to this tragedy without a failed state in Iraq. That is to set a date that is certain by which we would redeploy out of Iraq, because a date certain changes the structure of incentives within that region to change the behavior of other

nations, in particular, Iran and Syria, that are involved destructively in this conflict because we are, to their delight, bleeding, bleeding profusely.

I asked when I was there with Senator HAGEL, our highest political officer there, does Iran want a failed state if we are to redeploy? His response was no. Therefore, we must have the confidence to set a date that is certain to redeploy out of Iraq, put our troops in Afghanistan, remain in the region on our bases in Oman, Bahrain, Qatar, or Aircraft Carrier Battle Group or Amphibious Ready Group, and bring others home, so we don't degrade the readiness of our forces, but have the competence to deal with Iran and Syria, bring them together with the Iraqis as they deal with the extreme elements and we deal with the middle.

There is a saying in the Middle East, ''Insha'Allah,'' basically, ''God willing tomorrow.'' Tomorrow for U.S. security has been enough. A date certain, approximately a year, 9 months, to give those countries time to work with us to bring about the political decisions that must cease the civil war, to have the Iraqis step to the plate and assume responsibility in the 32 ministries that thus far have been personal fiefdoms for personal ambitions as we provide the political and military cover for them to go about their personal pursuits. This is a change that can only about be brought about not by doubling down on a bad military bet by more troops, but by enforcing a date certain within a timetable. And lastly, we should do so on an authorization bill.

We should never again put our troops between us and the President. Being in the military is a dangerous business, but it doesn't have to be unsafe. Our business in the military has the dignity of danger, but you must provide them the bullets and the equipment they need to protect themselves, while having an authorization bill provide the date certain by which no forces in Iraq would remain, or funding for them to remain would not be there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time with the understanding that there is a strategic approach to end this conflict without a failed state in order to enhance U.S. security.

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1415

A MATTER OF TRUST

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the ''New Yorker'' magazine, veteran reporter Seymour Hersh lays out the shame that was Abu Ghraib and the efforts at the highest levels to sweep it under the carpet.

Former Army General Antonio Taguba takes this very brave step to share details of his meetings with former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and other administration officials in the wake of the prisoner abuse scandal at Abu Ghraib. In May, 2004, photos of abuse at the American-run prison were made public by CBS and other media outlets. We can all recall the inhumane treatment and degradation depicted. What was included in the photos and videos were not interrogations. They were humiliating and often horrible acts of violence.

Months earlier, before the photos emerged, General Taguba had filed a report outlining the ''numerous incidents of sadistic, blatant and wanton criminal abuses that were inflicted on several detainees and systemic and illegal abuse.''

In fact, the first report sent to senior Pentagon officials came in January of that year. The response? A senior general in Iraq brushed off the report saying that the victims were ''only Iraqis.'' According to the article, General Taguba found that Lieutenant General Sanchez, the Army commander in Iraq who had visited the prison several times, knew exactly what was going on.

Despite many reports contradicting him, Secretary Rumsfeld himself clung to the claim that he saw the photos and video of the abuse only days before testifying before Congress. He said he first learned of the problem in late January or early February. His memory seems to be a little fuzzy in this regard. And in response, who did he send to oversee prison in Iraq? Major General Jeffrey Miller, the commander at Guantanamo.

If this were a movie plot, Mr. Speaker, it would seem ludicrous. Unfortunately, this is part of our real history in the occupation of Iraq.

And our commander-in-chief? It is unclear when he first learned of the situation at Abu Ghraib, but by most accounts it was months before the notorious pictures hit the airwaves. This is absolutely disgraceful.

It appears that the administration has no shame when it comes to the continuing abuse of human rights abroad and at home right here in America. Is this the legacy we want to leave in the Middle East? A preemptive strike against a nation which did not have weapons of mass destruction? A civil war that is tearing a nation apart? Our standing in the world at an all-time low? The loss of over 3,500 brave service members?

This did not have to happen. The administration willingly misled this Nation into an occupation that cannot be won.

The acts at Abu Ghraib could have besmirched the honor and reputation of all of the troops who serve each day with distinction and courage, but thankfully it did not, because the American people know and understand that the acts of the few and of the top leadership who endorse those acts should not be visited on those who so bravely and selflessly serve. Our troops have shown great valor in the face of unbelievable challenges. This Congress honors them and the sacrifices they have made.

That said, it is well past time that this Congress stands up and says, enough is enough from this administration. The American people are frustrated with the lack of progress on ending the occupation and bringing our troops home, and rightfully so.

This fight may be difficult, but it is our obligation. I ask my colleagues to demand that not another day goes by without a real effort to bring our troops home and to return the sovereignty of Iraq to its people.

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

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

COMMENTS ON THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is this time as we end a week of discussion and debate and we all leave to reconnect with our constituents and find out from the real people of America what we have actually done here that we have a time to sit back and contemplate the significant questions that will be brought to us next week, probably the greatest of which is simply will the Republicans continue to win the congressional baseball game.

But at this time in this weekend, I am joined tonight by Congressman GARRETT of New Jersey, who is the Chairman of the Constitutional Caucus, who wisely thought that this would be a good time for us to take a

moment and discuss once again the significance and importance of the Constitution as we come to this end of this section of our legislative year.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia once said he understood there were those people who believe that there should not be a strict adherence to the words or intent of the words of the Constitution. But, he wrote, you would have to be an idiot to believe that.

The Constitution is not a living organism. It is a legal document. It says some things and doesn't say other things. The Constitution is a piece of paper that has words, but each of those words have a meaning.

I was once watching an episode of Fawlty Towers, obviously a very old one, and it is one in which John Cleese is trying in vain to talk to his waiter Manuel from Barcelona, who doesn't speak English very well, and in contempt he finally walks away and says, ''Say Goodnight, Gracie.''

Now, my students in school never understood what that line, ''Say Goodnight, Gracie,'' meant. As I was talking to them or other audiences, you would have to be around my age to remember the old George Burns and Gracie Allen routines in which every tagline of one of their routines was simply, ''Say Goodnight, Gracie,'' which had the effect of implying that Gracie Allen was probably the most ditziest, dumbest blonde ever produced.

Now, oddly enough, my students understood the phrase ''dumb blond.'' They don't understand the phrase, ''Say Goodnight, Gracie.''

We all have certain cue words which create larger meanings in the mind of the hearer. Those words have meaning based on the usage of time. The Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution also had cue words that they used to expand the meaning of what they meant.

One of the things I am happy about is the academic community seems of late to take a great deal more interest in the words of the Constitution and defining and understanding what they actually meant at the time.

I had a college professor who used to say the Founding Fathers had baggage that they took with them, which meant there were common concepts they brought together and they understood.

One of them, for example, is they all had read and understood Aristotle. Aristotle loved to divide everything up into categories. He divided up governments into a category of the government of one, a government of the few, a government of the many, and he said that each of those breakdowns could have a government that is good or bad, simply depending on the attitude of the ruling group. And he gave them all names. A government of one, for example, that he said was good, he defined as a monarchy. So in the 1780s, if you claimed someone was a monarch, that was a compliment.

The government of one that was bad that had bad intentions, he gave the term of a tyrant or a tyranny. It is not a coincidence that a decade earlier when Thomas Jefferson is writing the Declaration of Independence, that of all the terms he can use to describe King George, he used the word ''tyrant.'' It had a cue meaning to it which ticked up a whole bunch of other ideas in the mind of the reader or the hearer.

It is the same way when the Federalists decided to criticize Jefferson, they called him a Jacobite. You cannot understand the significance of that insult unless you have a deeper understanding of the meaning of what happened in the French Revolution. The words have specific meanings and specific attitudes.

Akhil Amar wrote a wonderful book exploring the historical context of the words used in the Constitution. Much of what I am going to say is based on many of his works and his research. I would like to take just the preamble of the Constitution to try and illustrate what that is talk about.

You see, I thought Gouverneur Morris and the committee who wrote the Preamble to the Constitution at the very end of the Constitutional Convention were merely putting something in there to add some kind of literary flair to the document itself. And even though these words don't have the same status as statute, these majestic words give us a window to see into the minds of those who actually framed our republican form of government.

It starts off with the phrase ''We the people of the United States.'' Now, whether intentional or not, it began with the concept of empowering people. And earlier drafts started off with ''We the people of,'' and then it listed each and every individual State. Politically, that would have been unwise if indeed one of those states had eventually not ratified the document, which they thought could easily happen, because, after all, Rhode Island wasn't even there.

But by changing it to ''We the people of the United States,'' it is more than just a political maneuver, it is a fundamental mindset of the Convention delegates. This Constitution goes full circle. It starts off by talking about the people and ends with Article 7, which is a new way of ratifying the constitutional document, which is a relatively contemporary concept of having a ratifying convention elected by the people. A new concept of republican democracy.

So this document starts and ends with the commitment to the faith in the people. The Constitution doesn't pander to governments, but rather is aimed at empowering the people of this United States who indeed empower this government at the same time.

The Founding Fathers never intended to amend the Articles of Confederation. They realized to do so would take unanimous consent, and since Rhode Island wasn't there in fact it would never happen. In fact, 2 years earlier New York had vetoed a new financial management amendment. That act in and of itself had done much to spur the call for a new Convention to try and solve the problem. Because the Articles of Convention truly was a treaty between sovereign states and the national government.

This was something that was going to be different. It was going to be different to solve the problem by forming a more perfect union.

Now, once again, I always thought that the phrase ''in order to form a more perfect union'' was simply in opposition to the less perfect union under the Articles of Confederation. But it meant something so much more than that. It implied that they were leaving the treaty to join the new supreme law of the land. And ratification specifically denoted leaving the commitment of a flawed treaty to a commitment of a new supreme law of the land.

The anti-Federalists got that point. They debated it. They lost the argument. They lost the vote. Confederates did not get that in the Civil War time.

Abraham Lincoln actually was wrong about it as well. When he gave the Gettysburg Address, he talked about an indivisible Nation that started four score and seven years ago. That was a reference back to 1776 and the Declaration of Independence. To be accurate, he should have said three score and 15 years ago was when we became an individual nation, because that was the ratification of the Constitution of the United States.

There is more to that phrase that Gouverneur Morris meant than simply glossing over once again. This phrase, ''a more perfect union,'' is a specific reference to the 1707 Act of Unification between England and Scotland. The words say ''the union of two kingdoms more active and complete.'' In fact Queen Anne referred to it all the time as her ''more perfect union.''

You see, the attitude of the mindset at the time was they believed the progeny of landed borders was always armies. So they looked at the time when England, Scotland and even Wales were individual countries with land borders and each had an army to offset the other, which meant eventually they would use that army one against the other, and if they were not using it to disturb the peace of the island, than a tyrannical king was probably using it to destroy the liberties of his individual people.

Once they formed the more perfect union of England, Scotland and Wales together, the relative quiet of the United Kingdom was in contrast as they looked across the English Channel to Europe, which still had individual borders and was still engaged in border wars and subjection of the individual liberties of their individual citizens.

So what we consider to be incomprehensible, the idea that Massachusetts might raise an army for some of their indigenous people, and that New York

would respond by raising an Army just in case Massachusetts doesn't stay with their own indigenous people, and Virginia might raise an army then because all three of them claim the same lands in the West. What we thought of as incomprehensible was an actual fear at the time.

And they had an option, they will had an option of either eliminating that, or becoming like Europe. They could either be like Europe, with multiple boundaries and all the problems associated with it, or become like the United Kingdom in a more perfect union, eliminating that threat for evermore. And, more significantly, not just bringing peace to the continent, but also providing the protection and preservation of the individual liberties.

It is significant the Founding Fathers had a fear of armies. They limited the army to two years. It had to be dissolved. They didn't do the same thing to navies, because a navy boat could not chase you down the street and beat you up—Armies could. The idea of a citizen army is something that comes about in the French Revolution. That hasn't happened for a decade yet.

So armies at this time were mercenaries who were not necessarily sympathetic to the people they were supposed to be defending. In fact, the British army that came over here to defeat us and defend the British was actually hired Germans.

So the idea in here was an Army was not necessarily nice to people. The militia were the citizens, and those were the ones who were going to be important. Armies were foreigners. Militias were your neighbors. Giving primarily defense of the country to a militia made sense. Allowing a militia, in reality the people, to be armed made sense. An armed citizenry as a check to a potential political abuse made sense. Thinking of the modern National Guard as the same as a 1788 militia when we talk about the Second Amendment makes no sense because we don't understand the meaning of the words.

Lincoln also understood this concept of more perfect union when he talked about the Civil War. If the South was successful, even though this was a horrible war, at a high cost and greatly criticized by the intelligentsia at the time, he predicted that if the Civil War was successful for the South, it would not be the Civil War that created the South, but the beginning in a series of wars between the North and the South over regional boundaries and regional issues.

This Constitution also establishes justice. The Founding Fathers considered justice lacking on both the national and the State level, and they invented the checks and balances system of Federalism to counteract that.

If we truly understand what it means to establish justice, we have to understand the Framers hope to curb the excesses of the State governments, just the way patriots today have to curb the excesses of our national government. So Federalism means we forget the concept of establishing justice.

''To ensure domestic tranquility'' was not only a reference to Shay's Rebellion, but was also the concept that Revolutionary War veterans marched on Philadelphia to get their money from the Articles of Confederation Congress and both Philadelphia and Pennsylvania refused to provide protection, one is of the reasons they insisted on having this place, a Federal District, so they could ensure the domestic tranquility.

And the next phrase is ''to promote the general welfare.'' Mr. Speaker, at this time we sometimes have a combination, I think, or conception, conception today, that promoting the general welfare is a door to open up to national involvement in all sorts of areas.

I think if you look at the actual words, it was quite the opposite. ''General welfare'' was a term of limiting qualifications, not expanding them.

With that in mind at this stage of the preamble, I would like to yield to the Chairman of the Constitutional Caucus, the good gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. GARRETT, to talk about the concept of promoting general welfare.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah.

Of course, it is humbling to follow after such a gentleman who is learned in these things and also previous to coming to Congress a teacher of such topics of our history and of our Constitution. So I will try, while I will never live up to his standards, but try to emulate him as best I can. When I conclude, I guess I should end by say saying ''Goodnight, Rob.''

When we looked at those expressions, we remember the words of talk radio host Rush Limbaugh, who often does say the expression ''words mean something.'' He is usually expressing it about one of his callers who has just called in and talked about a particular topic or what have you, and he will take a little slight angle on it and say, well, those words mean something that are being said there.

So too it is with our Constitution, the fundamental document, the Founding Father document of this Nation. It is unique in a sense and it was recognized at that time. Back in 1803, Thomas Jefferson stated, ''Our peculiar security in this Nation is in the possession of a written Constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction.''

How prescient Jefferson was to see how future generations of this country possibly would and have and courts have as well taken that document; taken its plain meaning, and manipulated it to whatever the understanding of those words currently mean, as opposed to getting an understanding of what the founding document writers intended at the time.

James Wilson, writing in the Study of Law in 1790, said, ''The first and governing maxim in the interpretation of a statute,'' or in this case the Constitution, ''is discover those meanings of those words by those who made it.''

So when we come to the floor today, or any day, to take a look at our Constitution, we must have an understanding of those terms as those meanings of the words had when the Founders first wrote them.

The gentleman from Utah just went to the point as far as the fact the Preamble goes to the issue of a limiting basis. I would just suggest, and I believe he made one reference to this, that despite the fact that today certain people look to the actual words of the preamble as giving us certain rights or powers now, Gouverneur Morris, the delegate from Pennsylvania at the time, added the preamble, I won't use the word as an afterthought, but certainly after the rest of the Constitution was written down. And specifically preambles at that time in any legal document that were written, were understood to say that they did not have a substantive legal basis or meaning to them.

□ 1430

That is to say a Preamble did not grant nor did it limit powers.

So today, when people come and look at the Constitution and say there is the general welfare clause in the Preamble, they should have an understanding that that was not an intention of the drafters of the document, to expand the powers of the Federal Government.

This can be understood if you look to how those who wrote it and lived at that time understood the document. Anybody who has an understanding of the life and times of Alexander Hamilton understood that there was a brilliant mind, a confidant of George Washington. At the beginning of the revolution, he became an aide in battle, and later when George Washington became our first President, Hamilton was there as the Treasury Secretary and one of the most powerful men in government at the time second to the President himself, more powerful than the Vice President and the Cabinet members at the time, someone who had an array of employees under his control inasmuch as the Treasury was dealing with the collection of excise taxes and the like. He had people under his control throughout the entire country.

He understood in order for this country to be great, and he wanted this country to be great, just as the mighty powers of Europe had been at that time, he had envisions that this country could expand and grow through different aspects of building bridges and roads and building canals. But even Hamilton understood that if he was to try to go down this road, that the powers that were granted to the Federal Government at the time were limiting on him. Even Hamilton suggested that a constitutional amendment would have been necessary for them to do

some of the things that Hamilton thought necessary at the time.

So in 1790, Alexander Hamilton said an amendment to the Constitution is necessary in order to make the improvements to the country that are needed for a flourishing democracy. Of course, that amendment never occurred, and therefore the country and following Presidents never had the authority to do many of the things.

Mr. BISHOP will probably cite some of examples of some of the constructions that they were intending to do, and Presidents such as Madison and others vetoed those initiatives.

How all of this is relevant to us today, as someone who may be listening to our debate or discussion right now, this past week the House of Representatives began the debate and now passage of several appropriations bills. We will be coming back in the weeks to come on the consideration and eventual passage of other appropriation bills. Likewise this past week, or the week before last, I should say, this House had a considerable debate on the issue of earmarks.

Just an aside on the whole issue of earmarks. The debate on that topic goes to whether or not the Congress has the authority, and no one really questions this, but the authority to make, the issues of spending money on particular projects, and I don't think anybody debates that too much. The debate we have had on that topic is the transparency issue and whether or not Members of Congress and the American public are able to see exactly what individual Members are requesting that the American tax dollars go to. That is an appropriate debate and one which I supported, and I supported openness and transparency and to shine the light of day on what we do here.

But that really begs the question as to where American tax dollars go at the end of the day. Earmarks are just a very small fraction of the overall government spending. Sometimes we hear of egregious examples, the proverbial ''bridge to nowhere'' and the Cowgirl Hall of Fame and the like. These things are targeted in an appropriation bill, either on the House floor or in the Senate or in conference. People are outraged both here in the House and at home as well when these things are added to the budget.

But we must understand that such spending does not occur simply through earmarks, it occurs in the underlying bills as well. And it occurs also by the executive office and the administration as well.

So the fundamental question that we must be asking is whether it is a particular earmark, whether it is for a bridge to nowhere or a Cowgirl Hall of Fame or a museum someplace that we tag onto a bill here in the House or the Senate; or whether it can be exactly the same type of project that the administration puts into the spending pattern through their agencies and departments, or whether it is the same type of spending in the underlying bill. The larger question is, and this is a question that every Member of Congress should always consider every time they reach into their wallet or their pocket, wherever they keep it, and they pull out their voting card and they put it into the little device to vote ''yes'' or ''no,'' does Congress, does the Federal Government have the authority to spend those dollars on those purposes?

The argument is, and this is where the gentleman from Utah was leading to in the Preamble, which is also referenced in article I, section 8 of the Constitution, is the general spending clause.

So all the adherents of those who support the earmarks and support the spending on these particular topics will either look to the Preamble or article I, section 8, the general spending clause of the Constitution, which says for the general welfare of this country.

Well, as the learned gentleman from Utah would say, we have to have an understanding what the ''general welfare'' of this country was intended by the Framers when they penned that document.

Today we would take that to mean anything that the House of Representatives can think of that would be an improvement for this Nation. That broad and general, expansive meaning, interpretation of the language is not what the Framers intended. What they intended was the opposite. They intended it as a limitating factor on spending.

The Founders intended the general welfare clause and the spending clause in the Constitution was limiting to the extent that Washington could not spend the American taxpayers' dollars on just a parochial interest for this one particular Member's district or for this one particular Member's town or for this county or what have you. Instead, it had to be generally good for the entire Nation.

There is a story that came out of a book that was written in 1884 which I would like to share about a former Member of Congress, the name of which most Americans know, used to be on Disney TV, but he was a real Member of Congress back in 1827–1831, and that was a Member of Congress by the name of David Crockett, more familiarly known as Davy Crockett. He was, I guess you would call him back then, a conservative Member of Congress.

He actually addressed in his writings after he served in Congress this issue of whether or not under the general welfare clause he, as a Member of Congress, had the authority to actually spend money on these parochial interests. Let me share that with you.

He stated: ''If Congress is not given such extensive powers, then who is?'' The answer lies in the 10th amendment. Of course, I am not the first person to suggest this; others have as well.

He writes about how one day in the House of Representatives, that would have been in 1827–1831, a bill was taken up appropriating money for the benefit of a widow of a distinguished naval officer. Several beautiful speeches were made in its support. The Speaker was just about to put the question to the floor of the House when Congressman Crockett rose.

''Mr. Speaker,'' he said, ''I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased, and as much sympathy for the suffering of the living, if suffering there be, as any man in this House, but we must not permit our respect for the dead or sympathy for a part of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living. I will not go into an argument to prove that Congress has no power to appropriate money as an act of charity. Every Member on this floor knows it. We have the right, as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please in charity. But as a Member of Congress, we have no such right to appropriate a dollar of the public money. Some eloquent appeals have been made to us upon the ground that it is a debt due to the deceased. But, Mr. Speaker, the deceased lived long after the close of the war. He was in office to the day of his death, and I have never heard that government was in arrears to him.

''Every man in this House knows it is not a debt. We cannot, without the grossest of corruption, appropriate this money as payment of a debt. We have not the semblance of authority to appropriate it as a charity either. So, Mr. Speaker, I have said we have the right to give as much money of our own as we please. But I am the poorest man on this floor, and yet I cannot vote for this bill, but I will give 1 week's pay to the object. And if every Member of the Congress will do the same, it will amount to more money than this bill.''

At that point he took his seat, and no one replied. The bill was put upon for passage, and instead of passing unanimously, as no doubt it would but for his speech, it received only a few votes, and of course it failed.

Later, when asked by a friend why he had opposed the appropriation, he explained. Here is the crux of the story.

He told how several years earlier one evening he was standing on the steps of the Capitol with some other Members of Congress when their attention was attracted by a great light over the city of Georgetown. It was evidently a large fire. They jumped into a hack and drove over. The houses were burned, and many families were made homeless, and some of them lost all the clothes they had. The weather was cold, and he said that I felt that something ought to be done. And so the next morning a bill was introduced appropriating $20,000 for the relief. All business was put aside, and the bill was rushed through as soon as it could be done.

Davy Crockett stated, The next summer, when it came time to think about the election, I concluded I would take a scout around the district. When riding in a part of my district, I saw a man in

a field plowing and corning towards the road. I spoke to him. He replied politely, but I thought rather coldly.

I began, Well, friend, I am one of those unfortunate beings called candidates. The stranger said, Yes, I know, you are Colonel Crockett, but you should not waste your time. I have seen you before, and I voted for you once, but I shall not vote for you again.

Davy Crockett was shocked by this, but the man stated, You gave a vote last winter which shows that either you have not capacity to understand the Constitution, or you are wanting in the honesty and firmness to be guided by it. In either case, you are not the man to represent me. Your understanding of the Constitution is different than mine, and I cannot overlook, because the Constitution, to be worth anything, must be held sacred and rigidly observed in all its provisions.

To which the Congressman replied, I admit the truth of what you say, but I do not remember that I gave any vote last winter upon any unconstitutional ground. But the man responded that he knew about it, having read about it in the papers, and how last winter you voted to appropriate $20,000 to some sufferers in Georgetown. Crockett admitted that was true.

The gentleman pointed out it was not the amount of money that Congress appropriates that he complains of, it is the principle. In the first place, Congress should not have excess funding. And secondly, it is the principle whether or not the Congress is abiding by the Constitution when it appropriates its money.

He said, so you see, while you are contributing to relieve one person, in that case the people in Georgetown, you are drawing it from thousands who are even worse off than he. If you have the right to give anything, the amount is a matter of discretion. You gave $20,000; you could have given $20 million. If you have the right to give to one, you have the right to give to all. And since the Constitution neither defines charities nor stipulates the amount, you are at liberty to give to anything and everything you believe in as charity, and for any amount you believe. You will easily perceive what a wide door this will open for fraud and corruption and favoritism on the one hand, and for robbing from the people on the other.

The man continued, Colonel, Congress has no right to give to charity. Individual Members may give as much of their own money as they please, but they have no right to touch a dollar of the public money for that purpose. You see, you have violated the Constitution in what I consider a vital point.

In the end what the poor farmer was saying was this: That he had a better understanding of what the Constitution meant and what the Founders had intended when they crafted it less than 100 years earlier at that time; that the Constitution set out limiting powers on the spending of money, both on the Preamble which sets out no powers whatsoever, as previously stated, and under the general spending clause of article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

And this is not just my interpretation or the farmer's reading. The Supreme Court has commented on this in several instances of note.

□ 1445

In 1905, the Supreme Court made that comment that the general welfare of laws under the preamble is not a grant of power but a limiting of power.

This tendency of the understanding of the Constitution was the case from the time of the Founders basically up until around 1930s. Starting in the 1930s in the New Deal, this Nation changed substantially.

It was at that time that this Nation began to have an interpretation of the Constitution that the Congress would be the arbiter of what the general welfare clause meant, and that the general welfare clause basically means that Congress can decide to spend money on any process or program that they desire. Then furthermore, subsequent U.S. Supreme Court decisions have held that the U.S. Supreme Court would not interfere with the determinations of Congress that these are basically political decisions.

To conclude, what this all means, that when the House of Representatives comes back together next week in the weeks that follow on the appropriation bills, when we hear discussions on earmarks and the likes, and when we hear from the other side of the aisle that we will be spending ever more money on the appropriation process than we ever had in U.S. history, the question we should always be asking, is it within the limits of the general welfare clause.

A strict interpretation of that clause would say no, but the Founders have said in order for it to be a general clause it must be for individuals all across this country and nor for a particular town, city or area of a State. It must benefit everyone.

But you will see in each and every one of those appropriations bills, in just about every one of those earmarks that those dollars are going in contravention of the Constitution and in contravention of what the Founding Fathers intended.

For that reason, we come here on a regular basis to try to raise up these issues to have a better understanding of what our Founders intended for the Constitution.

With that, I will say good night, or at least, good evening, Gracie.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate being able to put the phrase, ''promoting the general welfare,'' into a constitutional perspective, as well as a historical perspective. It is true that Madison and Monroe, both as Presidents, vetoed road construction projects because they only benefited the vicinity of the road, not the general welfare.

It's true that the City of Savannah suffered a horrendous fire; and even though people wanted to give money for it, the rebuilding of Savannah, Congress refused because it wasn't the general welfare.

Obviously, as Mr. GARRETT has said, starting with the New Deal era, we changed our view of what these words mean, so that most times, most politicians today just assume Federal involvement is exactly what was intended.

It also says that when these guys wrote the elastic clause of article I, section 8, they must have had a vastly different and a much more limited view on what was the power entailed than modern policymakers or scholars do.

The last phrase of the preamble is that we do ordain and establish. It's an appropriate benediction to the preamble. It's a phrase that brought to the 1780 mind the creation found in the Book of Genesis, for religious vocabulary at the time spoke of God ordaining and creating the Earth, as comparison to the Founding Fathers who ordained and established this new government. These men in a very real and reverent sense created a new country.

We pass laws almost every week that we either make incorrect assumptions about the meaning of the Founders' words, or we simply ignore them as no longer relevant to our time.

Justice Scalia also once again said about the Constitution: ''What it meant when it was adopted it means today, and its meaning doesn't change just because we think that meaning is no longer adequate to our times.''

My students not understanding ''Say goodnight, Gracie'' was simply an annoyance, excusable because they're young, and their view is a tennis player trying to decide whether to date a 20-year-old or a 40-year-old is great television. But for Congress not to understand the meaning of the words of the Constitution is irresponsible, it's inexcusable, and it's dangerous.

Let me yield to one last comment to the chairman of the Constitution Caucus.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I will conclude with the quotes of Thomas Jefferson, who addressed this overall issue, in 1791, when opining on the constitutionality of a national bank, so, in essence, what he was doing is what we were doing, we do every week. The thought was at that time in 1791, of course, Alexander Hamilton at the time was pushing for such, and whether there was a constitutionality to do so.

He said: ''I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground that 'all powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people,' '' obviously our 10th amendment. ''To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specifically drawn around the powers of Congress is to take possession of a boundless field of power, not longer susceptible of any definition.''

Jefferson was very clear that once we overstep the authority that is granted to us by the Constitution, there is no limiting factor on us any more in Congress and the Senate can spend whatever they want on any purpose that they want. The Supreme Court has already opined that they are not going to be the element to rein us in.

So we, therefore, must, fortunately or unfortunately, if not going to rein in ourselves, look to the American public to be the political process to rein the Congress back in the manner that the Constitution and the Founders intended.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to thank the gentleman from Utah, Mr. BISHOP, for reserving time today so that we can discuss the Constitution, the cornerstone of our Republic and freedoms we cherish.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of this body, all of us are sworn to uphold and protect the principles outlined in the Constitution. Yet, all too often, we routinely find ourselves coming to this floor to vote for measures that directly assault the freedoms outlined in it. We too often consider legislation that contradicts the Constitution's core principles of individual freedom together with limited government.

However, make no mistake: Congress isn't the only culprit. It is much more widespread than that. The Constitution is a document of limited, delegated powers for all branches of government. However, we have an executive branch, whether a Republican or Democratic administration, that often looks for ways to grow beyond its constitutionally defined boundaries. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, my constituents are regularly impacted by Federal agencies with legions of bureaucrats who implement regulation upon regulation, each dealing a blow to their pocketbook and very often their liberty.

Again and again, we see the Federal Government taking more power away from the States, effectively leading them to become gigantic, castrated counties solely accountable to Washington, DC. This is wrong and we must take steps to begin rolling back the tide.

Finally, we have the judiciary which, under the principle of checks and balances, is supposed to be the final safeguard of our constitutional liberties. But just last summer, across the street, five people in black robes overturned established constitutional principles by reinterpreting the fifth amendment and the essence of private property rights. No, Mr. Speaker, these examples show that this isn't simply a congressional problem, this is a national problem.

With that, I urge my colleagues to take a moment to remind themselves just why it is they are here. We must remember that we are a body of limited, enumerated powers. We are the first line of defense for our Constitution. As James Madison said, we are the "guardians of . . . (the) rights and liberties" of our citizens. In doing so, we must be willing to question the merits of every bill.

We must be willing to conduct effective and rigorous oversight of the administration's activities. We must be sure to question any initiative that would seek to limit and constrain the rights of the individual and the States. The Constitution is the guide for doing just that. By checking our actions against what is outlined in the Constitution, we'll know when our deeds overstep their limits.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I came to Washington on a platform of freedom—the freedom that is promised to every citizen of the United States in our Constitution. The freedom that makes our Nation a beacon of liberty for the rest of the world.

Through the work of the Constitution Caucus and others in this Chamber, I believe that we can get there—to the Founders' intent: a federal government of limited powers which respects and protects the individuals' various freedoms. We should all heed the words of our Nation's first President, who said, "(t)he Constitution is the guide which I will never abandon."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Illinois) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

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. RAMSTAD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 28 and 29.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a scholarship event in the district.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1352. An act 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".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 25, 2007, at 12:30 p.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:

2284. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Self-Insurance Plans Under the Indian Housing Block Grant Program [Docket No. FR-4897-F-02] (RIN: 2577-AC58) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2285. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedural Rules for DOE Nuclear Activities and Occupational Radiation Protection [Docket No. EH-RM-02-835] (RIN: 1901-AA95) received June 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2286. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's request regarding the use of appropriated funds for the implementation of Section 1221(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2287. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Great Lakes Naval Training Center Harbor, North Chicago, IL [CGD09-07-012] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2288. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Kenosha Harbor, Kenosha, WI. [CGD09-07-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2289. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Patuxent River, Calvert County, MD [CGD05-07-037] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2290. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Baileys Harbor Fireworks, Baileys Harbor, Baileys Harbor, WI. [CGD09-07-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2291. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Kenosha Harbor, Kenosha, WI. [CGD09-07-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2292. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report regarding its efforts in the area of transportation security for the calendar year 2006, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44938; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

2293. A letter from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting a joint report setting forth recommendations regarding cooperative activities in areas of mutual interest related to research, development, and test and evaluation, pursuant to Public Law 109-163, section 259; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Science and Technology.

2294. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report of the Department's Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 345; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security and the Judiciary.

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. DICKS: Committee on Appropriations. Supplemental report on H.R. 2643. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–187, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SERRANO: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2829. A bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2286. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure with respect to bail bond forfeitures (Rept. 110–208). 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. SKELTON (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. NADLER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2826. A bill to amend titles 28 and 10, United States Code, to restore habeas corpus for individuals detained by the United States at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 2827. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide a floor of 1.0 for the practice expense and for the work expense geographic practice cost indices (GPCI) under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

H.R. 2828. A bill to provide compensation to relatives of United States citizens who were killed as a result of the bombings of United States Embassies in East Africa on August 7, 1998; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 2830. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FARR, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. CLARKE):

H.R. 2831. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 2832. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct or support a comprehensive study comparing total health outcomes, including risk of autism, in vaccinated populations in the United States with such outcomes in unvaccinated populations in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 2833. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional limitations on preexisting condition exclusions in group health plans and health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2834. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat income received by partners for performing investment management services as ordinary income received for the performance of services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 2835. A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to extend the requirements under such Act regarding the ability of absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters to use absentee registration procedures and vote by absentee ballot in Federal elections to elections for certain offices in American Samoa; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 2836. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Sea Grant College Program Act for fiscal years 2009 through 2013; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 2837. A bill to provide for administrative procedures to extend Federal recognition to certain Indian groups, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 2838. A bill to enhance the Department of Energy Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program established under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 by explicitly permitting its application on United States Government installations worldwide, in the Insular Areas of the United States, and in those nations in free association with the United States, as well as explicitly authorize loans for ocean thermal energy conversion projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, 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. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2839. A bill to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 to require protection and advocacy systems to give notice to, and obtain the authorization of, an individual (or the individual's legal representative) before pursuing remedies on behalf of the individual; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. CARSON):

H.R. 2840. A bill to amend the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 to allow the direct support by a financial institution of a qualified community-based financial literacy program provided to consumers and borrowers to be taken into account in assessing the institution's record of meeting the credit needs of its entire community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend the wetlands reserve program of the Department of Agriculture to exclude from enrollment under the program land subject to a State or local set-back requirement unless the Secretary determines that enrollment of the land is essential to restore or preserve wetlands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 2842. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit preexisting condition exclusions for children in group health plans and

health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 2843. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of existing libraries and resource centers at United States diplomatic and consular missions to provide information about American culture, society, and history, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that hunting seasons for migratory ducks and geese should be modified so that individuals have a fair and equitable opportunity to harvest such birds; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. REYES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. LEE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H. Res. 510. A resolution honoring the life accomplishments and extraordinary leadership of Sylvia K. Brooks, a 16-year President and CEO of the Houston Area Urban League (HAUL) and first female president of the Houston Urban League, who transformed the Houston Area Urban League into a nationally-recognized and respected social service agency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. BONO, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Res. 511. A resolution congratulating the men's volleyball team of the University of California, Irvine, for winning the 2007 NCAA Division I Men's Volleyball National Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H. Res. 512. A resolution honoring and commending the Honorable Wesley E. Brown, United States District Court Judge for the District of Kansas, for his commitment and dedication to public service, the judicial system, and equal access to justice as he celebrates his 100th birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

86. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Memorial No. 1004 encouraging the Congress of the United States to continue the funding and completion of Sbinet; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 23: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. WALSH of New York, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 111: Mr. HODES.

H.R. 196: Mr. LATHAM and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 197: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 346: Mr. HILL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 446: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 507: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 510: Mr. ISSA and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 552: Mr. OLVER and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 583: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 621: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 642: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 643: Mr. BOREN and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 728: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 743: Mr. SPACE, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 746: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 760: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 901: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 927: Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 969: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 980: Mrs. BONO, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1000: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1014: Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1043: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1077: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1102: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1113: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. FARR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1134: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1154: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1177: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1193: Mr. WATT, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1194: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1216: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1236: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1282: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1283: Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. HARE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 1338: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WATT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 1343: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 1355: Mr. POE.

H.R. 1366: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1399: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 1409: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1419: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1430: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1440: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1459: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1464: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1474: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 1514: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1528: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1532: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1537: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1542: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HARE, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1552: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. FOXX, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 1584: Mr. MELANCON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas and Ms. FALLIN.

H.R. 1589: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 1610: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. BOYD of Florida.

H.R. 1627: Mr. POE.

H.R. 1629: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1647: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

H.R. 1651: Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 1657: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1663: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1671: Mr. HARE, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1693: Ms. WATERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WYNN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WATT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 1713: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1728: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1732: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1740: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1792: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1840: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1841: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 1845: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1880: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1881: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1897: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 1926: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1940: Mr. POE.
H.R. 1947: Ms. CASTOR, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 1965: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1967: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1983: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 1990: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 2015: Mr. REYES, Ms. CASTOR, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 2016: Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 2035: Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 2054: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2066: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2122: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2189: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, MS. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2210: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2219: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 2244: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2265: Ms. NORTON, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 2266: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 2280: Mr. WELLER, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2286: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2293: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2295: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2303: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2307: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2315: Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 2327: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TAYLOR, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2353: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SAXTON.
H.R. 2362: Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 2363: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2365: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BOREN, Ms. MATSUI and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2370: Mr. FEENEY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2390: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 2405: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 2424: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 2464: Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2478: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2486: Mr. LANTOS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 2495: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2512: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2566: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2588: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2591: Mr. OLVER and Mr. HARE.
H.R. 2599: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2605: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 2723: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2729: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2734: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 2746: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2747: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 2750: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARROW, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DOYLE, MR. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. DE LAURO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2761: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 2762: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2772: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2778: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2787: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BURGESS, and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 2792: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.J. Res. 44: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. WYNN.
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. PENCE.
H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.
H. Con. Res. 169: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 32: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. TAUSCER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H. Res. 34: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. CARSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H. Res. 111: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 303: Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 375: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H. Res. 380: Mr. COHEN and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 426: Mr. FORTUÑO.
H. Res. 427: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H. Res. 433: Mr. PICKERING.
H. Res. 467: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Res. 470: Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Res. 477: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H. Res. 489: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H. Res. 493: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 501: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 506: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 509: Ms. LEE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

89. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, relative to a Resolution recognizing the need for state certified school library media specialists; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 22, 2007 No. 102

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SHERROD BROWN, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty and everlasting God whom the heavens of heavens cannot contain, illumine us by Your grace, that we may accurately represent You.

May our Senators today show You their gratitude through humble service to this land that we love. Help them to do Your will by bringing deliverance to captives, guidance for the lost, and relief to the oppressed. Direct their steps and give them the wisdom to focus on the things that truly matter. When bewildered by vicissitudes, may they look to You as the one whom they must seek to please.

Touch us all with Your unfailing love, particularly the many staffers and other unsung heroes and heroines who labor long hours in the background for liberty. We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable SHERROD BROWN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable SHERROD BROWN, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BROWN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate will conduct morning business this morning. It will be announced as soon as I sit down. Members will speak for up to 10 minutes each under the order. There will be no rollcall votes today or during Monday's session.

CREATING LONG-TERM ENERGY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE NATION ACT OF 2007

AMENDMENT NO. 1867

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the title amendment to H.R. 6, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the production of clean renewable fuels, to protect consumers from price gouging, to increase the energy efficiency of products, buildings, and vehicles, to promote research on and deploy greenhouse gas capture and storage options, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.''.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2359

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know that H.R. 2359 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2359) to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings at this time, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JOSHUA MODGLING
SERGEANT FIRST CLASS WILLIAM ZAPFE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, on Memorial Day, I spent a good part of the day in Boulder City, NV, where we have a veterans cemetery. It is new but growing fast. There are almost 25,000 graves in that cemetery which started less than 15 years ago.

On that day, I joined veterans, family, and friends to pay thanks to the Nevadans who have lost their lives in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars.

On that occasion, I shared the words of President Lincoln when our country was torn apart by the Civil War. Lincoln said:

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

My dream is of a place and a time where America will once again be seen as the last best hope of Earth.

With the war raging in Iraq, with the whole area destabilized, his words ring loudly and clearly. My dream, as Lincoln's, is of a place and time where America will once again be seen as the last, best hope on Earth.

The day before yesterday, PFC Joshua Modgling, of Henderson, NV, lost his life in pursuit of that dream. He was 22 years old. Joshua and Army SFC William Zapfe, from Kentucky, both died of wounds from a roadside bomb. They were 2 of the 15 killed within 36 hours, the day before yesterday, in that bloody civil war raging in Iraq.

There is not much that can be said, other than our hearts are with the families of Joshua and William and all those who knew them. I speak for my colleagues and all Americans in praying that every brave man and woman serving overseas will come home safe and come home soon.

PASSAGE OF H.R. 6

Mr. REID. Mr. President, leaving that subject, which is certainly a subject that concerns us all, turning to the subject of this morning, around midnight, when we passed the Energy bill, it was a tremendous accomplishment for this body. As I said yesterday when, with the first vote, cloture was invoked, I hope that set a new tone and pattern in Washington, where we can work together to pass things.

It would be one thing if the bill that was before the Senate for the last couple of weeks was a Democratic bill, but it wasn't. I took what was passed out of the Energy Committee on a bipartisan basis, I took what was passed out of the Commerce Committee on a bipartisan basis, I took what was passed out of the Environment and Public Works Committee on a bipartisan basis and put them into one bill and that is what we have been working on. It is bipartisan legislation.

It is too bad some tried to make it a partisan issue. There is nothing partisan about it. It was a bipartisan bill. But some who do not want any accomplishments in the Senate, who resent the fact we have been able to pass minimum wage; drought relief for farmers for the first time in 3 years; for the first time since President Bush has been President, we have gotten money for homeland security, over his objection—we had tried many times—we got $1 billion; we funded SCHIP; we funded the Government. You know, the Republicans left town and funded the Government only until February 1. We funded the Government until October 1. We passed a balanced budget, even though our majority, because of Senator JOHNSON's illness, was 50 to 49. Republicans with 55 to 45 couldn't pass a budget. We did, and some resent that.

We have focused attention on Iraq, which has been unfocused for the entire course of that war. We had 80 hearings. The Judiciary Committee has focused attention on the scandals at the Justice Department, led by Attorney General Gonzales. We have reestablished the legislative branch of Government. The Presiding Officer served for many years in the other body, such as I did. The House and the Senate make up the legislative branch of Government, set forth in the Constitution many years ago to be a separate and equal branch of Government—the legislative, executive and judicial branches of Government.

For the first 6 years of this Presidency, there was no legislative branch of Government. It did not exist. The President ignored it because the Republican-dominated House and Senate gave the President a big rubber stamp. We have changed that, and rightfully so, for the American people.

A number of people made possible passage of the bill late last night, or this morning. Senator BINGAMAN, Senator BOXER. And let me say this about that wonderful Senator from the State of California, Mrs. BOXER. Senator BOXER has one grandchild, Zach. I have watched him grow up. I don't know, he must be 10, 11 years old now. I watched him when he was a little boy crawling around on the floor. She was so excited.

I had the good fortune, my wife and I, to spend a weekend with them in one of their homes in California, she and Stu. They were so excited they were going to have their second grandchild. That second grandchild was born last night about 6 o'clock eastern time. She flew to California and was headed toward the airport, actually had entered the airport, when the vote occurred last night. She was coming back here to be here this morning to take that vote.

She is a real soldier. I so admire Senator BOXER. We came to Washington together in 1982. She was able to go back and spend some more time with her grandson because we didn't need her here this morning, but the vote was that close.

The bill is important. The overall manager of the bill was Senator BINGAMAN. He did a tremendous job. This quiet, effective man—Stanford and Harvard degrees—has done a wonderful job with this legislation, as he does with everything.

The CAFE standards in this bill which we have passed are so important. For 25 years, we have been trying to get increased fuel efficiency. Each time we have tried we have been defeated. People had enough. Senators had enough. We have voted against CAFE standards for too long. We were told they said that if you voted for increased fuel efficiency, we are going to close production plants, we are going to lay people off, we are going to lose market share.

They were right, except it didn't take increased fuel efficiency. They simply became not competitive. Other cars coming into this market that people wanted to buy, fuel-efficient vehicles, were bought. So we increased fuel efficiency. It is great for this country. It will save millions of barrels of oil every year.

There was legislation that was drafted by a number of people to make this effective. It came out of the Commerce Committee originally, but the people who worked so hard the last few days were Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator KERRY, Senator SNOWE, Senator STEVENS, and let me say, I have the good fortune in working very closely with the senior Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY. She is the secretary of the Democratic caucus. I have worked with her very closely.

She is a tremendous Senator, a tremendous asset to me, the caucus, of course the State of Washington, and the country.

One of the quiet, effective Members of the Senate is MARIA CANTWELL. Those of us who watched her the last 3 days on this Senate floor, making sure there were enough votes to pass the aspect of the bill we call CAFE standards, saw her effectiveness. She, at any given time with votes changing back and forth knew—that piece of paper she carried—where the votes were. I went to her many times yesterday and said what happens if this happens and what happens if this happens? She knew right away.

Senator INOUYE, the chairman of the Commerce Committee, reported that out. He worked with Senator STEVENS to make sure that as the matter changed a little bit, it was done properly. I hope I mentioned Senator KERRY's name; I meant to. He is such a believer. He has written books. He is so concerned about the environment.

Words cannot describe how important Senator CANTWELL was in our being able to pass this legislation. Of course, my friend Senator DURBIN, who is the whip, assistant leader, is always around, always helpful in doing things I and others ask him to do, and does so much on his own.

I wish I could express my appreciation adequately to all of the people whose names I mentioned. If I slighted someone, I certainly did not mean to do that. But I have mentioned some names that have come to my mind.

With strong bipartisan support, we passed an energy bill that will grow our economy, strengthen our national security, and protect our environment. If passed into law, this bill will put us on a path toward reducing our reliance on oil by increasing supply of renewable fuels produced right here at home, and decreasing the amount of energy we use in our cars, homes, and offices.

Why do we say it will strengthen our economy? Because especially in rural America there will be biofuel buildings, factories to make biofuels.

We have done things to protect our environment by reducing greenhouse gases and other toxins that are emitted using fossil fuel. For the first time since 1975, our bill raises standards for new cars and trucks, as I have mentioned, from 25 to 35 miles per gallon,

which is really important. That still puts us behind Europe, Japan, and China, but it is a critical step in the right direction and will save up to 1 billion gallons of gas every day. Think about that—1 billion gallons of gasoline every day. I don't know how big a tank a billion gallons is. I do know that we use 21 billion barrels of oil every day in America, 65 percent of which is imported. I know how big a hole that is. It is the width of a football field, 11 miles long and 10 feet deep.

For the automakers still wavering on increasing fuel efficiency, I say this: Do not fight the change; embrace it. There is no reason our automobile manufacturers cannot do this. There is no reason. Others do it all over the world. Cannot we as Americans do it? Of course we can. They need to embrace the opportunity to build the high performance cars and trucks Americans want to buy and drive and which we so desperately need for the sake of our national security and global warming. It is time for American automobile manufacturers to lead the world once again. That will only come through a commitment to clean innovation.

The next part of the bill that passed reduces crude oil consumption by more than 10 percent over the next 15 years by producing more renewable fuels, by producing them right here at home, more renewable fuels on America's farms, fields, and in our forests, which will create tens of thousands of new American jobs.

We set new energy efficiency standards with light bulbs, light fixtures, appliances, water heaters, boilers, air conditioners, which will save half a trillion gallons of water every year. For a State such as Nevada—Las Vegas gets 4 inches of rain every year—that is dramatic.

Because Government should lead by example, we also dramatically improved the energy efficiency of Federal buildings and vehicles, as relates to energy, which will save billions of American taxpayer dollars.

Senator BOXER has a provision in this bill that relates to the capture of carbon. It is a carbon capture study at the Capitol powerplant, and it also requires 15 percent of every bit of energy we use on this Capitol Hill complex—by the way, there are more than 10,000 employees here—that we need to get that from renewable sources.

We need to invest in the technologies that will drive our energy future, such as carbon capture and storage, that hold the hope of containing carbon emissions from producing power sources before they ever reach the air.

Last night's passage of the Energy bill was a great victory for the American people. Here is why: We will save American consumers tens of billions of dollars annually, cut our oil consumption by 7 million barrels a day within 20 years, reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources now, and take critical steps in these early stages of our fight against global warming. There is a long way to go to secure the kind of clean and safe energy future we need. This bill is a first step, but it is an important first step.

The bill is not perfect. It is unfortunate that in passing this bill the administration and most Senate Republicans blocked an effort to require more of our Nation's electricity to come from renewable sources as well as incentives to spur the production of more renewable fuels right here in America. But this fight is not over. Our friends in the House will pass their bill quickly so we can send it to the President for his signature. But this bill, once again, shows us when we find common ground, we can accomplish uncommon good.

Mr. President, I see that my friend and partner in what happens here in the Senate is here, Senator DURBIN.

I have already expressed, Senator DURBIN, my appreciation for the work you did in getting to the final passage of this bill. You and I spend so much time alone that I do not often get to say anything publicly about you, so I will take a brief moment to say you and I have been in the legislature, on a national basis, since 1982 together. We have had good days and bad days. That is what legislation is all about. But I so appreciate having you as a partner here in the Senate. You have been stalwart. The people of Illinois are so fortunate to have you representing them in the Senate. I hope I can tell you in this manner how much I admire and appreciate your advocacy, your friendship, and the good work you do for all of our country.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant majority leader is recognized.

PASSAGE OF H.R. 6

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, thank you for recognizing me. Also I want to thank the majority leader for his kind words. He and I work very closely together, spend more time together than we ever imagined as we embarked on this journey, now in leadership, to try to serve the people of this Nation.

I want to say a word about my friend from Nevada. Senator HARRY REID is misunderstood by many Americans. Because he is soft spoken, and not as assertive as some politicians are, there are many on the outside who question his leadership capacity. No one on the inside questions it. He is the most highly respected leader I have ever had the good fortune to work with. It is based on the fact that he is inclusive, he is honest, outspoken, and stands by those who are willing to work harder to achieve our agenda.

Last night was a perfect illustration of this. The Energy bill was just a dream, a theory, for so long. The question was, could we put together a bipartisan coalition. We had to find a level of compromise and a level of cooperation or we did not have a chance. It was not easy to try to put into law, for the first time in over 20 years, a new national goal for fuel efficiency of our cars and trucks. It changed a lot of things and was viewed as threatening by many people.

My wife and I have made a point of doing our very best to buy American cars. We are loyal to the American automobile industry. With very few exceptions we have tried to make sure our purchases were on behalf of American workers. It was painful last night to be engaged in a debate where my good friends in the automobile industry, not just management—but I guess I have to be totally open with you, I am closer to those who work the lines, in Belvidere, IL and Bloomington, the United Auto Worker employees. I know these men and women. These are good people. They are hard-working people. They take pride in what they do.

They have been disappointed. I have as well. But our automobile industry in this country has been falling farther and farther behind. Just a few months ago, the CEOs, the major corporate officers of the Big Three came, just a few feet away, and met with the leadership in Congress. I had a chance to ask a question of the CEOs of Ford and General Motors and Chrysler. I asked a pretty hard question, but it was one that has been bothering me.

I said to them at the time: You know, I am one of your most loyal customers. I have owned cars and trucks from each of your companies and plan on continuing to try to buy your products in the future. But I am troubled because of the simple fact—I asked them—I said: Have any of you ever heard of a magazine called ''Consumer Reports''?

There was this kind of embarrassed silence in the room. I said: Well, I want you to explain something to me. Why, for the last 20 years, have American cars consistently shown poorer performance results than imported cars? Why have foreign cars, particularly from Japan, over the last 20 years consistently shown better performance results, better trade-in value? Why? What has been happening out there? We have the best engineering schools in the world. We started this industry, at least on a mass volume basis. Why is there such a difference in quality?

There was this pained silence while they waited for one of them to respond. Finally, one of the CEOs said: Well, we are getting better.

I said: I hope you are.

But the bottom line is, this industry now has been challenged. If the bill we passed last night is passed in the House of Representatives and becomes law, they will face a challenge. I, for one, believe they can rise to this challenge. I honestly do. It is going to call for a different mindset among the management at the highest levels in our automobile companies. It is going to call for the same spirit of can-do approach we have seen on the assembly lines from the workers. I think they can rise to this challenge.

I think America wants them to. I want to buy a car made in this country by American workers that is of the highest quality, that I can take pride in driving, knowing it is not only a good bargain for my family, but also a good deal for the environment.

That, I think, is what most Americans want to do. Now, that means there is going to have to be some new thinking. It means a lot of people in the boardrooms of those major companies are going to have to sit down and rethink their game plan.

I met with the man who is about to become the leader of Chrysler Corporation. He was talking about the fact that his private equity bought Chrysler because of their patriotic feelings. They do not want this great American car manufacturer to go away.

Well, I know if you are in business, sentimentality takes you so far. At some point you have to produce a profitable product. I think there is a profitability product built into the Energy bill we talked about last night. I believe if there is a conscious effort by our automobile manufacturers, they can meet these fuel efficiency standards we have included in our bill.

They can convince a lot of skeptical Americans it is time to come back home, to start buying these American cars. Now, it will be a painful process. There will be winners and losers. But, ultimately, I have confidence in this country, in the companies that work in this country, and in the workers of this country. When they come together, they can achieve great things.

Last night we set down a challenge to them: Change what you are selling in America. Make it a better product. Make it a more efficient product. Make it a product that is going to help us deal with global warming and climate change.

I think most American families are on board for that agenda. That is why I think the passage of this was so important. We never would have passed this energy bill late last night were it not for a bipartisan effort. We had many Republicans who crossed the aisle to join us. I think ultimately 17 or 18 came over to join the Democrats in the key procedural vote that moved this forward. Then the final vote was 65 to 27; there were even more.

We could have never achieved this goal of a new energy bill were it not for bipartisan cooperation, if Republicans had not come forward.

For some, it wasn't easy. When the Republican Senate leader, Mr. MCCONNELL of Kentucky, stood up last night late in the debate and said: I want this debate to end, I want this bill to be defeated, I am going to vote no on the cloture motion—I heard him make that announcement—I was stunned. This is a bill which the administration believes has good elements relative to fuel economy. Yet the Republican leader stood on the floor and said: I am going to try to stop this bill. He did not prevail because 17 or 18 of his colleagues thought it was more important that the bill move forward. I salute them. It took extraordinary courage for them to do what they did.

There was another element in the Energy bill which is important to me because of my midwestern roots and because of my determination to see America shake its dependence on foreign oil. I am sick and tired of the United States hat in hand begging for oil from countries overseas. Many of these nations we turn to for oil don't share our values. In fact, some of them are on the wrong side in the war on terrorism. To think that every time you swipe that credit card through the gasoline pump or put the money on the counter, a portion of that is going to a nation which is funding terrorism is an outrage. It has to end. To think that time and again our brave soldiers, men and women in uniform, are drawn into conflicts in the Middle East because of oil is unacceptable. I don't want my grandchildren to face that. I want America to be as close to energy independent as possible. How do we reach that goal? Homegrown fuel, homegrown energy. We grow it in my State every year, a new crop of corn. With that new crop of corn, more ethanol, more alcohol fuels, and more biodiesel come from the soybean fields. That means we have less of a need to import oil.

Last night, in this bill, we raised to a much higher level our national goals when it comes to alcohol fuels, renewable fuels. It means a growing industry in my part of the world, in the Midwest, in Iowa, Illinois, Ohio, where ethanol plants are being built. These plants use local production of agriculture, corn by and large, and turn it into alcohol. The construction workers are building the plants, good-paying jobs. There are people at the plants making sure they are producing ethanol. They are shipping products in trucks driven by Americans to put in the cars driven by Americans. I feel good about this. We are moving in the right direction.

This bill made a significant commitment to strengthen the market for alcohol fuels. I was disappointed that my biodiesel program was not included. I wish it had been. I am not giving up. We have a farm bill coming up. We will have several other opportunities. I think biodiesel is great. It uses soybeans and other oilseeds to produce a vegetable oil added to diesel fuel so that we don't see that huge plume of black smoke coming out of the tailpipes of diesel trucks and cars, so there is less pollution. More homegrown energy is a good thing for the country. I want to include it as part of the energy picture.

This was a hard debate over the last 2 weeks. I am sorry it took 2 weeks. We wasted more time on the floor. I am sure the people who have C–SPAN on their cable often turn to it and say: What in the world is going on in the Senate? It doesn't look like there is any movement. Is anybody alive down there? The floor looks empty except for the handsome and beautiful staff we have here who are on television during the day. Many times there are periods when there is no activity. Time is wasted. There was time wasted on this bill. Time and again, the Republican minority forced us to wait 30 hours, file a motion, wait another 30 hours.

We have a lot to do. I think we owe it to the American people to roll up our sleeves and get it done. We need more bipartisan cooperation. We need to put an end to these endless motions and procedural delays. Let's get down to business. Wouldn't the American people cheer us if we said: Let's pass the 9/11 recommendations and turn them into law to make America safer; let's do something immediately about No Child Left Behind to send money to the schools so they can hire the very best teachers and produce students who are ready to compete in the 21st century. Wouldn't the American people cheer us if, instead of being lost in some procedural morass day after weary day, we came up with a way to help working families pay for college education expenses for their children so they don't end up graduating deep in debt and unable to take the jobs they had their hearts set on?

There are so many things we need to do. With a little cooperation from the other side of the aisle and a better approach, we can say to our Republican friends: You are entitled under the rules of the Senate to produce amendments, to ask for a vote, to ask for debate. But at some point, it has to come to an end. At some point, we have to move forward.

EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are going to have a bill come up next week, a critically important bill known as the Employee Free Choice Act. I confess I come into this debate with strong feelings. I am a product of a family where my mother and father, my two brothers, and I were all members of labor unions. This was during a period where the labor movement created the middle class in America. It was World War II's aftermath. All of the returning veterans had an appetite to build homes, start families, open schools, and create the kind of middle-income working families who are the bedrock of America's democracy. The organization that helped these Americans move

forward was the labor movement. Organized labor went into plants and factories and offices across America and said: Workers, if you stand together, if you bargain together, great things can happen.

They did. We created health insurance as we know it today, pension plans that have provided the kind of security people dream of in retirement, good-paying jobs in safe workplaces. The American dream was realized. People bought the second car, put the kids through college, had enough time for a vacation, and enjoyed the good life in America.

It is no coincidence that as the strength of America's labor movement has declined. So, too, have the wages of working families. Not that those working families aren't doing a good job; they are. They are producing more goods and services than ever. They are more productive than ever, but they are not being paid for their hard work. They are not receiving a decent, livable wage so they can work one job and still have time with their family. They are not receiving the kind of health insurance protection they once received and fewer and fewer are receiving.

Taking a look at the numbers, in Illinois the median hourly wage fell in 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 by 4.4 percent. Think about that. The median wage of people getting up and going to work every day is not keeping up with inflation; it is falling behind. Health care benefits in Illinois, the share of the population under the age of 65 with employer-provided health insurance fell from 71.9 percent in 1999 to 68.2 percent in 2004. Fewer people had health insurance through their employers over a 5-year period. That is the wrong direction. Pensions are the same. In my State, 52.6 percent of the people had employer-provided pensions in the years 1998 to 2000. By 2003 to 2005, the share had dropped to under 50 percent.

I honestly believe if workers can organize, if they can bargain, we could have profitable corporations with quality goods and services, good employee morale, and employees treated decently. That can happen.

The Employer Free Choice Act says that we want to give employees who want to organize a fighting chance. Some will say during the debate: If a majority of the workers in the workplace sign a card and say, I want to be part of a union, the process moves forward. Currently, if 30 percent of the workers sign a card, they move toward an election. Do you know how long it takes to have this election? Do you know how long it takes for the employees to finally get their chance to vote today as to whether they want a union? The Chicago Tribune pointed out in March of this year that the average National Labor Relations Board disputed election—and so many of them are disputed—takes 802 days to resolve, more than 2 years. Just think for a moment: if we said that the interminable campaigns we now have for public office would double in length—instead of a year from announcing your candidacy to a vote, we will make it over 2 years—is it possible voters would lose interest in that period of time? Is it possible people could work on their minds about prejudices against a candidate or for a candidate during that time? Of course it is. We need to make this a reasonable period and a reasonable process that comes to the ultimate question: Do a majority of the workers at this location want to organize collectively to try to represent their best interests and the interests of their family? I believe that is only fair.

Tuesday morning, we will have a vote. I hope my colleagues on both sides will take a close look at the legislation. If we give more opportunities for workers to express their heartfelt intentions about creating a union and they do, what is going to happen in America is as positive as what happened after World War II. We are going to see more workers in safer workplaces with decent living wages, good health insurance, and good pension benefits, and the corporations will still make a profit. Instead of giving some CEO $600 million for very little performance, they may have to make do with $300 million. I know it is going to be tough, but I think they can get by and then take that $300 million and give it to the workers so they have a chance to enjoy a good life without indebtedness and without the worries that come with the current situation.

I hope my colleagues will join me on Tuesday in supporting this effort. I hope in joining me, we will see a change in the law and, with this change, we will see a dramatic improvement in the economic fate of American families.

PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post had a front-page story that troubles me. It is about Vice President CHENEY and his attempts to exempt the Office of the Vice President of the United States of America from the Presidential Executive order that establishes a uniform, government-wide system for safeguarding classified national security information. The decision by Vice President CHENEY to exempt his office from this system for protecting classified information troubles me. It could place national security secrets at risk.

It is hard to believe the Vice President is taking this action given the history of security breaches involving high-ranking officials in his office. Scooter Libby, the Vice President's former Chief of Staff, has been convicted of several felonies: perjury, obstruction of justice, and false statements. He has been sentenced to prison in part for his role in disclosing the identity of a covert CIA agent and then misrepresenting that fact to a grand jury. Worse, it appears, at least according to these press reports, Vice President CHENEY has attempted to block inspection of Federal agencies and White House offices to ensure compliance with the security procedures required by the President.

According to the National Archives, the agency responsible for conducting the oversight, Vice President CHENEY asserted that his office is not ''an entity within the executive branch'' and, therefore, not subject to Presidential Executive orders. The Vice President is arguing that his office is not in the executive branch of Government? It is hard to imagine the tortured logic Vice President CHENEY is using to avoid the requirements of the law and Executive orders.

Then he recommended that the Executive order be amended to abolish the Information Security Oversight Office. Here is a Vice President who has already been challenged as to the groups he meets with and the people he consults with in making some of the most important decisions for the country's policy. Here is a Vice President who has sadly misrepresented this war in Iraq over and over again, from the initiation of the war, the existence of weapons of mass destruction, and now is saying that he is not covered by the law when it comes to the disclosure of classified information within his own office. This is evidence of arrogance of power, and it is unacceptable.

The Vice President of the United States and his former Chief of Staff are not above the law. They have to be held to the same high standard of performance as Members of Congress and every member of our Government. For the Vice President to believe he has no responsibility to meet this requirement of the law is, in my mind, a dereliction of duty and responsibility to the people of the United States. And then for him to attempt to abolish the agency that was putting pressure on him to follow the law shows he has gone entirely too far.

Vice President CHENEY is not above the law. He is required to follow the law, as every American citizen should. This situation and the prosecution of his former Chief of Staff are evidence of an attitude toward governmental responsibility which has to change. I sincerely hope the Vice President will make it clear in the week ahead that he is finally going to comply with these Executive orders, that he is going to make sure we protect classified information moving through his office so we do not compromise this important intelligence data that keeps America safe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS THEODORE M. ''COTY'' WEST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the legacy left behind by a brave young Kentuckian. In Berea, KY, people remember Theodore M. ''Coty'' West as a devoted husband, a caring older brother, a loving son, and a steadfast friend.

His fellow soldiers remember him as a sturdy soldier who cared about his buddies. His legacy remains in the form of a charity he founded that sends care packages to soldiers serving in Iraq. This work is now carried on by his family, in his memory.

PFC Theodore M. West—''Coty'' was his nickname—enlisted in the U.S. Army in August 2005, and was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 1st Cavalry Division, at Fort Hood, TX.

He was deployed in Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom in November 2006. Just a few weeks later, on November 29, 2006, an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle during combat operations in Baghdad, tragically ending Coty's life. He was 23 years old.

For his valorous service, Private First Class West received the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart, along with numerous other medals and awards.

Private First Class West understood the values that set America apart have been paid for by freedom's defenders, and he wanted to join their ranks. In a letter to his church that arrived on the day he died, Coty urged his friends at home to ''sleep well tonight . . . because tonight we stand guard on the wall, and no one will get through to hurt you.''

That kind of courage to stand up to any enemy, that strength of spirit, made Coty West one of America's finest sons.

Coty grew up amidst the rolling hills of Berea, KY, surrounded by a loving family, a circle of friends, and a devoted young wife. All of these members of Coty's community hold special memories of him, from when he was a little boy to the day he left for Fort Hood.

It was in Berea, when Coty was only 4 years old, that he told his parents he and his brother Ben would go out and dig for treasure. His parents told their young treasure hunters to be safe and stay within sight. Imagine their surprise when Coty and Ben returned home with a collection of 14 antique silver dollars and some antique jewelry they had dug up in the yard.

Coty's family was important to him. They remember him gallantly saddling up and taking out his horse at the age of 8, in a saddle as big as he was, desperately trying to be brave, when he must have been scared to death.

And the time he and his younger sister Sheri enrolled in a hunting safety course so they could get their hunting licenses. The younger Sheri bested Coty by 10 points on the test, a fact he was never allowed to live down.

Coty and his family especially enjoyed taking road trips. They would travel to NASCAR races, State parks, and Civil War battlefields. It was something the family cherished, especially as the kids grew up. It gave them a way of all getting back together again.

On July 5, 2006, Coty married Jennifer Gregory in a military ceremony near her home in Greenville, KY. His father later wrote that ''the ceremony really fit Coty, as it was beautiful, it was country, and it was military.'' Jennifer remembers her husband as ''an angel . . . and perfect.'' I am certain Coty felt the same about her.

After graduating from Estill County High School, Coty worked in his family's energy and construction business as an operator and foreman. He was certain, though, that his career lay in the military. His father describes Coty as neither a hawk nor a dove, but a soldier. He viewed his job as protecting those he loved and waging war on those who would harm them.

Early on in his military career, Coty became aware of the financial burden combat could have on his fellow soldiers. He also felt for those with little or no family, who lacked the messages from home that so often sustain a young soldier.

So Coty began a charity to help his fellow soldiers going to Iraq. His efforts evolved into ''Coty and Friends,'' a circle of military families and supporters who would send soldiers needed supplies before their deployment.

But Coty never lived to see his plans come to fruition. He was killed before the first box of Coty and Friends supplies arrived in Iraq. The group's efforts still continue, in his memory.

The night Coty was deployed to Iraq, the last thing he told his family was: ''I love you all, I know you love me, I am good at my job, and I will see you soon.''

Coty leaves behind a beloved family. He is missed and cherished by his wife, Jennifer Gregory West, his mother, Rene Brandenburg, his father, Bill West, his stepmother, Mary Ann West, his sister, Sheri Miller, his brothers Dee, Matt, and Ben West, his grandparents Rufus West and Jessie Mae Brandenburg, and many others.

Coty West understood the price of freedom. He wanted his family to be safe here at home, and he saw that they would be, as he and his fellow soldiers stood guard on the wall. He gave of himself so others could enjoy what he fought to protect.

The Coty and Friends charity still brings his family together, and it still sustains our brave sons and daughters in Iraq who stand guard on the wall, so that others may live in peace and security.

This country will never forget PFC Theodore West's sacrifice. Neither will the soldier in Iraq who opens a Coty and Friends care package tonight. I ask the Senate to send their thoughts and prayers to the West family, who continue to give to their country, even after they have already given so much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we are all thankful for those comments given by our Members about the extraordinary bravery and heroism of our men and women who serve in the Armed Forces of our country. All of us, day after day, salute their courage and their dedication to the country, and it reminds us of our responsibility of making sure we are going to get the policy right in Iraq. More about that at another time.

THE ECONOMY AND WORKING FAMILIES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we find ourselves now in the middle of June, and it is important, as we move through the legislative agenda—and more on that next week—that we pause for a few moments and take stock about where our country is in terms of the economy of this Nation and take stock about where our country is with regard to working families in this Nation.

We often get tied up on particular pieces of legislation, but I think all of us are very mindful it is the working families of this Nation who have made America great. If America is great—and it is great—it is because of working families in all parts of our Nation.

We are mindful of our recent history: of those extraordinary men and women who lifted our Nation out of the Great Depression of the 1920s and the 1930s; the extraordinary exploitation of workers that took place, even prior to that time and during that period of time; and the struggle workers had in order to have a voice in the decisionmaking part of this Nation, in the workplace as well as in governmental policies, that influenced the conditions by which they worked. It was a long, continuing struggle. It was a long, continuing struggle, with a loss of life and blood that was shed and with battles that were fought—physically fought.

Out of the end of it came the trade union movement, which has made such a difference in terms of the life of this country, the fairness of the country, the economic fairness and economic justice of the Nation.

It has always impressed me—as one who has been a sponsor of the increase in the minimum wage, with a number of our colleagues—that even though many of these union members are making a good deal more than the minimum wage, that any time issues about the working conditions of fellow Americans who are at the short end of the economic ladder arise, they are always out there. They are always there. They are always not only speaking for but in support of their fellow workers in this country.

That was seen in this last year in the six different States that had initiatives about the increase in the minimum

wage, where the representatives of the trade union movement were out there going door-to-door, working with other families, shoulder to shoulder, to try to indicate and reflect that this Nation wanted to make sure that work paid, that those on the short end of the economic ladder—primarily women—were going to be able to receive a decent wage for a decent hour's work.

We need to recognize, again, the majority of women who are out there receiving the minimum wage have children, so it is a children's issue, it is a women's issue. It is a civil rights issue because so many of those who earn the minimum wage are men and women of color. Most of all, it is a fairness issue. Americans understand fairness.

What we have seen over the more recent years is enormously distressing and disturbing because we have seen that those efforts of the trade union movement are targeted by unscrupulous employers and companies who are bent upon destroying the trade union movement and to move us back into a different time and a different circumstance for those workers.

We saw, in fact, it took 10 years for us to get an increase in the minimum wage. The minimum wage was purchasing, at the end of those 10 years, perhaps less than at any time in the history of the minimum wage. We have seen it reflected in the policies of this administration, when they cut about 6 million workers out of overtime and when they refused to include Davis-Bacon provisions for the restoration of the buildings and constructions down in the gulf coast because of Katrina and with a whole series of additional kinds of activities. We see the courts, as well, striking down protections in the last few weeks—protections for an increase in the minimum wage and overtime pay for homecare workers. We see the Supreme Court also effectively striking down equal pay for women. There is really an assault—an assault—on working families.

As we look back at the history of this country, what really reflects—these are general statements and comments, but let's look at what were the circumstances and what were the conditions I speak about. If you look at 1947 to 1973—and we are looking at the economic growth in the United States of America; this is the Economic Policy Institute—and you look over this chart and you see each segment of the American economy is all growing, virtually at the same rate. This was 1947 to 1973. America was growing together. This is extraordinary because we know we just came out of World War II. We had mobilized 16 million of our fellow citizens, and that had an extraordinary impact, and we had to retool the whole domestic economy and still we were able to see the growth in the United States of America move along at a similar kind of growth pattern so that all Americans and those at the lowest end of the economic ladder moving just a little bit faster, a little bit faster than some of those in the top 20 percent.

Then, from 1973 up to the year 2000, we find a new political philosophy taking place in this country. These were the policies we were going to see, the very dramatic and significant tax cut policies, the economic policies that took place in the 1980s and after, with the Republicans. We look at this and we see the level of growth between 1973 and 2000, and we see the lowest economic growth growing at the lowest rate and on up to those at the top growing the fastest—in a number of instances, growing three or four times faster than those at the lowest. That is a direct result of economic policies by primarily the Executive and Congress, which advantages those individuals at the top of the economic ladder and disadvantages those at the bottom.

If we look at what has been happening over the last 5 years, we see those at the lowest end of the economic ladder are now not only not moving up but falling further and further behind, and those top 1 percent—not the top 20 percent, but the top 1 percent—have been moving up so dramatically. So we are having a divided America.

Now, let's see what is the one factor that has had the greatest influence. This is an interesting chart because, remember, we talked about 1947 and how we all grew together. Look at this. We had the increase in productivity, that is the increase in workers' output, finding more efficiencies, more effectiveness, and we also found a corresponding increase in the wages. American workers were participating in the increased productivity, and with that participation all during this 20-year period, the American economy and Americans were growing together—growing together, not apart. We ask ourselves: Do we want to be a divided nation, or do we want to be one nation with one history and one destiny?

Then look what happened during the latter period. This is at a period of peak union membership. Wages and productivity rose together. America was on the road to prosperity, and all Americans were participating, and the trade union movement played an important role to ensure fairness in the workplace. Now we find that the unions are declining. And what happens correspondingly? As the unions decline, the workers fall further behind. Here we have real wages from the 1970s to 2000 virtually stagnant, and the increasing productivity which grew at 206 percent more than wages. What does that demonstrate? It demonstrates that we have seen the extraordinary growth in the profits. We find workers' wages have basically stabilized, but corporate profits grew up to 63 percent. Wages were down here, and profits were at the top during the same period of time that workers and unions are being attacked and attacked and attacked.

From 1947 to the early 1960s, right in here, we had effectively what we call the card checkoff, which is the subject of the legislation we will be voting on next Tuesday. Interestingly, the card checkoff was in effect all during this period of time: from 1941, 1946, 1956, right up to 1966. We had the card checkoff then.

The legislation we will be voting on next Tuesday has already been in effect and been utilized. We will hear a lot of statements on the floor of the Senate about a process and a procedure which is irregular and fraught with problems and complexities, but the fact is, we had it in use in the United States of America all during the period where we had economic stability and economic growth, and the Nation was growing together. Then, as the National Labor Relations Board changed and the Supreme Court and businesses got geared up, they effectively eliminated the card checkoff.

We have seen what has been happening in the workplace, and this indicates how abuses have skyrocketed. So when we had the checkoff, we had economic growth, we had economic prosperity, and America growing together. That is what we want. That is what next Tuesday morning is about—to restore this period of time when America, with the checkoff, was able to ensure economic growth and prosperity for workers across the board. That is what we are looking for.

Now, you say: Well, what are all these abuses you talk about? That is an easy word to use, but what are we really talking about? What we are talking about are these kinds of abuses which are the everyday abuses being used in the workplace.

First of all, the workers face too many roadblocks to try to get a union. Over here, workers who lead the union effort are fired. I will give examples and illustrations of that.

Then, the employer challenges the election results at the NLRB. So even if they have a successful vote for the union, too many of all of those results are challenged in the NLRB.

Then, the employer appeals the ruling often in court.

Then, the employer stalls and refuses to bargain for a first contract.

If you look at what has been happening in the courts, you will find more have been upholding the National Labor Relations Board when they have found against the workers.

Then, after 1 year, the employers, if they are able to delay, can seek to stop recognizing the union, and workers have to start all over again.

This is a pattern. This isn't a unique situation. This is what is happening now.

This is what is happening. The employees are fired in one-quarter of all the private sector union organizing campaigns. One-quarter are all fired. One in five workers who openly advocate for a union during an election campaign is fired.

Now, it is fair enough to ask—in 2005, here is the employer abuses chart. In

2005, 30,000 workers received backpay after the National Labor Relations Board found that employers had violated their rights—30,000 in 1 year alone. That means employers at some time during the year fired or violated the rights of 30,000 people—30,000. That is 30,000 we are talking about who are being treated unfairly.

Now, the question becomes, do workers really want to join? Are we talking about something that is a real problem or not?

Here is 1984 to 2005. Workers want unions more than ever, but can't join them. The percentage of nonunion workers who want a union is up 23 percent. The percentage of workers in a union is down 6.5 percent. So you would think with those kinds of indicators we would be able to have a clear pathway where people would have an opportunity to join, but that is not the case. What we have seen is out across the countryside, on a wide range of different kinds of issues, this is what is happening across the countryside for the average family in this country.

We find that gas is up 79 percent. We find medical expenses are up 38 percent. College tuition is up 43 percent. We find that housing is up 40 percent, and wages effectively are stagnant or up only 4 percent.

The survey we earlier saw about the numbers of people who wanted to join the unions show that over half of the workers—more than 60 million workers—would join a union if they could, but they cannot.

Now, we have given some of the flow lines and the statistics, but these charts show what happens to some real people: ''I was fired,'' Erron Hohrein, former boilermaker from Front Range Energy. This is a picture of him.

They forced us to attend meetings. They threatened that if our campaign was successful, our paychecks may suffer. Managers would follow me around the workplace at all times. They would not permit other workers to talk to me. They isolated me from my coworkers. Within days after the union election was certified by the National Labor Relations Board, I was fired.

This gentleman worked in that plant and found all kinds of safety concerns and raised the safety concerns to the employers and was told to keep quiet, even though he believed those kinds of safety matters were endangering the lives of the people with whom he was working. When he found that the employer was unwilling to try and address some of these safety conditions, he said: I am going to try and form a union. Then he had the following circumstances: within days after the union election was certified, he was fired. So this is happening out there. These are examples of the 30,000.

Anna Calles, who is a laundry worker in North Carolina:

The union was the only way to have better pay, good health insurance and equality, not discrimination. Cintas will never improve working conditions on its own free will. When we tried to organize, management told us that we would lose our jobs. The workers are scared. The NLRB has not been able to help much. We have had to wait three years to get a decision.

Delay, delay, delay, delay.

Cintas has appealed the NLRB's ruling that the company committed extensive violations of workers' rights.

So Anna and her coworkers are still waiting for justice.

These are real-life stories. It is quite clear why individuals want to be able to join the unions.

These are the figures which show that union members get better wages. These are Department of Labor statistics which show that workers are going to be able to have a modest increase 30 percent more—than those who are nonunion.

If we look at particular sectors of our economy—this is an interesting chart. A union job means higher wages for women and for people of color. Again, we are talking about equity in this country. We are talking about fairness in this country.

This is what unions do in terms of equity and in terms of fairness. If you look at women, the difference it makes in terms of helping, it is more than 31 percent; nonunion, if you are talking about African-Americans and Latinos—all of them are inevitably much better off. If you have the freedom to choose the union, it lifts the workers out of poverty. This is the Federal poverty line, this black line across here on the chart. Look at this. These are the national figures for these particular industries: cashier, childcare, cook, and housekeeper. If they are nonunion, they are below the poverty line.

If you are a cashier and a member of a union, you are just above it, a little less than $25,000. We are talking about people who have a sense of dignity and pride and desire to do a good day's work. These are men and women of pride. We are talking about $20,000 to $25,000 a year. For childcare, the difference at a union wage is just about at the Federal poverty level. If you are a cook, it is a little above the poverty level. For a housekeeper, it is just above it also.

This is a commitment to try to make sure we are not going to have our fellow Americans living in poverty. We are talking about people who want to work, can work, and will work. That chart is about as clear an indication of the difference, if they have an opportunity to join.

Mr. President, I will mention a couple of companies that have recognized the card check process. Some employers have been remarkably enlightened and say: We are going to let our workers, if they choose, have a checkoff, and we will recognize them. That used to be the way the law went. A number of companies, including Cingular Wireless, have supported that concept. This person said:

Management didn't pressure us to try to interfere. We didn't attack the company and they didn't attack us. We were focused on improving our jobs and making Cingular a better place to work.

This is Rick Bradley:

We believe employees should have a choice. . . . We make that choice available to them results . . . in employees who are engaged in the business and who have a passion for customers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 final minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the purpose of this is to show that when America has been at its best and strongest, we all grow together. When we find out that America is divided—and the principal reason for this division is demonstrated with these charts; it is so often because employers have assaulted and attacked the rights of workers and their representatives over this history. We want to try to bring America back together again and make it stronger from an economic point of view.

A final chart shows that in Ireland, which has the one of the strongest economies in Europe and a high rate of union membership and strong annual growth, a partnership of decency and fairness goes hand in hand. I hope the Senate recognizes that on Tuesday when we vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to share some general comments on where we are with regard to immigration and, really, American workers. I am pleased to see my colleague, Senator KENNEDY, here. I know he believes strongly in the minimum wage and in union contracts and strikes and that kind of thing to get wages up. I will just say to my colleague that the real thing which drives wages, which helps working Americans be able to get higher wages and better benefits, is when their product or their labor becomes more valuable.

In this debate last year, I raised that question. I see my former chairman of the HELP Committee—the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee—Senator ENZI. Senator KENNEDY now chairs that committee. When Senator ENZI chaired it, we had a hearing in September of 2006 with economists and experts to discuss the impact on working Americans, middle-class workers, the wages they receive as impacted by immigration. I don't think there was a single dissent in that committee—everyone agreed that large influxes of low skilled immigrant labor bring down the wages of the American workers that compete with them. And the Judiciary Committee last year also had one hearing on the matter in April of 2006. Witnesses at that hearing also agreed unanimously that the wages of working class Americans are adversely

impacted by large flows of immigrants into our country. How could it be otherwise? That is a basic economic principle—when supply goes up, the price goes down. When demand goes up and supply remains the same, the price goes up.

When I raised this point on the floor, Senator KENNEDY, during the immigration reform debate last year, responded to me. His solution was that we should raise the minimum wage. I responded that it is not my goal to have American citizens making $7 an hour; my goal is to create a free market economy where their labor is worth $12, $15, $18, or $25 an hour. These wage levels are being seen by workers in nonunion businesses in Alabama right now. We absolutely don't need to go back to a system that allows self-interested union organizers to force people into unions when they are already making higher wages then they have ever made before, as they are in Alabama. I absolutely don't believe that unions are the way to see us make progress on wages. But I am concerned that the net effect of large flows of immigration is that wages are being brought down. It is not responsible to have immigration policies that depress the wages of American workers.

Some of the immigrants are legal, but most are not legal. Together, they are pulling down wages of the Americans that compete with them in the labor market. We have had expert testimony to that effect. I cite to my colleagues a professor at the Kennedy School at Government at Harvard University, himself a Cuban refugee, George Borjas. He says that working wages for Americans have been pulled down by as much as 8 percent in the areas where immigration is highest. That is a significant amount. Instead of going up in a booming economy, wages have gone down. Alan Tonelson, a research fellow from the U.S. Business and Industry Council Educational Foundation testified that from 2000 to 2005, in job categories where competition from illegal immigrants is the highest, real wages—those adjusted for inflation—went down, even though demand for labor was going up. How could it be otherwise? Don't we believe in a free market? Does any farmer doubt that if more cotton and corn were brought into this country, the price of their product would go down? Certainly we know that. We deal with that issue every day in the Senate, and we understand it. Why that base economic free market principle would be denied and overlooked when it comes to how immigration effects the labor market is beyond my understanding.

So, sure, immigration is important. We are not trying to stop immigration. Immigrants are overwhelmingly good people, they are hard workers, and they want to make a better life for themselves and their families. But, we have to ask ourselves, what levels and types of immigration serve our national interest? How can we make sure our middle-class workers are not having their incomes substantially reduced in a time when the growth and prosperity of our nation should be putting part of the high profits being made into their pockets? We can make sure that lower and middle class Americans are benefitting from out surging economy if we do this immigration bill right. This bill doesn't do that, and that is why I oppose it.

I had a wonderful day yesterday with President Bush. We disagree on this issue. He made the comment in my hometown of Mobile that a Texan friend of his once said if we agree 100 percent on every issue, then one of us would not be needed. Well, we don't agree on this issue, but he has a good vision for America. He believes we need to do something about immigration and he has high ideals about it. He wants to fix our immigration system and he wants to fix it comprehensively.

I have said repeatedly, in the last 2 years of debate, that we do need a comprehensive fix, we need a guest worker program that actually will work and be effective, one that is responsive to the needs of the market without depressing the wages of the American worker. I have said that we need to replace the lawless system of immigration we now have with a lawful one, one that serves our national interests, and by that I mean the interests of the American worker and the long-term national interests of our country.

Sadly, I do not believe that the bill before the Senate comes close to creating a lawful system that serves our national interests. The Senate bill is a 750-page document that was plopped down here after only 48 hours of notice, without any committee hearings this year. It lacks cohesive policy goals. It is a political baby-splitting document crafted by politicians who were focused on the need to write something that could pass, rather than a document produced by professionals and experts and economists and law enforcement officials focused on how to create a system that will be honest and will work. That is what the debate is all about. Will the Senate bill actually work. So my disagreement with the legislation is not what it aspires to do, if I believed that it would do what it aspires to do—to secure the border and restore the rule of law then I'd be supportive of the bill.

You will hear my colleagues come to the floor and talk about their mama and grandma and that they emigrated from country X and we are all blessed because overwhelmingly, except for Native Americans—even their ancestors at one time came here—we are all descendants of immigrants. I want to be clear. Those of us opposed to the Senate bill are not against immigration. Instead, we want to do it right so that it serves the immigrants who come to America and serves America by selecting those who can be most benefited by the American experience and who will most benefit America.

We are indeed, I am afraid, moving to legislation that would repeat the error of 1986 in which amnesty was given and enforcement never occurred. Three million people were given amnesty then. Now we have 12 million people asking for amnesty again. What is the problem with the legislation? Let me share some thoughts.

First, under this legislation, the number of legal immigrants to be allowed into our country and to be given permanent legal status within the next 20 years will double. The legal number will double. Do you think most Americans understand that? I don't.

Let me briefly mention the history of immigration in our country.

From 1820 to 1879, we had what was called the great continental expansion, where people moved out toward the west. One hundred and sixty thousand came a year. Then it dropped off significantly.

From 1880 to 1924, they called it the great wave of immigration. Immigration averaged 580,000 people a year, a big movement of people into our country, and we continued to expand westward in our Nation. Then immigration again began to drop off, particularly during the Depression, and people's wages were down.

The period of 1925 through 1965 is sometimes referred to as the stop-and-settle period. During that time, immigration was at 180,000 a year, and the large great wave of immigrants that came in the decades before were assimilated into America. They became productive, mastered the language, and became part of a settlement and an assimilation that was important for our country.

In 1965, we developed the new system of immigration now known as chain migration, which resulted in about 500,000 immigrants a year up until 1990.

Since 1990, however, the number doubled, and it has been about 1 million a year. Since 2000, I suggest, counting the illegal flow, it has been at least 1.5 million a year, which is the highest rate of immigration in the history of our country.

This bill would basically double legal immigration and do very little to stop the illegal flow. This gives us no time for a stop-and-settle period but perpetuates the record high rates of immigration for an indefinite period. That is where we are historically, and we ought to understand that. I don't think anybody would dispute, basically, what I just summarized for you.

Let me explain how the Senate bill will double legal immigration. Under current law, 23.4 million immigrants, including 19.6 million green cards and 3.8 million workers, would be admitted and here in year 2027. But under the Senate bill, the numbers would be 47 million immigrants, composed of 38.1 million green cards, twice the 19.6 million green cards that would be issued under current law, and 8 million, almost 9 million temporary workers on top of that. That number of temporary

workers would be here on an annual basis. Some would have to leave every year and return every year but that is the potential number.

I am certain most Americans do not believe that doubling of the immigration levels in America is what was being discussed when people were promised comprehensive immigration reform. Doubling the legal rate, I believe, is contrary to the impression given by the bill's sponsors. People are not being told that reform means this kind of increase. In fact, I would think most people are expecting that immigration reform means we will reduce the rate of immigration which already is at the highest this Nation has ever had.

So this kind of knowledge, when it gets out to people, fuels cynicism about what Congress is doing, it fuels anger at the voters. I repeat, I don't think their anger is focussed at immigrants. I think it is focused at those of us in Congress who promised we were going to create a lawful system that would bring some control to our borders, and it ends up doubling the number of immigrants that come lawfully. That is part of the problem. Some people get mad at the talk shows. All the talk shows are doing is telling the truth, that people did not state clearly when they promoted this bill for passage. People ought to be cynical and they ought to be upset about that, in my view.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for an additional 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. That is what this is all about. I was under the impression that when the bill promoters came forward from their secret meetings, they thought they had produced a bill that was going to give us a a lawful system of immigration. Didn't you hear that? Isn't that what you expected to be part of the product we would pass, that amnesty would be given but we would have a lawful system in the future, right? This is important. Isn't that what we were basically told by the people who produced this document, the 750-page bill they plopped down here without hearings a few weeks ago?

The sad fact is that the bill language does not keep the promises of its drafters. According to the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan group that works for the Congress that helps us analyze legislation, Cost Estimate released on June 4: Implementing the bill's enforcement and verification requirements will only ''reduce the net annual flow of illegal immigrants by one-quarter.''

So that is a 25-percent reduction, approximately 2 million over 20 years. Twenty-five percent, do you think that is enough of a result for comprehensive reform? But wait, there is more. CBO also estimates that the bill's temporary worker provision will add approximately 1 million illegal visa overstays over the same 20 years. The bill will add an additional number of illegal overstays, more illegal overstays than under current law. That is because we already have a lot of temporary worker visa programs, and when you create new ones that will bring in more temporary workers, then more people are going to stay illegally.

CBO goes on to say this in their careful analysis:

> Other aspects of the legislation are likely to increase the number of illegal immigrants, in particular through people overstaying their visas from the guest worker and H–1B programs. CBO estimates—

This is their report—

> that another 1.1 million people would be added by 2017 as a result of the guest worker program, about half of them authorized workers and dependents, the remainder the result of unauthorized overstays. That figure would grow to 2 million by 2027.

Twenty years from now. The net result is that according to CBO, a mere 1.3 million less illegal immigrants will enter this country and live in this country in 2027 than would be expected under current law, where we expect 10 million under current law to come illegally.

They go on to say:

> CBO expects that the enforcement measure and the higher number of overstayers would on net diminish the number of unauthorized immigrants by about 500,000 in 2017 and about 1.3 million in 2027.

What that means is when you take the 25-percent reduction of illegality at the border and an increase in visa overstays illegality, it comes out, according to their numbers, to only a net 13-percent reduction in illegality.

So we are going to double the legal number, see, and as a result we are only going to get a 13-percent reduction in illegality.

I say to the Members of the Senate, that is not what we are getting paid to do, that is not what we promised to do, that is not what we should do. That is not acceptable. I wish it were not so. I wish we had legislation before the Senate that would do better job at reducing illegal immigration, that would comprehensively fix our illegal immigration, but we don't.

I have been warning my colleagues about this and pointing out the flaws in the bill, and other Senators have pointed out flaw after flaw. We have this official report that indicates we have only a 13-percent reduction in illegality, and it is not right. We cannot pass such a bill and then go to our constituents and say we did something good for you, we fixed a broken system. We just cannot do that.

I urge my colleagues, no matter how much they want to see our immigration system reformed, no matter how much they have hoped that this legislation would be the vehicle to do it to consider my comments before you vote. A careful reading of this bill indicates it will not create the system they are envisioning, and we should not pass it.

Once again, didn't the promoters of the legislation promise more than this, that it would actually secure our border, that it would end lawlessness? Isn't that what they promised? Isn't creating a lawful immigration system for America a national imperative? Isn't it something we must do? No wonder the American people are cynical and angry.

Another promise we were given when the bill was introduced, and probably while it was being prepared, was that we would move to a merit-based system; that we would do a better job of identifying those people who apply to our country who have the greatest potential to flourish in America and do well. Canada does this. Sixty percent of the people who come to Canada come based on a merit-based competition. If you speak English or French, if you have some education, if you have special skills Canada can utilize, you get more points and you compete with others who apply. So they attempt in this fashion to serve the national interest. A move toward more skill based immigration is what Canada has done, and they are very happy with it. Australia does it. New Zealand does it. Other countries operate their immigration system in this fashion. They still provide immigration slots for refugees, as they always have, and if the United States moved to this system, we would still have humanitarian based immigration as well. We would not end those programs.

We were told that moving the United States to a Canadian or Australian immigration system might happen in this new bill. I was very interested in it because I urged my colleagues last year to have a point system or a merit based system in the bill. Nothing was even discussed about it last year and there was no hint of it in the bill that was offered then. So when I was told it was being considered this year, that presented some hope.

Unfortunately, the merit-based system that actually made it into the bill does not commence in any effective way at the passage of the bill, instead it will not increase the percentage of immigrants who come to America based on skills until 9 years after passage of the bill.

In 2006, employment-based or skill-based immigration made up 22 percent of our immigrant flow. In 2006, we only had 12 percent. So, recently, skill based immigration has made up 12 percent to 22 percent of annual immigration. As I stated before, Canada has 60 percent and Australia has 62 percent skill based immigration.

Under the Senate bill, skill-based or merit-based immigration will make up about 18 percent of the total immigration levels for the first 5 years. That is not even as high as we had in 2005. Then, for the years 6 through 8 after the bill passes, merit immigration will drop to 11 percent of the total annual immigration level, lower than the 12 percent we had in 2006. Even when the

percentage finally increases after the ninth or tenth year, it only rises to as high as 36 percent based on skilled immigration, which is a little more than half of what the Canadian system now has.

I don't think that is a strong enough move, and it is a strong disappointment to me that this is the case.

Mr. President, I see my colleague from Wyoming, the ranking member of the HELP Committee, is here. I will not go on at greater length. I could do so because what I am pointing out to my colleagues today is fundamental flaws in this legislation. It is those fundamental flaws that one or two amendments are not going to fix.

The difficulty we have with amendments is the bill's sponsors, the group that was in the grand bargain coalition, have agreed that anyone who submits an amendment that changes any substantial part of the agreement they reached in secret somewhere without hearings, without input from the American people, will have their amendment voted down. They basically have said that publically and have told that to me personally. They say: JEFF, I like your amendment, I think it addresses a valid criticism. But, we met and we reached this compromise, and I am going to have to vote against it because we made a pact and we are going to stick together to make sure we move this bill through the Senate without any real changes.

That is what they have said on the floor of the Senate. They said: This violates our compromise. I am sorry, Senator, we can't vote for it. They ask their colleagues to vote the amendment down because it is a killer amendment, one that will harm their deal. They claim that if the amendment passes, the compromise will fail, and the whole bill will fall apart. JEFF, we have told you what we are going to do. Take it or leave it. Vote for it or vote against it.

That is fundamentally what has been said, and that is not right. That is not what this Senate is about. If they had a bill that would actually work, I may be irritable with the way it was produced and brought to the floor procedurally, but maybe I would be able to support it. Instead, I can only judge how valuable the bill is based on what it says and whether or not it will work. CBO says it will not work. I believe it will not work. I believe we are going to have another 1986 situation where we provide amnesty without enforcement. I believe we are again going to send a message around the world that all you have to do is get into our country illegally and one day you will be made a citizen.

There is another concern that I have not talked about much so far, but it is critical. I can show you why the Z visa and the legal status that is given to illegal alien applicants 24 hours after they file an application for amnesty will provide a safe haven and a secure identity for people in our country who are here unlawfully and who are actually members of terrorist groups. The bill provides them, without any serious background check, lawful identity documents that they can then utilize to get bank accounts, to travel, and do potentially fulfill their dastardly goals.

In fact, Michael Cutler, a former investigator with the immigration enforcement agency wrote an article in the Washington Times today titled ''Immigration bill a No Go'' discussing that very point. In careful detail, he explains the utter failure of this bill to protect us from terrorism.

In addition to stating that the bill would not reduce illegality, CBO also found out it is going to cost the taxpayers. You are used to hearing that the bill will make money for us, help us and make the Treasury do better, all claims that I have strongly disputed. But the way CBO scored the bill this year, it is going to be over $20 billion in costs in the next 10 years and may be closer to 30, and those costs to the Treasury will increase in the out years. That is because under this system, we are going to legalize millions of illegal immigrants who are uneducated, many illiterate even in their own countries, and statics tell us that they will draw more from the Treasury than they will ever pay in. I just tell you, that is what they say. And the numbers get worse in the outyears, dramatically worse. In fact, the Heritage Foundation has said, based on the amnesty alone—and I don't know if these numbers are correct but they were done by Robert Rector and he has been known to be very correct on many occasions—based on the amnesty alone, based on the educational levels and the income levels of the people who would be given amnesty, the cost to our country would amount to $2.6 trillion during the retirement periods of the people who came here illegally and would be given amnesty under the bill.

So that is a stunning number. I can't say with absolute certainty it is correct, but that is what we have been told, and we should be talking about it and studying it. We also know this: The net deficit caused by the bill according to the CBO score will grow each year after the first 10 years. They have said so themselves at last August's Budget Committee Hearing chaired by Senator ALLARD.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I hope my colleagues will study this bill carefully. I hope the Senate will reject it, not approve it. I hope we will do a better job in the future.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. The senior Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for his steadfast effort to inform the Senate and other people about the flaws of the immigration bill. It is a bill that was put together by a coalition. It didn't go through committee. I have never seen a bill that passed this body that didn't go through a committee. That is because people put together the bill by bringing together their own pet projects and one saying to the other: I don't like your part, but if you will put my part in there, I will vote for your part and we will stick together to the bitter end. And that is usually what happens to a bill like that, it is a bitter end.

I don't think people are paying attention to their phone calls, their e-mails, and other things they are getting if they stick steadfast with that bill. But that is not what I am here to talk about today.

I am here to voice my strong opposition to the grossly misnamed Employee Free Choice Act. It should be called the Union Intimidation Act.

For generations, this body has faithfully protected and continually expanded the rights of working men and women. Today, however, the proponents of this legislation would do exactly the opposite and would strip away from working men and women their most fundamental democratic right—the right to a secret ballot. That is right. This bill would strip away the right to a secret ballot.

If the Democratic Party stands behind that principle, they should have to change their name. You can't strip away the right to a secret ballot from people of the United States or, hopefully, anywhere in the world. For generations now we have guaranteed to all workers in our country the right to choose whether they do or do not wish to be represented by a union. That is very often a critical decision for most employees, one that entails significant legal and practical consequence. It is a fundamental matter of individual choice and an essential right in the workplace.

Given its importance, we have secured that right through the use of the most basic and essential tool of the free and democratic people—the private ballot. The private ballot is the way those of us who live in a free society select all of those we would ask to represent us. Everyone in this Congress was selected by a private ballot, and American citizens wouldn't have it any other way. That is why it is so astonishing to me the majority is trying to take us to this bill, this Union Intimidation Act.

Under this bill, the rights and safeguards for a private ballot would no longer apply when employees decide whether they want the union to be their exclusive representative in the workplace. It is a very disturbing development when this body, which has no greater purpose than the preservation of our democratic rights, would choose to tell the working men and women of this country that democracy will stop at the factory gate.

To make it even more astonishing, some of the very people now pushing

this antidemocratic agenda are on record previously recognizing both the importance of the private ballot and the fallibility of just signing cards with the intimidator over your shoulder. In 2001, the lead sponsor of this misguided legislation in the House, along with 15 of his then-colleagues, wrote a letter to the Mexican Government regarding its labor laws in which they noted:

> The secret ballot election is absolutely necessary in order to ensure that workers are not intimidated into voting for a union they might not otherwise choose.

Now, what would prompt legislators in both Houses of Congress to lecture foreign governments on the necessity of private ballot union elections in their respective countries while simultaneously voting to deprive workers in this country of the same right?

In 1998, two of the AFL–CIO's most prominent unions argued to the National Labor Relations Board that:

> The National Labor Relations Board supervised election process is a solemn occasion conducted under safeguards to voluntary choice. Other means of decision-making are not comparable to the privacy and independence of the voting booth. The secret ballot election system provides the surest means of avoiding decisions which are the result of group pressures and not individual decisions.

What could possibly convince us to become partners in hypocrisy by joining these same unions and their surrogates when they now claim that we would strip workers of the right to decide the question of unionization in their own workplace by private ballot?

The view that the private ballot is the best way to determine employee choice and that alternatives such as card check are fatally flawed is not only shared by our colleagues across the aisle and labor unions, it is consistent with the views of the Federal Judiciary. The U.S. Supreme Court, along with the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals has uniformly, and over the course of decades, held that the private ballot is the best, most reliable, most democratic means of determining employees' free choice in the matter of unionization, and that all other methods, most particularly—most particularly—card signing are inherently flawed and unreliable.

With regard to signed cards, the Supreme Court noted that:

> Cards are not only unreliable because of the possibility of threats surrounding their signing, but because they are inherently untrustworthy since they are signed in the absence of secrecy and the natural inclination of most people to avoid stands which appear to be nonconformist and antagonistic to friends and fellow employees.

I wonder how many people here and how many people who might be listening have had somebody, a friend or somebody they are a little afraid of, bring them a petition to sign. How many people turned down that opportunity to sign that petition? I will bet not many.

With respect to the importance of the private ballot, one Federal Court of Appeals put it best when it observed that its preservation mattered simply because ''the integrity and confidentiality of secret voting is at the heart of democratic society, and this includes industrial democracy as well.''

That is what the judges say. So then what would make us reject the consistent—consistent—reasoning of the Federal Judiciary compiled in a host of rulings authored by scores of judges and accumulated over decades of time?

Finally, we should remember the cynicism of those who seek this legislation when they imperiously claim, ''We don't do elections,'' as if the democratic process was somehow beneath them. The source on that is Michael Fishman, the president of the Service Employees International Union, the largest property services local. Or when they arbitrarily dismiss fundamental employee rights by claiming, ''There's no need to subject the workers to an election.'' The source on that is Bruce Raynor, the general president of UNITE HERE. When labor leaders act like despots and tyrants, why would we conceivably make common cause with them?

There is no end to the fundamentally disturbing questions this legislation raises. Since this legislation was introduced, a host of claims have been made in an ultimately futile attempt to answer these questions. We need to stop and ask ourselves: What could possibly be the justification for this radical departure from our democratic tradition?

First, we have been told the current law is broken and that the system of private ballot elections is somehow rigged against labor unions. As proof positive of this claim, we have cited the fact that labor unions currently represent only 7½ percent of the private sector workforce, where at one time they represented 30 percent of the workforce.

At least in this instance the proponents of this legislation have gotten their facts and their statistics right, a notable departure from the avalanche of misinformation and completely inaccurate data that has characterized their side of this debate. However, what they have gotten entirely wrong is the notion that the decline in union representation levels has anything whatsoever to do with some infirmity in the law. Those who make this claim conveniently forget to mention that the law which they complain about today is identical to the law in effect when unions enjoyed their greatest organizing success and their highest levels of private sector membership.

The National Labor Relations Act, the statute which governs private sector unionization and which this legislation would radically change, has been substantially amended only twice in over 70 years—in 1947 and in 1959. The process of deciding the question of unionization by the use of a government-supervised private ballot election among all eligible employees has been unchanged for over six decades. This was the law and this was the process when union membership levels were at 25 or even 35 percent of the workforce. No one complained then that the law or the private ballot process was broken. No one ever claimed that either was so unfair or one-sided that we should change them by stripping away the employees' democratic rights.

As this chart shows, over the course of the last six decades, private sector union membership has declined steadily, but the law has remained the same. There is no doubt that the decline has been real, but organized labor and the supporters of this legislation need to look elsewhere for the cause of that decline since there is no connection between the law that has remained the same for 60 years and the steady decrease in union membership levels that have happened over that same time.

Second, we are told even if there is no infirmity in the law, employers now violate it with impunity and, therefore, unions cannot possibly win elections supervised by the National Labor Relations Board like they used to.

That claim is entirely erroneous. The reality is, when unions choose to participate in a fair, private ballot process, they are more than able to secure the support of eligible employees.

In fact, the success rate for unions in secret ballot organizing elections is at historically high levels. The union win rate in initial organizing elections has been over 50 percent for 10 straight years. That is an unprecedented run. Even more unprecedented is the fact that the union win has increased each and every year for the past 10 years in a row. That is what this chart shows. Unions have never before enjoyed such a run of increasing electoral success as they have over the last 10 years. In the last 2 years unions have won a record of nearly 62 percent of initial organizing elections. This, too, is historically unprecedented.

Before anyone buys the phony claim about how the election process has suddenly become unfair, they need to not only realize that union electoral success is at record highs, they also need to compare the past. For example, the unions won organizing elections over 62 percent of the time in the last 2 years, and averaged winning nearly 56 percent of the time over the last ten years. During the decade of the 1980s, the average union win rate was less than 50 percent. So it is going up. For example, in 1982, unions won less than 45 percent of the time. The same is true for the decade of the 1970s, when unions again averaged losing more often than they won.

Yet, despite union election win rates that were dramatically lower than the record highs of the past 10 years, and despite the fact that for many of those years the Democratic Party held the majority vote in one or both Houses of Congress, no one had the audacity to even propose that we should strip away from American workers the most fundamental guarantee of a free society—the right to a secret ballot. When

Democrats were in charge before, they didn't even suggest that.

Now, the truth is, where unions choose to participate in a democratic process and make their case to the workers in an atmosphere of open debate, the system is fair and they are more than capable of success. Their unprecedented level of recent success plainly makes this point. Moreover, it does not remotely justify changing a process that has worked for more than 60 years. It certainly does not justify any change that strips workers of their democratic rights. In light of organized labor's unprecedented electoral success over the last 10 years, this bill is like a baseball hitter who is on a decade-long hot streak and batting .620, insisting that the game is unfair and that the pitcher's mound has to be moved back.

The claim that the employers are violating the law with increased frequency and making fair elections impossible is equally incorrect. In fact, the incidents of even alleged but unproven employer misconduct have actually dropped steadily and dramatically over the last 10 years.

That is what this chart shows. The current rate of alleged employer unfair labor practices represents a drop of nearly 24 percent compared to 1990; a staggering 42 percent when compared to 1980.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ENZI. I see there is another Senator left to speak here. I have a lot left to say. This is a very important issue. A lot more needs to be said when we are faced with a proposal to take away away the right to a secret ballot in a bill deceptively called the Free Choice Act. It should correctly be called the Union Intimidation Act.

I will reserve the remainder of my remarks and speak again a little later. When I speak later, I will ask the RECORD not show an interruption.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the order. The Senator is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. BOND pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 252 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, as we debated energy and immigration issues in this body for the last 3 weeks, there has been palpable anxiety that we all see in our States, we all see in our homes, about our economy and about the future of the middle class—the squeeze on the middle class, the declining or stagnant wages of way too many middle-class households. In 2005 the real median household income in America actually went down 3 percent, from the year 2000. In Ohio it was down almost 10 percent. The average CEO makes 411 times the wage of the average worker; in 1990 the average CEO made 107 times as much. We know what has happened.

More important, we need to look at what has happened to wages in this country in a historical sense in the last 60 years. From 1947 to 1973, when our country, after World War II, was growing, you can see how wages grew among different people in our economy. The bar on the left is the lowest 20-percent wage earners, up to the highest 20-percent wage earners.

So those are the lowest wages. The lowest incomes in our country saw their wages grow the fastest of any one of those groups.

From 1973 until 2000, you can see the increase. Every group still increased, but growth changed sharply. The lowest 20 had the lowest economic growth; the highest 20 percent had the highest. I would add, 1973 was the year we went from a trade surplus in our country to a trade deficit. In other words, before 1973, we exported more goods in terms of dollars, in terms of value, than we imported.

Since 1973, that number has gone the other way. It has gone dramatically the other way in the last 10 or 15 years. Now, since President Bush took office in 2000, we have seen an even greater change in income for all Americans. The lowest 20 percent had an annual decrease, as I mentioned earlier, but so did the second quintile, the middle, the slightly upper middle, and the top 20 percent all had income decline. The only group that had an income increase in this 5-year period or so was the top 1 percent.

We have seen clearly that our economy is not working the way it should for middle-class Americans. That is why there is such anxiety among middle-class Americans. That is why so many of us who were elected for the first time, including the Presiding Officer, to the Senate in the year 2006, we knew of that anxiety and talked about middle-class issues: about health care, education, about jobs, about trade, about income.

Here is the real story. Since around the time of the trade deficit, the trade surplus prior to 1973 turning into the trade deficit, we have seen wages and productivity go like this. For many years, from World War II, for about 25 years, if you were a productive worker, your wages reflected your productivity. In other words, the more money you created for your employer, the more you shared in the wealth you created.

That was the American way. That is how you build a middle class. You are more productive and you share in the wealth you create. But something happened in the early 1970s. Again, in 1973 we went from a trade deficit to a trade surplus. We can see from about that time on, that productivity in this country kept rising, but wages in our country have been relatively flat.

One other thing happened, in addition to in 1973 going from a trade surplus to trade deficit, that was the time with the most pronounced decline in unionization. As Senator KENNEDY pointed out earlier today, as we have seen fewer people who are organized into unions, we have seen more stagnation of wages, even with productive workers

With the decline in unionization and with the trade deficit, wages have stayed relatively flat. That is why we need a very different trade policy. That is why we need the Employee Free Choice Act.

I might point out the Employee Free Choice Act does not abolish the secret election process. That would still be available. The bill simply enables workers to form a union through majority signup, if they prefer that method. So workers under current law may use the majority signup process only if their employers say yes. We think workers should make that determination, that we either want an election or we would like to do the simple card check. That will, in fact, increase unionization. We will also see that it will mean more mirroring of productivity in wages.

I would like to shift for a moment to some of my earlier comments about how in 1973, as we went from trade surplus to trade deficit, some of the things that happened in our economy. We know, going back not quite as far as 1973, only 15 years ago, the trade deficit in this country was $38 billion the year I first ran for the House of Representatives down the hall.

Today, the trade deficit in our country exceeds $700 billion. It has gone from $38 billion to $700-plus billion. President Bush, the first, said $1 billion in trade deficit translates into 13,000 jobs—$1 billion in trade deficit translates into 13,000 jobs. So do the math. We now have a $700 billion-plus trade deficit. We know what kind of havoc that wreaks on Steubenville, Toledo, and Portsmouth, Marion and Mansfield and Springfield and Xenia and Zanesville and all of these communities that were industrial towns that have had such damage done to their communities. They have had plant closings, they have had layoffs. Every time a plant closes, it means fewer firefighters, fewer police officers, fewer teachers in the public schools. We know what that does to our quality of life.

So the answer from the Bush administration, as we passed NAFTA and PNTR with China and CAFTA and every other trade agreement, as this trade policy has clearly failed, is: Let's do more of it. Let's do more trade agreements.

So now the President is likely going to bring in front of this body a trade agreement with Peru and a trade agreement with Panama. The President's U.S. Trade Representative, Susan Schwab, an honorable woman, straightforward, candid when you talk to her about this, she says: Yes, but now we have environmental and labor standards in these trade agreements.

But there are a couple of problems with that. First of all, we do not yet. We have not seen the text of the agreements. We have not seen, in fact, nor are we at all certain, that the labor and environmental standards will be inside the agreements; they may be side agreements. We tried that once with the North American Free Trade Agreements. The labor and environmental standards were outside the agreements. They were in a special side agreement, and they had virtually no impact. Where we had a trade surplus with Mexico when NAFTA was signed a decade and a half ago, now our trade deficit with Mexico is some $70 billion.

That same trade situation has exploded to a huge trade deficit with Canada also. So clearly we know in our communities how many plants have closed and companies have and jobs have moved to Mexico.

So the second thing we know about Jordan, about the trade agreements with Peru and Panama, the proposed agreements, is that the Secretary says they will enforce these labor and environmental standards as they unveil them, again not specific, not in writing yet.

The lesson again from this administration is when Congress, in the year 2000, passed the Jordan trade agreement, there were strong labor and environmental standards in that agreement. But when his U.S. Trade Representative, Mr. Zoelleck, assumed his position at USTR, Mr. Zoelleck sent a letter soon after to the Government of Jordan saying he was not going to, because of the dispute resolution, he was not going to enforce the labor and environmental standards.

Jordan has since pretty much become a country of sweatshops, where Bangladeshi workers, many workers imported from Bangladesh work at substandard wages and terrible conditions in sweatshop-like atmospheres and use Jordan as an export platform.

All of that tells me our trade policy simply is not working. If we are going to get serious about building the middle class—we spent a lot of time yesterday in Senator ENZI's committee, and Senator KENNEDY's committee, we passed legislation on higher education, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, passed bipartisanly. Senator ENZI showed great leadership, as did Senator KENNEDY and others. We need to do better to make education affordable for the middle class.

We need to do better with health care and better with prescription drug benefits. We need to continue to keep up with the minimum wage. We raised the minimum wage earlier this year. All of those things are important. But at the same time, two of the most important things that this body needs to do is to pass the Employee Free Choice Act to give the tens of millions of workers in this country who want to join a union the opportunity to organize and bargain collectively because it will mean higher wages and higher benefits. History absolutely proves that.

The other thing we need to do is to understand we need a very different trade policy, not more of the same, not Panama, not Peru, not Colombia, the way these agreements are written, not South Korea, the way that agreement is written, but agreements that serve the middle class, that lift up workers in the United States and lift up workers of our bilateral trading partners. Because we know that our trading policies will not be judged effective until the poorest workers in the poorest countries in the world are not just making products for Americans to use but that those workers are actually able to buy those products themselves.

We have seen that. Where we do trade right, we know it can work. We have clearly seen a trade policy that has failed. It is important, as this Congress looks at the trade agreements coming forward, Panama and Peru, and looks at trade promotion authority, legislation that may come in front of this body sometime this summer, that we keep our eye on looking at what has failed in trade policy and what has worked.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I am fascinated to listen to some of these discussions to find out we can change the balance of trade if we took away the right of employees to decide by secret ballot if they do or do not wish to be represented by a union.

I also heard the argument, that pay and benefits would go up if we took away the Democratic right to a secret ballot. Fascinating. Fascinating. But, also, not true. You cannot take away rights from people in America and expect them to be happy about what is happening to them.

Now, I did see the Senator from Ohio in some national news broadcasts thanking one of the major unions for putting the Democrats in power; and, as a result, saying that they were willing to bring up this bill that would take away the right to a secret ballot. I don't think that is how things are supposed to work in America.

I began earlier and talked about several of the problems with taking away this right to a secret ballot under the Employee Free Choice Act—legislation that I believe should properly be called the Union Intimidation Act because that is exactly how it is going to work.

Previously I was discussing this myth rampant employer misconduct; and noted that contrary to these claims even allegations of misconduct have dropped significantly.

The truth is that the National Labor Relations Board scrupulously monitors the behavior of all parties during the entire period of a union-organizing campaign. Any misconduct by an employer that interferes with the employees' free choice in the election process is automatic grounds, automatic grounds, to set aside and rerun an election.

Now such misconduct not only includes any employer unfair labor practice, but it also includes even less serious transgressions, such as an employer's inadvertent failure to provide the union with the names and home addresses of all of its eligible employees in a timely manner.

Every word that is uttered and every act that takes place during a union organizing campaign is subject to National Labor Relations Board review and scrutiny. If a party's words or conduct, clearly including the commission of any unfair labor practice, in any way disturbs the ''laboratory conditions'' required for an election, the NLRB is empowered to set aside the election and require it to be rerun.

However, the fact is only about 1 percent of the National Labor Relations Board elections are rerun each year because of the misconduct of either employers or unions. So you notice I am not saying this is all one-sided, that there are two sides to it. There are some that are set aside because of union misconduct.

Now, just like the number of unfair labor practice charges, this figure, has been steadily declining as well. The secret ballot election and entire union election process is remarkably fair, heavily scrutinized and monitored and tightly regulated.

Where an employer acts improperly over the course of a union campaign and adversely affects the outcome of the election, the National Labor Relations Board has full authority to set aside that election and order it to be rerun.

In addition, in those instances where an employer engages in misconduct that has the effect of dissipating a union's card majority, the law already allows the National Labor Relations Board to certify the union and require the employer to recognize and bargain with that union. This has been the law for nearly 40 years. The claim that employers are increasing violating the law is totally inaccurate.

What unions and their supporters would like—indeed, what they hope—to accomplish by this legislation is to characterize any expression of opposition to unionization as misconduct and choke it off. Fortunately, however, we do not live in a totalitarian country. We live in a country that protects free speech and fosters the open debate of ideas. It is for those reasons, rooted in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights,

that current law does permit employers and employees that oppose unionization certain limited free speech rights. Even these, however, are strictly limited and closely monitored. The supporters of this bill, however, would seek to strip away even these limited democratic rights and to kill off any opportunity for free speech and open debate in the workplace. We cannot oppose totalitarian behavior abroad while sanctioning it in America's factories.

Thirdly, we are told that even if the law is not broken, even if fair elections are the norm, and even if employers do not violate the law as erroneously claimed, that union membership levels have been steadily declining and therefore the law must be changed. That is why they are trying to offer this early Christmas gift to union bosses. This is the only argument which proponents of this legislation have made that is at least based on fact. However, its fundamental premise is shockingly and radically wrong and represents a complete reversal of Federal labor policy.

It has never been and it should never be the role of the Federal Government to maintain or increase the level of unionization. That is a matter of free choice for individual employees, not a matter of Government mandate. The role of the Federal Government in private sector labor-management relations has wisely and for generations been one of neutrality. Our appropriate role has not been to guarantee unionization; it has been to guarantee free choice by employees. Our appropriate concern must always be the process, not the outcome.

When it comes to guaranteeing free choice and providing fair decisional processes, the history of government and society tell us unmistakably that the best means to achieve that end is through the use of a private, secret ballot. The proponents of this bill are not concerned about employee free choice at all. They are concerned solely with giving organized labor a way to stop their decades-long membership decline, the loss of membership dues money, and the loss of the political leverage such money buys.

This legislation is a transparent payback to organized labor—maybe not too transparent. I have been watching television, and that is exactly what has been said to the union leaders who came to DC. Catering to special interests is a disturbing enough phenomenon in Washington, but when the cost of such catering is the loss of employees' fundamental democratic right, the practice is just shameful.

I want to be sure all my colleagues know that the consequences of this bill's enactment would be far greater than merely increasing union membership. The bill the majority is asking us to consider today does more than take away Americans' right to vote on whether they want to join a union; it also upends the enforcement balance of the National Labor Relations Act and can destroy the ability of employers to control their workplace. In some cases, it also eliminates the ability of unionized employees to have a vote on accepting an employment contract.

The balance struck by the National Labor Relations Act drafters so many decades ago included a remedial system that is intended to make whole or repair any damage done by violations of the act. Instead, this bill will inject a tort-like system into workplace relations, and we all know how well the tort system works. Instead of encouraging speedy resolution of disputes before the National Labor Relations Board, this bill will drag them into the Federal court. The result will be a Federal court system even more clogged with litigation and delayed resolution of workplace disputes.

The bill also applies a stronger set of penalties, but only against employers. Even though unions face an annual average of almost 6,000 claims of harassment, intimidation, and coercion, it should come as no surprise that the bill's drafters see unfair labor practices as a one-sided affair.

The last part of the bill I would like to discuss is perhaps the part which worries me the most, and that is the imposition of mandatory binding interest arbitration. When employees decide to unionize, the first order of business is to negotiate a collective bargaining agreement with the employer. This agreement can cover every aspect of the workplace, including pay, hours, time off, working conditions, health and retirement benefits. Typically, a committee of union leaders negotiates with the employer, and once an agreement is reached, all of the unionized employees have the right to ratify the agreement. If they reject it, the union and employer go back to the negotiating table. Under this bill, these negotiations will be halted after a mere 90 days and a Government arbitrator will be called in to impose a contract on all parties. The workers would lose their right to ratify that agreement, the employer would have to comply with the terms of the contract even if it crippled the business plan, and the contract would be binding for 2 years.

This is a radical departure from the tradition of private sector collective bargaining in which parties to the contract, not some third party, make the terms of their own labor agreement. If this becomes the law of the land, we can expect the parties in labor negotiations to take radical positions to set themselves up for arbitration. This is because usually, the arbitration decision comes down in the middle of however far the parties are separated. So you have both parties taking radical stands, delaying until there is an arbitrator, and nobody having a part in the final say except the arbitrator. Again, while the current system encourages cooperation, this bill imposes conflict.

There is another side effect of this provision. Because a 2-year contract would be imposed on the parties, employees would lose the right to decertify or vote out the union for a period of at least 2 years. This would be the case even when they did not approve of the contract or where they originally signed union cards not knowing what they meant or even under pressure. I have no way of knowing whether this consequence was intended by the bill's drafters, but I can certainly guess.

Another little hidden gift to organized labor in this bill is that under this legislation, there would be no private ballot vote when a union was attempting to get into the workplace; however, a private ballot vote would be required to let the employees get out of the union. Seems like you ought to be able to just get 51 percent to sign the card, and it could be done the other way too. But no. That alone should make it clear that the only intended beneficiary of this bill is organized labor bosses and that its proponents could care less about a worker's democratic rights.

To put it simply, this bill is an attempt to rig the system, deny employers any opportunity to present their views on unionization, and prevent employees who may oppose unionization from speaking to coworkers. It would impose a union on employees based on unverifiable evidence of a majority, severely limit employees' ability to get out of a union once they are in, and stack the penalties against the employer. This may be the perfect recipe to end labor's decades-long losing streak, but the only winners will be union bosses and their political allies. Not American workers.

I have listened to the speeches over the last couple of days as this bill has been promoted as something essential. Again, I am fascinated that the Democratic Party wants to take away the democratic principle of the secret ballot. One mythical reason they mentioned is that a private ballot election supposedly stalls the process. The fact is, according to 2006 NLRB statistics, once a certification petition is filed, there is a median of 39 days to an election, and 94.2 percent of all elections are conducted within 56 days.

Another myth out there is that the private ballot election silences prounion workers. Here are the facts: All employees have a guaranteed right to discuss their support of unionization and to persuade coworkers to do likewise while at work. The only restriction is the reasonable one that they not neglect their own work or interfere with the work of others when doing so. Employees have the unlimited right to campaign in favor of unionization away from the workplace. For example, they, along with union organizers, can visit employees at their homes. In fact, the law requires that employers provide unions with a list of employee names and home addresses for just such a purpose.

Employee speech is virtually unregulated. In an effort to gain support for unionization of employees and unions, for that matter, they can promise, can

pressure, can provide financial incentives such as waiving union fees, and can spread false claims, distortions, and misrepresentations, all with no consequence. By contrast, the employer speech is strictly limited, closely monitored, and regulated. Employers cannot lawfully visit employees at their homes. Employers can't even invite an employee into certain areas of the workplace to talk about unionization. Employers cannot promise and cannot make any statement that could be construed as threatening, intimidating, or coercive. Such behavior is strictly unlawful for the employer.

The other side says the Employee Free Choice Act, which I call the Union Intimidation Act, allows workers to have an election if they want one. We just heard that argument. The fact is, we have a body around here—a couple hundred researchers at the Library of Congress—that does research in a nonpartisan manner. They look at the facts and pass them on to us. They were asked about employees being able to have an election if they want one under this bill. The Congressional Research Service disagrees with their supposition. They read the bill's words that say ''the board shall not direct an election'' the way most reasonable people would read them. In a memo to me which was entered into the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing record, CRS wrote:

> An election would be unavailable once the board concludes that a majority of the employees in an appropriate unit has signed valid authorizations designating an individual or labor organization as its bargaining representative.

The Democrats' own witness at the HELP Committee hearing in March admits that it is not true that any one employee who prefers to vote by secret ballot election can secure such an election. That is their own witness saying: Not true. It was Professor Estlund who said that in response to a question for the record.

Essentially, private ballot elections will only take place under H.R. 800 if the union chooses to have one by submitting authorization cards from less than 50 percent of the workers. As a practical matter, that will never happen. If union organizers cannot get enough cards in a public, coercive, intimidating signing campaign, they just don't bother with an election.

Another myth: The Employee Free Choice Act, which I call the Union Intimidation Act, would increase health care and pension benefits. We heard that a few minutes ago. Wishing or asking doesn't make it so. Health insurance, like higher wages and benefits, cost money. Unions don't have to contribute a single penny toward those costs. In fact, since unionized operations are less efficient, they make paying for those things more difficult. They don't take into consideration the business plan and how to continue the business.

Comparing union wages versus nonunion wages nationwide is also inherently misleading since union workers are concentrated in geographic areas and industries where the wages and benefits of all workers are generally higher.

Another myth: Workers seeking to form unions are routinely fired; one in five is fired; one in five is fired every 20 minutes.

OK. Let's look at the facts on that. To begin with, under current law, it is illegal to terminate or discriminate in any way against an employee for their union activities. If this occurs during an organizing campaign, the National Labor Relations Board not only remedies the violation, it is also empowered to set aside and rerun the election since the necessary ''laboratory conditions'' for a valid NLRB election have not been met. However, that occurs in less than 1 percent of all elections, and that number has been steadily decreasing.

That is not the end of the NLRB's authority under current law. If the National Labor Relations Board finds a fair election is not possible, they can certify the union regardless of the vote and order the employer to bargain.

Yesterday, we heard this same myth repeated, and it is based on three phony analyses by stridently prounion researchers, who often make a series of wholly unfounded assumptions and routinely misuse statistical data.

The first analysis arrives at its conclusions by taking the number of National Labor Relations Board reinstatements offered each year, assuming that half occur in the context of an organizing campaign, and then dividing that number into some completely mythical and arbitrary number of ''union supporters''. Now, even if the first assumption was right, it is the number of supporters that matters. The lower the number, the more dramatic it looks. This number, however, is completely made up. There is no factual basis for determining this number.

Here are the facts. In 2004, for example, nearly 150,000 employees were eligible voters in National Labor Relations Board elections. Using their assumptions, there were only about 1,000 reinstatement offers that year. That is not 1 in 5; that is 1 in 150. Even that is likely very high since the vast majority of these offers are settlements which do not account for the fact that many of these terminations may have been perfectly lawful. Moreover, since unions won over 61 percent of these elections, their supporters amounted to at least 90,000.

Now, the second ''analysis'' uses the National Labor Relations Board's backpay figures as the basis for this claim. Here is the problem. The vast majority of those backpay claims do not arise in the context of an organizing campaign. They do not involve union employee terminations. And they do not single out union supporters. Most involve bargaining violations with already-established unions. In 2000, for example, two-thirds of the backpay number involved a single case that had absolutely nothing to do with an organizing campaign.

The third study consisted of stridently prounion researchers calling union organizers about campaigns they conducted over a short period of time in an isolated geographic area. The ''statistics'' relied on were nothing more than untested anecdotes.

So as this discussion continues, we are not going to allow incorrect and distorted numbers, and misused and misinterpreted data to obscure what is really at issue here. This is about taking away the right for people to have a secret ballot. Again, I want to reiterate that while this bill may be grossly misnamed as the Employee Free Choice Act, it has absolutely nothing to do with preserving free choice. In fact, it's just the opposite. How would you like to have someone come into your house with two or three people—one of them being very big—and pressuring you to sign a union card? Would you feel a little intimidated? Most people certainly would. Would you sign because you felt pressured, because you just wanted to have people stop bothering you, or because you didn't want to offend a coworker or friend? Most people would. However, under this bill all a union would have to do is obtain 51 percent this way and it is automatic.

Once the total reaches 50 percent, there is no latitude. These claims that employees could still have an election under this bill are simply not true. Oh, yes, there is this extraordinarily deceptive claim that a union could stop at 49 percent and ask for an election. That is simply nonsense. Why would a union ever do that. More importantly, how could employees make the union stop under 50 percent. They can't. And the unions certainly won't stop—with one percent more they have guaranteed members, and guaranteed dues. Do you really think they'd risk that in a secret ballot where someone who signed under pressure would have the right to change their mind and vote their real beliefs? Why would a union ever do that? Guaranteed union members and guaranteed dues. Do you really think union organizers would actually risk that by giving employees a truly free choice? I do not think so.

It is a fundamental democratic principle to have a secret ballot. The proponents of this legislation would do exactly the opposite and strip away from working men and women this most fundamental democratic right. The proponents of this bill ought to change the name of their party if they continue to advocate this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

THANKING STAFF

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, last night the Senate worked late to produce an energy bill. I believe it is a good bill. It does not contain all I had

hoped it would. Obviously, I regret that we were not able to go ahead with a vote on a renewable energy or electricity standard and also that we were not able to invoke cloture on the tax title of the bill. Nonetheless, I do think the bill will make important contributions to our energy security. I am proud to have worked on it with my colleagues.

Much has been said about the bill, and I am not going to debate the issues involved again today. We spent 9 days debating the bill and filled many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with that debate. But I would like to thank the many members of the Senate staff who have invested such long hours and enormous effort over the last couple of months to make this bill possible.

In the hurry to get the vote accomplished last night, it was not possible to express appreciation to these staff members whose assistance was absolutely invaluable.

First and foremost, I thank Bob Simon, the staff director of our Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. His knowledge of the issues, his wise counsel, and his tireless energy were invaluable to me and to the Senate, in my view.

I also, of course, thank Sam Fowler, our general counsel. He was involved at every step in the development and the passage of the legislation. The work product we have finished with out of the Senate is much better for his involvement.

In addition, I thank Allyson Anderson, who worked on the carbon sequestration title and geothermal issues; Angela Becker-Dippmann, who kept track of the 350 or more amendments that were filed on the bill; Patty Beneke, who worked hard on the oil and gas leasing and public lands issues; Tara Billingsley, who worked on the biofuels title; Michael Carr, who worked on coal and transportation issues; Deborah Estes, who worked on the efficiency title; Leon Lowery, who labored mightily on the renewable energy standard or electricity standard; Jonathan Epstein, who worked on the science issues; Scott Miller, who helped on biomass and tax issues; and Cathy Koch of my personal staff and the staff director of the finance subcommittee on energy taxes, who played such a large role in crafting the tax amendment.

I also thank the rest of the professional staff of the committee, who pitched in to help when called upon: David Brooks, Paul Augustine, Jonathan Black, Mike Connor, David Marks, Jorge Silva-Banuelos, Al Stayman, and Bill Wicker; our support staff: Mia Bennett, Amanda Kelly, Rachel Pasternak, Britini Rillera, and Gina Weinstock.

Also, we have four excellent interns working with the committee this year: Kristen Meierhoff, Ben Robinson, Jodi Sweitzer, and Matt Zedler.

I also express appreciation for the work of the minority staff of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and specifically: Frank Macchiarola, who is the Republican staff director; Judy Pensabene, who is the Republican chief counsel; Kathryn Clay and Kellie Donnelly.

I commend the Senate Finance staff who worked so tirelessly to craft a tax package that would have been an invaluable complement to the authorizing legislation. Senate Finance staff on both the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle worked in concert to forge a bipartisan package and did that under the direction of Senators BAUCUS and GRASSLEY. I acknowledge their excellent efforts. The staff includes Pat Bousliman, Ryan Abramam, Jo-Ellen Darcy, Elizabeth Paris, Pat Heck, Mark Prater, John Angell, Bill Dauster, and Russ Sullivan, of course, the staff director.

I also thank Tom Barthold and the entire staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation, who helped us greatly, particularly with the tax package that was offered as an add-on to this bill.

Finally, I express my gratitude to the majority leader's staff. I have expressed my gratitude to the majority leader many times for his leadership in getting this bill to the floor and getting it passed through the Senate, but let me also thank the majority leader's staff and very able floor staff: Marty Paone, of course, the secretary for the majority; Lula Davis, the assistant secretary; Chris Miller, the majority leader's senior policy adviser; and all the other members of the staff, on both sides of the aisle, who worked very hard to see this happen.

To each of them, I extend my heartfelt thanks.

Shakespeare lamented how ''oft good turns Are shuffled off with such uncurrent pay.'' I think if he were speaking today, he would probably say: Are shuffled off with such inadequate pay as a simple thank you.

So uncurrent or inadequate though it may be, our thanks is owed to all of the many staff members on our committees and in our personal offices whose hard work and professional assistance have made this legislative accomplishment possible. I am very grateful to each of them and wanted to acknowledge their contribution today.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, it is my understanding that roughly 30 minutes remains allocated between the Senator from Utah and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business with 10-minute grants.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I come to the floor this afternoon to respond to some remarks made by the distinguished majority leader earlier today. The majority leader listed accomplishments he believes the new majority has accomplished during the 6 months that new majority has been in power. He talked about homeland security funding, the SCHIP program, appropriations, the budget, Iraq, Attorney General Gonzales, and the Energy bill.

One of the things I admire about the majority leader is that he is a very good advocate. He knows how to put a good face on the facts. But I wish to suggest to my colleagues here that in reality, the current state of affairs in the Senate is not nearly as rosy as the majority leader would have us believe.

We spent nearly 2 weeks trying to craft an energy bill that would relieve some of the pressure on American consumers when they fill up their tanks or go to pay their electric bills. Unfortunately, the bill that was offered will not provide a single watt of new energy or a single drop of new oil. Instead, we saw amendments that would have improved the bill in this area defeated time and time again. Moreover, it will actually raise prices for consumers.

This bill, in fact, that was passed last night is bad energy policy because it will raise energy prices for consumers. It will enact, if finally signed into law, price controls, returning us to the failed energy policies of the 1970s and the 1980s, which produced shortages, gas lines, and other severe economic dislocation. This energy bill passed by the Senate last night will increase costs for American energy companies. It will force them to do more of their investment outside of the continental United States, and it will increase—not decrease but increase—our dependence on foreign sources of oil and gas, primarily from dangerous parts of the world and enemies of our country. It will enact unattainable Federal mandates. It will reduce the Nation's ability to compete in the global market against much larger state-owned energy companies for reserves around the globe. Finally, it will continue the prohibition on expanding the domestic production of oil and natural gas.

Instead of trying to work through these problems in a bipartisan way to try to actually bring results and solutions that make sense, the majority leader chose instead to file cloture on the bill, which means, of course, to close off debate and to force a vote so we could speed through it without resolving the predicament Americans will continue to find themselves in, with high prices at the pump and when they pay their utility bills each month. Last night, I am sorry to report, this body approved this ineffective—and perhaps even harmful—legislation.

Why, I might ask, were we so quick to pass this bill before we could turn it into something that might actually help the American consumer? Well, as it turns out, the reason we were in such a big hurry to close off debate and to stop our work before we could actually provide some relief to the American consumer when they pay their utility bills or when they fill up their gas tanks is because we have to turn to a bill that big labor regards as their single most important legislative agenda, and that is to eliminate the right of prospective union members to the secret ballot. That is right. The bill we are moving to next because we didn't have enough time to finish the energy bill to actually provide some meaningful relief for American consumers is designed to help labor unions intimidate workers into the decision of whether to unionize.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are demanding that the U.S. Government strip workers of the right to a secret ballot when it comes to the decision of whether to join a labor union. As a matter of fact, they have deceptively named this bill the ''Employee Free Choice Act.'' This is anything but a matter of employee free choice because it would deny workers the freedom of choice, exposing them to intimidation and manipulation that comes from anything other than a secret ballot. This bill ought to be called the ''Employee NO Choice Act.'' It provides opportunities to bully workers into joining labor unions, stripping them of the valuable right to a secret ballot.

Why in the world would we move from one of the most pressing problems confronting our country today—literally a national security problem relating to our dependence on foreign oil—and failing to address the most pressing concerns that most Americans feel each day because of high gas prices and high electricity prices? Well, apparently, the answer is to turn to a partisan matter such as avoiding the secret ballot for union members.

Some of those who have given support to those across the aisle have attempted to provide the rationale. One explanation given last fall was that ''the Democrats are beholden to labor and must pass the Employee Free Choice Act.''

Unfortunately, this has the simple feel of political payback for efforts made by labor to provide Democrats control of Congress last November. I cannot see any other logical explanation for the timing and interruption of one of the most important pieces of legislation Congress will consider this year. In fact, just last week, the majority leader's spokesman explained that ''we need to make clear to the American people that we are following through on the promises we made in November.''

Madam President, I am not alone in my hesitation about this bill stripping American workers of a fundamental right. Just a few short years ago, Democratic Members of Congress, including the author of the House version of this bill, wrote to officials in Pueblo, Mexico, to urge use of secret ballot in union elections. In that letter, those Democrats set forth the reasons secret ballots are essential. They said:

> We feel that the secret ballot is absolutely necessary in order to ensure that workers are not intimidated into voting for a union they might not otherwise choose. . . .
>
> We feel that the increased use of the secret ballot in union recognition elections will help bring real democracy to the Mexican workplace.

I agree with the letter, but I disagree with this bill, which would strip workers of this valuable and fundamental right. Why would our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to give big labor the power to intimidate, potentially, American workers? Why urge free choice and democracy in the international workplace, while offering no choice to American workers?

I am afraid the answer is clear. Union memberships have declined. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, union membership is down from 20 percent of the workforce in 1980 to just 12 percent now. Less than 8 percent of private sector workers belong to a union today.

As a recent Washington Times editorial explains:

> Card-check unionization has quickly become the only way big labor seems to increase membership these days.

Big labor helped elect Democrats in the 110th Congress. In fact, union PAC contributions to Federal candidates increased 11 percent from 2004 and are higher than any other industry grouping.

The Center for Responsive Politics found recently that since 1989–1990, labor unions have comprised 6 of the top 10 political donors to Federal candidates and political parties, ranging from the AFSCME, to Teamsters, to the Service Employees Union.

This has all the earmarks of political payback, plain and simple. This should not be the reason we have taken up valuable time on the floor of the Senate—to deal with political payback. Now is not the time to repay political favors, when the Senate has a seemingly endless list of more pressing and urgent matters to solve. True free choice in any election only comes with the secret ballot. I think we all intuitively understand that. Union elections are no exception.

American democracy must preserve an employee's right to a secret ballot when deciding union representation. We should not even be considering this bill, but if forced to, we should oppose it.

I also want to point out on this front, in case you don't believe this matter is motivated by pure politics, that the majority leader scheduled a vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the immigration bill immediately following the procedural vote on the secret ballot bill on Tuesday. So no matter what happens on the vote to proceed to the union payback bill, we will not actually be considering that legislation—even if we were to vote to go to it. How can this exercise be categorized as anything other than a waste of the Senate's time?

I wish I could report that this is the first time our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who control the Senate calendar, have held votes that waste time and divert attention from issues that are much more important. As America struggles with record prices at the gas pump, and our broken immigration system is in desperate need of reform, the new leadership of this majority believes the Senate should spend more time and energy on a nonbinding and purely political resolution on the Attorney General. I think that is unfortunate. Unfortunately, it is also indicative of the priorities we have seen.

Since taking control of the Congress 6 months ago, our colleagues have refused to address needed reforms of entitlement programs. The Children's Health Insurance Program, better known as SCHIP, that the majority leader said would greatly expand and provide benefits to individuals—unfortunately, we have not taken that matter up. In fact, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have transformed this program designed to help children in need of having health insurance to one that would cover adults and children who are part of families making double the income the program started with. Instead of children of modest economic means, it has been expanded now as a new Government entitlement, leading the way more and more to a single-payer, Government-run system out of Washington, DC.

The majority leader also pointed out successes relating to the budget, while highlighting that the 109th Congress didn't even pass a budget. What the majority leader didn't say is, this budget contemplates the single largest tax increase in American history.

If the majority leader believes passing a tax-and-spend budget that includes the largest tax increase in history, does nothing to control entitlement spending, and explodes the debt is an accomplishment, well, it may be an accomplishment for tax-and-spenders, but it certainly was not an accomplishment for the American people. This budget was not an accomplishment for middle-class families and American entrepreneurs who will get socked with the highest tax increase in our Nation's history.

This budget was not an accomplishment for our children and grandchildren, who will have to deal with the consequences of this body's refusal to reform entitlement spending—a fiscal tsunami that we all know is coming. If we do nothing about entitlement spending, we soon will not have a dime to pay for anything else except four

things: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and part of the interest on the debt.

This budget was certainly not something to be proud of. It includes more money than what the President asked for and doesn't eliminate a single wasteful Government program. It adds to our Nation's debt, and it raises taxes on middle-class families.

To date, this Congress, under the new majority, has failed to send any meaningful legislation to the President's desk for signature. Instead, the majority leader pulled the immigration bill from the floor, delayed consideration of an energy bill, ultimately passing a bill that will fix none of the current problems, and pursued political resolutions aimed at weakening the President, at the expense of strengthening our Nation.

Only one of the ''six for '06'' initiatives that our Democrat colleagues heralded when they got elected to the majority have become law, due in part to their lack of bipartisanship and cooperation.

Their agenda so far has included passing a budget with the largest tax increase in American history; increasing spending on wasteful programs; they have sought to micromanage the war rather than to give our commanders and soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines on the ground the opportunity to actually succeed; they forced our troops to shoulder pork barrel projects and made them wait 117 days to get a bill to the President that he would sign—an emergency spending bill that would get necessary relief to our troops in a time of war; they sought to raise the minimum wage without protections for small businesses; they have hampered the 9/11 Commission recommendations with paybacks to unions; they forced taxpayers to fund embryonic stem cell research under circumstances that many Americans would find crosses a moral line, by taking life in order to conduct scientific research; they have undermined a successful Medicare prescription drug plan in favor of a Government-run health care plan, and opposed market-based solutions.

My friends across the aisle have had a rough go of it during their first 6 months in the majority. They would have you believe, and the majority leader would have you believe, from his comments earlier today, that they have not been able to accomplish anything because of their narrow majority here.

In truth, however, the blame lies with the incredibly partisan way in which the majority has conducted themselves. They have refused to cooperate with this side of the aisle to accomplish many good things for the American people, instead filing a record number of cloture motions and bringing this body to a halt—40 times so far this Congress, compared with 13 during the same period of time in the 109th Congress, 9 in the 108th, and only 2 in the 107th Congress.

I am here to urge our colleagues in the majority to discard the approach they have attempted so far, which is to ram legislation through a closely divided body without compromise. This has not worked for them so far, and it will not work for them in the future. Even more important, it will not work to solve the problems of the American people.

In order to do the job the American people sent us here to do, we have to work together. As my Democrat colleagues have pointed out many times in the past, we are not the House. We must continue to look at all issues that are vital to the American people. We must compromise on those issues in good faith to do our very best, and we must put an end to the time we are wasting on such divisive, partisan issues, such as frivolous votes of no confidence against the current administration and payback to big labor for November favors.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGAMAN). The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that I be given enough time to make this speech, as long as I finish before 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise in fierce opposition to the horribly misnamed Employee Free Choice Act.

When I first came to the Senate, I thought the 1977–1978 labor law reform bill we turned back was bad public policy. The bill we are considering moving to the floor, H.R. 800, is far worse.

Where is the free choice for employees in this horribly misnamed Employee Free Choice Act? In all my years in the Senate, I have to say that the title of this bill is the most misleading of any I can recall. This bill doesn't give rights to employees; it takes away the rights of employees and replaces them with the rights of union bosses.

Back in 1977 and 1978, when we fought the labor law reform bill, there were 62 Democrats in the Senate and only 38 Republicans. But we were able to defeat that bill by one vote. Thank goodness we did because this would be a far different country today.

This bill would more aptly be named the Union Bosses Free Ride Act because it would allow union organizers to skip the efforts of having to convince employees to vote for union representation in secret ballot elections to gain certification as the exclusive bargaining representative. Then it would allow union negotiators to skip the efforts of bargaining for a first contract. Instead, unions need only make a pretense of collective bargaining for an initial union contract before turning to the Federal Government, which can for 2 years impose the wages, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment binding on employees, without employees' ratification or approval—binding on the employer as well, without the employer's ratification or approval.

Is this what my colleagues want to support—eliminating secret ballot elections and mandating Government certification of a union based on union-solicited authorization cards? Is this what my colleagues want to support—the Federal Government writing the binding contract terms for private sector wages, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment? That is what this bill does.

Apparently, it is not what the American public want us to support. According to a January 2007 poll by McLaughlin and Associates, 79 percent of the public opposes this bill, including 80 percent of union households, 80 percent of Republicans, and 78 percent of Democrats.

When asked: ''Would you be more or less likely to vote for a Member of Congress who supported this bill?'' the response was 70 percent less likely.

Recent polls also suggest that 87 percent of voters, almost 9 out of 10, agree that every worker should continue to have the right to a federally supervised, private-ballot election when deciding whether to organize a union. The same survey found that 79 percent, that is 4 out of 5 voters, oppose efforts replace the current private-ballot system with one that would simply require a majority of workers to sign a card to authorize organizing a union. There was virtually no variation in reply among Republicans, Democrats, or Independents in this survey; this sentiment rings true across the board.

Likewise, in a 2004 Zogby International survey of union workers, it was found that the majority of union members agree that the fairest way to decide on a union is for the government to hold a private-ballot election and keep the workers' decisions private. In the same survey, 71 percent of union members agreed that the current private-ballot process is fair. The survey also found that 84 percent of union workers stated that workers should have the right to vote on whether or not they wish to belong to a union.

It is hard to believe that we are seriously considering a bill to deny workers a secret ballot vote so soon after the national elections, and our own elections, given our Nation's history in promoting secret ballot elections for the disenfranchised members of society through the suffragette and civil rights movements. This is especially true since we are fighting for the opportunity of individuals around the world to have the democratic right to a secret ballot election.

Apparently, even congressional cosponsors of the bill acknowledge that it would be bad policy to take away secret ballot union representation elections, at least for workers in Mexico. In a 2001 letter to Mexican Government

officials, the House sponsor of H.R. 800, 16 Members of the House of Representatives including one then-member who now serves in this body, wrote:

> We understand that the private ballot is allowed for, but not required by Mexican labor law. However, we feel that the private ballot is absolutely necessary in order to ensure workers are not intimidated into voting for a union they may not otherwise choose.

If private ballot elections are absolutely necessary for workers in Mexico, why aren't they necessary here? That is what you have to ask.

The answer is simple. Union bosses are more successful under card check. Recently, according to official NLRB statistics, unions have won over 60 percent of NLRB-supervised secret ballot union representation elections. In other words, they are winning the vast majority of elections on secret ballot. They want to win all of them, and that is why they support this card-check approach. At least by political election standards, that 60 percent is a high mark. But not for union bosses. Statistics show that under a card check, unions win approximately 80 percent of the time, and an even higher percentage when the employer remains neutral and does not communicate with workers, as employers are permitted to do under the section 8(c) free speech provision of the National Labor Relations Act.

In effect, forced employer neutrality would be the result of card check under H.R. 800, since union organizers would control the timing of the election by quietly securing a majority of signatures—50 percent plus 1—among a group of employees, large or small, determined by the union organizer, and then springing the demand for certification upon the employer and the NLRB. The result would, in effect, silence the employer and thus deny employees the right to be fully informed about the particular union seeking their support.

Under this bill, the role of the NLRB, which has such a proud history of conducting secret ballot union representation elections, would be reduced to that of handwriting analysts checking to make sure that employees' signatures were not forged, and determining whether the group of employees designated by the union constitutes an appropriate unit. Remember, under NLRB law, the unit petitioned for does not have to be the appropriate unit, or the most appropriate unit, but only an appropriate unit for bargaining where the employees share a community of interest. Thus, in effect, the union organizer can select a group of employees that are most easily organized by means of card check, force NLRB certification by designating ''an'' appropriate unit, and then force a government-imposed first contract, the terms of which could incorporate employer obligations affecting the employer's entire operations, such as contract provisions barring subcontracting of work.

In effect, H. R. 800 is push-button unionism.

Under this bill, to force union representation, union organizers only have to get employees to sign union authorization cards, which the Supreme Court has an ''inherently unreliable'' indicator of true employee support due to peer pressures, intimidation and coercion.

Would the unions like the employers to have the same right, to be able to go privately and intimidate employees as the union organizers will do and get 50 percent plus 1 to throw the union out? Not on your life.

In fact, as one court stated with regard to card check authorization, ''It would be difficult to imagine a more unreliable method of ascertaining the real wishes of employees than a card check unless it were an employer's request for an open show of hands. The one is no more reliable than the other.'' NLRB v. Logan Packing Co., Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Some supporters of the bill have asserted that the bill does not eliminate secret ballot elections. But if they simply read the bill, it provides just the opposite. Just so we are clear, quoting from the bill:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, whenever a petition shall have been filed by an employee or group of employees or any individual or labor organization acting in their behalf alleging that a majority of employees in a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining wish to be represented by an individual or labor organization for such purposes, the board shall investigate the petition. If the board finds that a majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for bargaining has signed valid authorizations designating the individual or labor organization specified in the petition as their bargaining representative and that no other individual or labor organization is currently certified or recognized as the exclusive representative of any of the employees in the unit, the board shall not direct an election but shall certify the individual or labor organization as the representative described in subsection.

How can one say with a straight face that card check for union representation is any more protective than a private ballot election where employees may be solicited, intimidated, and coerced, subtly or not so subtly, to sign union authorization cards by fellow employees during nonwork hours and nonwork areas at the workplace, or by outside union organizers at the employees' homes or at the union hall or simply on the street or at the plant gates.

How is card check more of a free choice than the long-established and hard-won employee protections of a private ballot election, which is supervised, monitored, and shielded by Government officials of the National Labor Relations Board, who are present at the voting booth to prevent improper electioneering and misconduct by representatives of either labor or management?

The compulsory, first contract, interest arbitration is even a greater departure from sound national labor policy because it destroys free collective bargaining.

Under this bill, to force an initial union contract, union negotiators only have to make a pretense of bargaining for 90 days before calling on federal mediation for 30 days. If not resolved, the contract then must go to a federally appointed arbitrator who will write the employment terms binding on the employees and the employer for 2 years. That is long enough to sour employees on the federally imposed terms of employment, and long enough to bankrupt an employer or make it so noncompetitive that it decides to close operations and do business elsewhere—perhaps and probably overseas.

How can one say with a straight face that it is an employee's free choice to have the Federal Government write the terms of employment through compulsory interest arbitration by a federally appointed arbitrator? Under this bill, the arbitrator has unfettered authority to impose the wages, benefits, terms and conditions of employment of an initial union contract, which is then binding on employees and their employers for two years, without the employees even being able to approve or ratify those terms as they can under current law? How is that employee free choice? How is that open collective bargaining?

And how is it an employee's free choice then, by operation of the current contract bar doctrine, to prevent those employees from challenging the union's continuing majority support by an NLRB supervised secret ballot election?

This bill is not about employee free choice. It is about union leaders calling in their political chits in order to increase membership, and being able to deny workers the protections of an NLRB-supervised secret ballot election.

It is about union leaders then being able to get the Federal Government to impose wages, benefits, terms and conditions of employment and deny workers the right to ratify or approve the first union contract that will govern their employment for 2 years.

This is a huge and radical change in national labor policy, which the bill's sponsors are trying to foist on American workers and employers without even the benefit of a committee markup. Imagine, with only one day of committee hearings, completely rewriting and reversing over 70 years of national labor policy by injecting the Government into private sector collective bargaining through compulsory arbitration. The Federal Government steps in, not where the parties voluntarily agree to such intervention, but by congressional mandate, by operation of law, whether the parties agree or not.

That is not the way national labor policy is designed to work. This is not how it worked when the original Wagner Act was enacted in 1935, and in all subsequent amendments including the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act. Consistent with the decisions of every NLRB in Democratic as well as Republican administrations—and enforced by every federal

court including the Supreme Court, it has been bedrock national labor policy that the Federal Government must not set the terms of the private employment contract. The role of the Federal Government through the NLRB and the courts has been to establish the rules for good faith bargaining. And the law does not require agreement, nor does it require a contract, so long as the parties bargain in good faith. Those sound national labor policies are destroyed under H.R. 800, which ignores whether the parties are bargaining in good faith and mandates a first contract binding on both sides.

This bill does not require a finding by the NLRB or the courts that the parties have failed to engage in good faith bargaining. Although misguided and bad policy, at least the 1977–1978 labor law reform bill addressed union complaints about the difficulty of reaching agreement on first contracts by first requiring a finding by the NLRB that the employer was guilty of bad faith bargaining. Then, the so-called make whole remedy proposed was to pay wages equivalent to a BLS index of average hourly manufacturing wages for the period of the employer's refusal to bargain. That, in my opinion, is not something Congress should endorse.

But to show you how truly extreme the current bill is, under H.R. 800 there is no requirement of a finding that the employer had violated the National Labor Relations Act by failing to bargain in good faith on an initial contract. The employer may have negotiated completely in good faith, and the parties need not have even reached an impasse in negotiations, to trigger the supreme sanction of having the Government step in and write the contract. The only trigger is when the parties have been unable to agree on a contract after 90 days of negotiations and 30 days of federal mediation. In effect, we are legislating that it is an unfair labor practice for an employer not to reach agreement on a first contract within 90 days of bargaining and 30 days of mediation, and that unless you agree to the union's terms the penalty is that the Federal Government will appoint an outside, third party to impose a contract on you for 2 years. Now that is not American.

Think of the effect of all this on the Nation's small business community. Informed of union certification because of card check, suddenly dragged to the bargaining table within 10 days of the union's demand, and most likely never having engaged in collective bargaining before, the small business owner will be confronted with professional union negotiators insisting on wages, benefits, terms, and conditions perhaps beyond the small business owner's ability to accept and remain competitive. But unless the small business owner agrees, the Federal Government, through a federally appointed arbitrator, will step in and write the contract.

Do we want the Federal Government writing private sector contracts? I don't think so. I cannot stress enough my concern about the bill's provision for first contract compulsory interest arbitration, especially as it would affect small business. That is even worse than the card check scheme to begin with, but without the card check scheme, you can't get to this.

It is close to socialism to mandate that the Federal Government, through federally appointed arbitrators, should dictate private sector wages, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment. These are not simply my words and my concerns. Let me quote from the Nation's leading basic textbook on arbitration, Elkouri & Elkouri, ''How Arbitration Works,'' the sixth edition, 2003, which is published by the American Bar Association's section of labor and employment law with editors representing labor and management.

The Elkouri text states:

> Compulsory arbitration is the antithesis of free collective bargaining.

The text then lists several reasons against compulsory arbitration.

> Broadly stated, that: First, it is incompatible with free collective bargaining; second, it will not produce satisfactory solutions to disputes; third, it may involve great enforcement problems; and fourth, it will have damaging effects on economic structure.

The text continues.

> Compulsory arbitration is a dictatorial and imitative process rather than a democratic and creative one.

Summarizing the arguments against compulsory arbitration, the text concludes:

> Compulsory arbitration means governmental—politically influenced—determination of wages and will inevitably lead to governmental regulation of prices, production, and profits; it threatens not only free collective bargaining, but also the free market and enterprise system.''

Can you imagine being a small business owner, especially the owner of a family business, confronted with the choice of capitulating to a skilled union negotiator's unreasonable demands after 90 days of bargaining? Imagine the business being, in effect, turned over to a Federal arbitrator to impose whatever wages, benefits, terms, and conditions of employment the arbitrator chose to impose, as Elkouri states, ''affected by the arbitrator's own economic or social theories, often without the benefit or understanding of practical, competitive economic forces''?

Is that what we want to do to our small business community, much less to larger businesses, whose issues for bargaining are even more complex? Since there are no limits on what an arbitrator may impose through interest arbitration, it is conceivable that the terms could include participation in an industry's underfunded multiemployer pension plan, for example, something which could eventually force an employer into insolvency.

Lost in what little debate we have had on this bill is the unfairness of its provisions for anti-employer punitive sanctions. Once again, these provisions in the bill are a radical departure from the balance of traditional national labor policy which for over 70 years has confined the act to ''make whole'' remedies, and, at least since the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act, has tried to maintain a balance of the remedies for union unfair labor practices and employer unfair labor practices.

H.R. 800 provides, for the first time, punitive rather than remedial sanctions under the National Labor Relations Act and contains only anti-employer sanctions. That is, H.R. 800 contains revolutionary punitive sanctions only against employers. Regardless of how corrupt the union may be, there are no sanctions possible against the union.

It provides for increased damages against employers in the form of back pay and liquidated damages equal to two times that amount for anti-union discrimination from the initiation of a union organizing campaign and until the first collective bargaining. These increased damages are clearly punitive, not remedial and not designed to make whole an employee for anti-union discrimination. Nowhere in H.R. 800 does the law provide for such punitive sanctions against union unfair labor practices.

In addition to back pay, the bill provides civil penalties against employers of $20,000 for each violation. Since each unfair labor practice charge filed against employers or unions often contains allegations of multiple violations, the $20,000 civil penalty could multiply several times for a single charge. Of course, under the bill, the $20,000 simple penalty applies only against employers. How fair is that? Nowhere does H.R. 800 provide civil monetary damages against unions where they commit unfair labor practices against employees.

Finally, the bill provides for a mandatory injunction against employers' alleged acts of anti-union discrimination, including—and I am reading from H.R. 800—allegations that the employer:

> (1) discharged or otherwise discriminated against an employee; (2) threatened to discharge or to otherwise discriminate against an employee; or (3) engaged in any other unfair labor practice that significantly interferes with, restrains, or coerces employees in the exercise of their rights guaranteed in section 7.

This is, in other words, the right to organize, bargain collectively, and engage in concerted activities such as strikes.

Supporters of the bill argue this provision mirrors the act's section 10(I) injunction against unions which is mandatory when unions engage in secondary boycotts affecting neutral parties. Of course, therein lies the reason for the injunction. By current definition a section 10(I) injunction applies only where a neutral third party is involved and the injunction is designed

to prevent harm to the public where labor disputes are expanded to those employers not directly involved in such disputes.

That is not the type of unfair labor practice against an employee during the course of a union organizing campaign, where a make-whole remedy of reinstatement with full back pay is available.

Mandatory injunctions are extraordinary penalties, especially involving small businesses, since they involve expensive Federal court litigation. As such, the threat of a mandatory injunction—which, for example, would mandate the employer reinstate the employee during the investigation and prosecution of the injunction—could operate to silence the employer from communicating its views regarding unionization. This is the employer's right under section 8(c) of the National Labor Relations Act.

There has been much said recently by supporters of H.R. 800 about employer misconduct during union organizing campaigns and collective bargaining for a first contract. This has been used to justify the radical provisions of H.R. 800 denying workers of private ballot union elections, increasing anti-employer sanctions, as well as compelling interest arbitration of first contracts.

Unfortunately, much of what has been said is simply untrue or exaggerated and based on flawed information and studies of dubious quality. I cite as an example one fatally flawed study conducted by Cornell Law School Professor Kate Bronfenbrenner. It is frequently cited regarding the firing of union organizers in over one-quarter of union organizing campaigns. The study is based on a survey of union organizers for their opinion as to how often organizers are fired during a union organizing campaign. That hardly constitutes an objective, unbiased sample, and such anecdotal opinions hardly constitute the type of factual, statistical information we have the right to expect before radically changing over 70 years of national labor policy.

Also, supporters of H.R. 800 claim from an NLRB report that over 31,000 employees received back pay annually and thus presumably were fired during union organizing campaigns, which represent one worker fired every 17 minutes. That figure grossly misapplies the report and its basis. In fact, that number includes a very high percentage of workers who were already represented by unions, some for many years, who were being paid back pay because their employer took some unilateral action, such as contracting out work, without consulting their union. Therefore, a high percentage of such back pay had absolutely nothing to do with union organizing campaigns, and supporters of H.R. 800, who must know better, are simply using this statistic to exaggerate their claims. Also, supporters of H.R. 800 ignore the more accurate number that according to the NLRB's most recent annual statistics only 2,000 employees were ordered reinstated by the Board.

As we debate over whether or not to deny private ballots to workers deciding whether or not to unionize, it is my hope that we will be able to at least hold fast and true to the facts. And there should be full debate on these facts, not simply a cursory one-day hearing, bypassed markup and we move straight to the floor. We must not rely on slogans, anecdotal stories, and questionable secretly-commissioned and selective statistics about alleged unfair labor practices.

In conclusion, those on the other side of this debate have advanced—with fervor—several misleading arguments about the so-called Employee Free Choice Act. I look forward to a debate on the facts of this legislation. We should debate. Let each side be passionate. And of course we will disagree; but let us be respectful. Most importantly, let's make sure that this is an honest debate.

As we enter this debate we should not be fooled by the misinformation from supporters of the bill:

They claim that employers coerce employees to vote no on unionization. The truth is that in less than 2 percent of cases is it found that an employer has inappropriately interfered in a union organizing election.

They claim that under the current system unions are not able to win. The truth is that unions won 62 percent of the National Labor Relations Board elections in 2005—the last year where a complete set of statistics exists.

They claim that the use of a card-check system is the best, most reliable and fair way of judging employees' true intentions of unionizing. The truth is that the use of a card-check system is an inherently unreliable indicator of an employee's true sentiments which lead me to a few other truths on their misleading reliability claim. The truth is that the card acquisition process is unregulated, meaning there is no check on potential undue influence when gathering cards; the truth is that we have found that intimidation, coercion, and pressure tactics can be—and usually are—used to obtain signatures; the truth is that often, bounties and financial incentives are paid to union organizers to obtain signatures on cards; the truth is that intentional deception and misrepresentation are often used by unions when obtaining cards; and the truth is that employees are often induced to sign cards by promises of higher pay, better benefits, and waivers of fees—of course the same employees are not made aware of the potential risks and costs of unionization. And finally, they claim that American workers want to form unions using a card check system.

The truth is that according to a recent poll 79 percent of Americans oppose the elimination of private ballots when voting in union organizing elections.

Senators should be aware this is not a free vote! The bill is not passed this year, or is passed but vetoed, it will put those of us who voted for it on record as supporting a radical change in national labor law and labor policy. It will put us in support of a system which denies workers a secret ballot election, which has been the bedrock underpinning of national labor policy—the crown jewel of the National Labor Relations Board.

A vote for this bill, or for cloture, will put us on record as against free collective bargaining on first contracts and in support of a political, government-dictated system of compulsory interest arbitration where a federally-appointed arbitrator will dictate the wages, benefits, terms and conditions of employment binding on employees without their even having a vote to approve those terms.

And it will put us on record as supporting an unbalanced system of remedies where employers are subject to punitive sanctions, rather than remedial make whole remedies while ignoring sanctions for union unfair labor practices.

In the end, H.R. 800 will hurt workers and will take away rights they currently have under federal labor law.

In the end, it will hurt employers, leading some to look elsewhere to do business and foreign investment to turn elsewhere rather than the United States.

We will be on record, and we will be reminded of our vote today in future congresses. We must vote no on cloture, just as we should vote no on the bill.

Mr. President, I hope my statement reflects why this is such a horribly misnamed and bad bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

WELCOME TO WYOMING'S NEW SENATOR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, minutes ago a new Senator for the State of Wyoming was officially appointed by the Governor of Wyoming, and I want to welcome Dr. JOHN BARRASSO, now Senator BARRASSO, and introduce him to the Senate.

John is an extremely capable person who has gone through a selection process that involved 30 people who were interested in serving as Senator. He went through an interview process and a selection process and was one of three people given to the Governor from whom to select. The Governor gave each of the people a list of 42 issues of critical interest to the State of Wyoming and interviewed each of them and made a selection on that basis. Dr. JOHN BARRASSO was the selection.

I am very excited about this. I am excited about having a full roster from Wyoming. I have known JOHN for many years. I was pleased that he ran for the State Senate. He worked on a lot of conservative issues there. He was a

hard worker, and he was extremely efficient. In fact, one of the amazing things to me was that he was able to answer every e-mail almost immediately and to keep his desk clean. It is different from the way I worked when I was in the Wyoming legislature and it is much different than the way my desk looks here. So his efficiency is unmatched, and he has great knowledge of Wyoming and the issues that are important in Wyoming, which include energy, and of course health. He is an orthopedic surgeon and will make a big difference in our health care debate back here.

He is quiet but efficient and has worked across the aisle in Wyoming, and I am sure he will continue to do that here, much the way Senator Thomas and I have done. We have always worked as a team, the Wyoming delegation, and he will become a very strong team member.

I want to congratulate the Wyoming Republican Party on the process they went through. I want to particularly congratulate Fred Parady, who is the State chairman, for the way he walked into some fairly uncharted waters, particularly for that many people who were interested. He did an excellent and fair job, and one that was timely so we would be able to get to this point. He did an outstanding job.

I congratulate the Governor for the care and concern he gave and the way he went about his job and the comments he made as he did that job and as he introduced the new Senator. I think Wyoming can be a good example for the rest of the Nation to follow.

Of course, no one is going to be able to replace CRAIG THOMAS, but working with JOHN, we can ensure the representation of Wyoming in the Senate will remain second to none.

JOHN has had some interesting things he has worked on in Wyoming. He is extremely well known across the State because he has been doing virtually a nightly television spot helping people to help their own health and has given tips for a number of years doing that. I have no idea how many years he has also been the host for the Jerry Lewis telethon for Wyoming and has raised innumerable dollars for that great cause, and he does it so easily and so naturally and is such a great speaker.

Of course, he is very pleased that both of his children, Pete and Emma, have graduated from high school. Emma graduated this year. So he has gotten to watch them grow up in a very involved way through the years, and now that they are going to college, he can come to Washington, and I know he and his family are very excited about it and are great participants.

So I welcome the newest member of the Senate and let everyone know we are looking forward to a great team and his extreme capability.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PASSAGE OF H.R. 6

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend from Hawaii, the chairman of the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, for sponsoring this amendment that was added to energy legislation last evening.

This energy legislation seeks to expand the Nation's supply of renewable biofuels and to begin moving our base of transportation fuel toward renewable energy. Across America, including in my State of North Dakota, American farmers have the ability to grow abundant supplies of corn and energy crops from which ethanol and other transportation biofuels can be manufactured. However, our Nation's ability to produce an abundant supply of transportation biofuels will be of no use if we are not able to transport these biofuels to the population centers where they are needed. Today, due to the special qualities of biofuels, there are no pipelines that can move them to market. Thus, transportation is dependent primarily on trucks and rail, except in those rare cases where water transportation is available between the areas where the biofuels are produced and consumed.

Last week, the Government Accountability Office released a report entitled ''Biofuels—DOE Lacks a Strategic Approach to Coordinate Increasing Production with Infrastructure Development and Vehicle Needs.'' The summary of the report states, in the second paragraph:

> Existing Biofuel distribution infrastructure has limited capacity to transport the fuels and deliver them to consumers. Biofuels are transported largely by rail and the ability of that industry to meet growing demand is uncertain.

If our Nation is to realize the potential of sustainable, domestically produced transportation fuels, we can have no uncertainty concerning whether the rail industry can transport the amount of biofuels that the Nation will be producing. Therefore, Senator INOUYE and I have joined in this amendment which calls for a joint study by the Secretaries of Energy and Transportation. The study will consider two primary issues and a number of related issues. First, will there be sufficient railroad infrastructure to move the amount of biofuels the Nation will be producing? Second, will that railroad transportation occur in a competitive environment in which the cost is reasonable and the service is reliable?

Ensuring adequate, reliable, and cost-effective rail transportation for ethanol and other transportation biofuels that will become so important to the Nation is an essential element of the Nation's policy to move toward sustainable, domestic supplies of energy. I thank my friend from Hawaii, the chairman of the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, for joining with me to pursue this study, and I look forward to working with him to ensure that our national rail system is adequate, reliable, and competitive.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, yesterday the U.S. Senate passed comprehensive energy legislation that will set the course for our national energy security in the decades to come. The members of this body were able to reach important conclusions regarding the need for increased corporate average fuel economy standards, improved energy efficiency for buildings and appliances, a national standard to help accelerate the development of renewable fuels, and carbon sequestration technology to capture carbon emitted through the burning of coal. The Energy bill approved by the Senate truly represents a shift toward a comprehensive, responsible, and focused national energy policy.

Not to be forgotten in establishing this policy are America's small business owners. There are nearly 26 million small businesses in this country—nearly 26 million business owners that are focused on keeping their doors open and putting food on the table for their families. And while climate change and national energy security sometimes seem like distant threats compared to rising health care costs and staying competitive in an increasingly global economy, small business owners are telling us that energy costs are indeed a concern. The National Small Business Association recently conducted a poll of its members, asking how energy prices affected their business decisions. Seventy-five percent said that energy prices had at least a moderate effect on their businesses—with roughly the same number saying that reducing energy costs would increase their profitability. Despite these numbers, only 33 percent have invested in energy efficiency measures.

In March of this year, I convened a hearing in the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship to look at what small businesses can do to confront global warming. We learned over the course of that hearing just how much can be done to help small businesses become energy efficient. We also learned just how little the current administration is doing. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that small businesses consume roughly 30 percent of the commercial energy consumed in this country—that is roughly 2 trillion kBtu of energy per year, and it's costing small business concerns approximately $29 million a year. Through efforts to increase energy efficiency, small businesses can contribute to America's energy security, help to combat global warming, and add to their bottom line all at the same time.

Last night, I worked with Senator SNOWE to include two amendments to H.R. 6 that will go a long way toward helping small business owners become more energy efficient. These amendments, which together represent the provisions included in S. 1657, the

Small Business Energy Efficiency Act of 2007, require the Small Business Administration, SBA, to implement an energy efficiency program that was mandated in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. To date, the SBA has dragged its feet in implementing a program that could help small business owners to become more energy efficient. Administrator Preston should implement this important program today, and this bill directs him to do so.

Second, this legislation establishes a program to increase energy efficiency through energy audits at Small Business Development Centers, SBDCs. The Pennsylvania SBDC currently operates a similar program, and has successfully assisted hundreds of businesses to become more energy efficient. As a result of the program, six of the eight winners of the 2006 ENERGY STAR Small Business Awards given by the EPA went to Pennsylvania businesses. This program should be replicated so that small businesses across the country have the same opportunity to cut energy costs through the efficiency measures.

Third, the SBA Administrator is authorized to guarantee on-bill financing agreements between businesses and utility companies, to cover a utility company's risk in entering into such an agreement. The federal government should encourage utility companies to pursue these agreements with businesses, where an electric utility will cover the up-front costs of implementing energy efficiency measures, and a business will repay these costs through the savings realized in their energy bill.

Fourth, the legislation creates a telecommuting pilot program through the SBA. The Administrator is authorized to establish a program that produces educational materials and performs outreach to small businesses on the benefits of telecommuting.

Finally, the legislation encourages increased innovation by providing a priority status within the SBIR and STTR programs that ensures high priority be given to small business concerns participating in energy efficiency or renewable energy system research and development projects.

As a nation, we have much to do to secure our future energy supply and to solve the international crisis that is global warming. Last night's approval of H.R. 6 demonstrates this body's will to set the right course, and America's small business owners should know that Congress is providing them with the tools they need to join the crusade.

Mr. President, last night, we successfully passed comprehensive energy legislation which included a significant increase in fuel economy standards. For far too long, this has been the third rail of energy policy. It has been one of Washington's great failures in leadership. But thanks to a bipartisan effort on the part of so many of my colleagues, these new requirements will cut automobile carbon emissions dramatically and will help put our country on a path toward energy dependence. The oil savings from the CAFE provision alone will ultimately total 1.2 million barrels per day by 2020.

When we first established CAFE standards for passenger cars and trucks in 1975, within 10 years we increased fuel economy by 70 percent and decreased our oil dependence from 36 percent to 27 percent. Ever since then, we have been stuck in neutral. The fuel economy of the average new passenger vehicle is lower today than it was 10 years ago.

We now have overcome the forces of inertia, and our country is now poised to at last revolutionize the way we drive. I am proud of the bipartisan commitment to this issue, which was demonstrated with historic vote. I particularly would like to thank my colleagues, Senator INOUYE and Senator STEVENS, for their leadership on this issue.

I was proud to cast my vote in support of this important bipartisan energy legislation, which will dramatically increase our use of renewable fuels, incentivize energy efficiency, reduce our oil dependence, and address the growing threat of climate change. This bill truly puts us on a path toward a cleaner, healthier, and more secure energy future.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the Energy bill that passed with my support. The bill increases biofuels production from the current mandate of 7.5 billion gallons in 2012 to 36 billion gallons by 2022. The bill also establishes new appliance and lighting efficiency standards in Government buildings and includes Federal grants and loan guarantees to promote research into fuel-efficient vehicles, including hybrids, advanced diesel and battery technologies.

I was pleased that this bill included my very important NOPEC amendment, an amendment that passed with the support of 70 Senators. The NOPEC amendment will hold OPEC member nations to account under U.S. antitrust law when they agree to limit the supply or fix the price of oil in violation of the most basic principles of free competition. It will authorize the Justice Department—and only the Justice Department—to file suit against nations or other entities that participate in a conspiracy to limit the supply, or fix the price, of oil. In addition, it will specify that the doctrines of sovereign immunity and act of state do not exempt nations that participate in oil cartels from basic antitrust law. Further, it will give our Government a much needed tool to fight back against the selfish price-fixing conspiracy of OPEC members, a conspiracy that significantly raises the cost of gasoline and other essential energy products to millions consumers every day.

I was also pleased that this bill included an amendment I offered that would allow small manufacturers to access awards under the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Incentive title. Considering that small manufacturers that employ roughly 75 employees or less contribute 29.5 percent to all value added to automobiles, it made sense that they should have the opportunity to get these awards.

I was disappointed that the Energy bill didn't include provisions to require utilities to provide 15 percent of their electric power from renewable sources by 2020. The reduction in the use of fossil fuels to generate electricity would have strengthened our national energy security by diversifying our sources of electric generation. Also, the bill did not include an energy tax package that would have created incentives for renewable power, biofuels, plug-in hybrids, clean coal and other technologies.

Taken together, this bill allows the United States to become more energy efficient in a cost effective and responsible way.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss our efforts to address the energy challenges that are facing our Nation today and the solutions we need for tomorrow. I am pleased that the Senate last night passed a comprehensive energy bill that moves our Nation forward.

We all know how important energy is to our economy, our families, and our quality of life. The high cost of energy is putting a painful squeeze on every sector of my home State: Commuters notice every time they fill up the tank; businesses are struggling with the higher costs of transportation; industry is feeling the impact of higher energy costs, and farmers feel the pain both in the price of fuel and fertilizer.

The question is, what are we going to do about it? It is clear there are no silver bullets.

It is going to take smart policies, carried out consistently over many years, to begin to change the way we use and save energy.

Overall, I believe we must focus on several priorities, including: making America more self-reliant so we are less dependent on foreign sources of energy; using innovation to meet our energy needs in creative ways; supporting conservation to reduce our energy demands; investing in education so we can cultivate the scientists, researchers, and workers of the new energy future; and protecting consumers from unscrupulous energy manipulators.

Before I turn to those specific priorities, I want to share with the Senate some of the innovative things that leaders in Washington State are doing to meet our energy needs.

Washington State is moving forward on renewable sources of energy like wind energy.

In April, I had an opportunity to visit the Hopkins Ridge Wind Farm in Columbia County, WA. This is a Puget Sound energy facility that has 83 wind turbines. When they are running at peak capacity, they can generate enough energy on an average basis to supply about 50,000 homes.

In fact, the Ports of Longview and Vancouver in southwest Washington have become a gateway for bringing wind energy components into the United States. I have been able to support their work through the wind energy tax credit. Last year, I got to visit the Port of Longview and see how our longshoremen expertly handle these massive turbines.

Washington's agriculture community is stepping up and embracing renewable sources of energy. This Spring, I was in Colfax, WA, for a roundtable discussion with farmers, and energy was a big part of the discussion.

I can tell you that Washington State farmers are poised to become active players in the renewable energy market. We talked about ways to help them make the transition into biofuel crops.

And there are other innovative projects. In Gray's Harbor, we are moving forward with a biodiesel plant. It will be a new home for Washington state biofuel production, a new source of jobs for the people of Grays Harbor County, and a new way to combat high gas prices. And in the Tri-Cities, we are moving forward with a new research center on biofuels and bioproducts.

In my home State of Washington, we have also been testing some cutting edge technology that puts information into the hands of consumers so they can make informed decisions about how—and when—they use energy.

With the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and other partners, I helped kick off a GridWise demonstration project to test smart appliances. These appliances give consumers the power to decide when to run them based on the cost of energy. For example, your thermostat could indicate to you when heat costs are at a premium. Or you could set your dryer to run only when energy is a certain price.

We all know that the cost of energy fluctuates throughout the day. Unfortunately, today's consumers don't know the real cost of energy at any given time. So it is hard for them to make informed energy choices.

These innovative appliances were tested for a year in 150 homes, a water-pumping station and a commercial building. The results are impressive. Researchers found that giving consumers these tools helps save energy and reduce demand on the electricity grid. They found that real-time pricing can also alleviate the need to build a new substation.

So I am really proud of the innovative work that is already underway in Washington State, and both Senator CANTWELL and I believe it can serve as a model for the progress we can make in the rest of the country.

Now I would like to turn to my energy priorities and some of the positive steps that this bill takes.

My first priority is to help make America more energy self-reliant. Here at home we have tremendous demand for energy and that demand is growing. Unfortunately, today we are still too dependent on foreign sources of energy, particularly oil. That dependence affects our security and our relations with other countries. We need to reduce our dependence, and we can do that through some of the measures in this bill. This bill includes a renewable fuels standard that will increase our use of renewable fuels, including biofuels like cellulosic ethanol and biogas. It also includes tighter CAFE standards for our auto industry, and it increases the number of bioresearch centers focused on biofuel. This bill will also help us diversify our fuel sources by promoting alternative fuels, such as ethanol, biogas, and biodiesel.

I am disappointed that important tax incentives, which would spur the development of renewable electricity, increase the production of alternative transportation fuels, and help homeowners who make their properties more energy efficient, were blocked in a procedural effort by the minority. I am hopeful that these important investments will be restored as this legislation moves forward.

Second, we need to use innovation to help meet our energy needs. This bill will help move forward our innovation agenda by increasing research and development funding for new technologies. It authorizes funding for research in States with low rates of ethanol production. This investment could help Washington get off the ground in the area of cellulosic ethanol. This bill also boosts research in carbon capture and storage. We are doing some interesting work on that at PNNL in my home State, and I am pleased to support further research.

Third, we need to be more aggressive about conserving energy. It is everything from choosing compact fluorescent light bulbs and energy efficient appliances to consolidating errands so you make fewer trips in your car. Through this bill, the Federal Government will lead by example by using energy efficiently and employing conservation practices. It includes, as I mentioned, higher CAFE standards on our vehicles, which will help conserve gasoline. It will promote efficient lighting technologies, efficient vehicles and advanced batteries.

Fourth, we need to expand education so we have the scientists, researchers, and workers to help us reach a new generation of energy innovation.

The existing and new technologies that we will deploy to increase our self-reliance are complicated, and we need to make sure we have a well-trained workforce that is able to implement these forward-thinking technologies. This entails both continuing education for our current workforce, but also training the workers of tomorrow. We must provide these training programs while our young people are still in our educational system.

In my home State of Washington, several universities are addressing these needs by offering curriculums in this area. For example, Gonzaga University in Spokane has a transmission line worker training program.

Central Washington University in Ellensburg wants to teach its students how to operate the efficiency technologies of the future. I think we should support these efforts by ensuring funding for programs like these. I am pleased that this legislation calls out this important issue.

In Washington State, we are also working to educate the next generation of energy innovators.

Washington State University, the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, and the State of Washington have worked together to create the Bioproducts, Sciences, and Engineering Laboratory in Richland.

This is a pioneering research center where researchers will develop technology to turn biomass into energy and products. It will have teaching laboratories and classrooms and is located on WSU's Tri-Cities campus. I have been pleased to support this project from its inception, and I will continue to do so.

Finally, we need to protect consumers from those who would manipulate the price of energy to take advantage of high demand. One of the things that the Enron scandal revealed is that some people were happy to create false shortages of energy in order to drive up the price.

This bill helps us fight energy manipulators through a price-gouging bill that I co-sponsored, which is including in the underlying bill.

We have a lot of challenges in front of us as individuals and as a country when it comes to energy. But we also have the ability to craft responsible, smart legislation that will help move us in the right direction.

I am pleased to be working to make our country more self-reliant, to invest in innovation, conservation and education and to help protect consumers. I am honored to come from a State that is producing some of the most innovative energy ideas anywhere, and I am excited about moving this bill forward so we can use that progress to benefit our entire country.

FAMILY LEAVE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, every day millions of men and women across America get up and go to work. Their labor—whether it is building bridges or selling groceries, programming computers or cleaning homes—is what makes this country great.

Their work is the foundation of our economy and of our communities and families. Over 100 million Americans rely on their jobs to keep a roof over their heads and put food on the table, pay their doctor's bills, save for their children's college tuition, and retire in dignity. But all of that can be threatened in an instant when serious injury or illness strikes.

Fourteen years ago, we passed the Family and Medical Leave Act to enable employees to take up to 12 weeks

of unpaid leave each year to care for themselves or a seriously ill family member. For the first time, employees could meet their responsibility to their loved ones without risking their jobs. It was landmark legislation—the first bill signed into law by President Clinton in 1993—and tens of millions of families are healthier and more secure because of it.

But for millions of Americans, the ability to meet their family health needs is still out of reach. Most American families can't afford to take unpaid leave because it means they will miss even one weekly paycheck. They need every week's income to meet the rent, pay the electricity bill, and feed their families. A serious illness shouldn't mean choosing between caring for a sick child, spouse or parent, or suffering a financial catastrophe.

That is why I strongly support the Family Leave Insurance Act. This legislation will fill a serious gap in the Nation's health policy. It builds on the Family and Medical Leave Act by providing a safety net for the average working family.

Under this vital legislation, employees would be eligible for up to 8 weeks of paid benefits while they care for their families. With such benefits, workers would not be forced to choose between the families they love and the paychecks they need.

Most important, the program targets the employers and workers who will most benefit from the program. Lower income workers, who are least able to afford time off from their jobs, would be eligible for up to 100 percent of their weekly income. Smaller employers would have the option to participate—and would receive special incentives for doing so.

This is an idea whose time has come. California has led the way with its paid leave program, which has been a great success. Other State legislatures around the country are considering it as well.

The Family Leave Insurance Act is just one of the important new policies we should adopt to help America's working families. We also need to address the nearly half of American workers who don't receive paid sick days at work—and millions more who cannot take paid time off to care for their families.

That is why I will continue to fight for the Healthy Families Act, which will provide up to 7 paid sick days a year to workers, to help them meet immediate and short-term health needs not covered by the Federal Leave Insurance Act.

I commend my colleagues, Senator DODD and Senator STEVENS, for their leadership on this issue. This legislation, together with the Healthy Families Act, removes the risk that a sudden illness in the family will devastate a worker's financial well-being. Hard-working American families deserve no less.

I urge my colleagues to support the Family Leave Insurance Act.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the plague of gun violence is one that affects our society on many levels. Across the country people are calling out for a change in our Nation's gun policies. A recent article, The Battle Over Illegal Guns, in the June issue of Ladies' Home Journal Magazine, is a case in point. This article detailed the tragic death of Wake County, NC sheriff's department investigator Mark Tucker, and provided yet another example of a pervasive problem in our country that has not yet been addressed.

On February 12, 2004, Mark Tucker returned home from work to eat lunch. As he left his house to return to work, he noticed an unfamiliar car with an open trunk parked in a field near his home. He drove over to investigate it. As he stepped out of his unmarked patrol car, an 18-year-old young man pulled a gun out of the trunk of the unfamiliar car. The teenager, who was on probation for breaking into cars, stated he had only intended to engage in a little target practice that day. However, because he was on probation, he was not legally allowed to possess a firearm. When he saw Mark's badge he panicked, killing Mark with a single shot.

Because the teenager had a felony record, he was not legally permitted to purchase a gun himself. In order to circumvent this, he simply had a friend fill out the required Federal paperwork for him at the gun dealer. This type of transaction, when one customer stands in for another who is not legally able to purchase a weapon, is known as a straw purchase. According to a 2000 report by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, ATF, straw purchases are the most common source of crime guns. Approximately half of the 1,530 trafficking investigations examined in the report involved stand-in buyers.

Though Federal law enforcement officials have increasingly teamed up with local officials over the past few years to increase prosecution of firearm-related crimes, not enough attention is being focused on the source of the problem. According to the ATF, nearly 60 percent of the guns used in crimes can be traced to just over 1 percent of this Nation's licensed gun dealers. Five out of six of these guns are obtained illegally.

This article not only detailed the tragic events which occurred in Wake County, it illustrated a problem that plagues our society. Negligent dealers and straw purchasers indirectly threaten the security of our communities by facilitating the transfer of dangerous firearms to potential criminals who may use them in violent crimes. We must do more to help our Federal, State and local law enforcement officials keep guns out of the hands of those who shouldn't have them. Simply put, Congress needs to take up and pass sensible gun legislation.

IRAN

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the international community's effort to press Iran to suspend its nuclear enrichment has been virtually grounded as of late and there does not seem to be a way out. This deadlock is of great concern to me—particularly because of the threat Iran poses to our national security strategy but also because I do not trust this administration to make the right choices when it comes to our safety and security.

As a known sponsor of international terrorism, and in light of President Ahmadinejad's belligerent statements calling for Israel to be ''wiped off the map,'' we must redouble our efforts to ensure Iran is no longer allowed to violate international treaties, does not develop nuclear weapons, and does not become any more of a threat to our national security than it already is.

History has taught us that we cannot ignore the stated intent of those who seek to destroy other nations. A nuclear Iran would be a grave threat to the region, to Israel, and to the entire international community but that does not mean we should act rashly or act alone. Indeed, recent history has also shown that we are at our strongest—and most secure—when we are part of a strong multilateral team.

And yet, the Bush administration's saber-rattling flies in the face of any effort to legitimately build consensus for effective dealings with Iran. Our allies at the United Nations have worked with us in the past to support a resolution sanctioning Iran but they may not be willing to work with us again if these confrontations in the Persian Gulf become habitual occurrences. Such threats are stunningly counterproductive as they embolden Iranian hardliners to dig in their heels, undermine our multilateral commitments, and jeopardize our national security significantly.

Iran's ability to sniff out and exploit fissures within the international community and use it to their advantage should not be underestimated. Knowing this, it is in the interest of our national security to ensure there is strong unanimity among our allies at the United Nations. Critical to this effort is cooperation from Russia and China. To ensure they are on board, this administration must prioritize robust diplomacy with these two countries to ensure they are on board and engaged. Without them, there can be no real headway.

Just last month an International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, report said that Iran has not suspended its enrichment activities and we must take this claim very seriously. We must work with our allies to take concerted, decisive action to break this stalemate. The Security Council must speak with one voice and send a clear signal that continued defiance of the international community will not be tolerated.

It is essential that all U.N. member states and the international community, more generally, continue to condemn the violent and defiant rhetoric of Iran's President. If his aggressive words go unchecked it could signal approval of the Iranian regime's determination to undermine its international obligations.

This Congress can also take critical steps to stop or slow Iran's nuclear enrichment, but we will not be effective in doing so unless we acknowledge that the United States must be in lock-step with the international community if we are to overcome decades of mistrust and ongoing threats to our national security.

MATTHEW SHEPARD ACT OF 2007

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On May 12, 2007 in New York, NY, Omar Willock attacked Roberto Duncanson, a gay man, on the street in Crown Heights. Willock allegedly yelled anti-gay slurs at Duncanson when they passed each other on the street. Later, Willock encountered Duncanson again and started a fist fight, eventually stabbing Duncanson. Willock is being held without bail and is charged with a hate crime.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Matthew Shepard Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

WELCOMING THE MINNESOTA NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, it is my great pleasure to welcome the brave and courageous members of the 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 34th Infantry back to Minnesota today. For nearly 2 years, these troops have selflessly and honorably served our State and our Nation, demonstrating a level of commitment and sacrifice beyond anything our country could ask of them.

To welcome these soldiers home properly, it is important to roll the calendar back to September of 2005, when these men and women learned that they would soon deploy to Iraq for a 12-month mission. The news was difficult for a lot of Guard troops and families in our State. Many of them had already been deployed on active duty to Bosnia or Kosovo since September 11, and they knew how hard it would be to say goodbye once more to their families, friends, and communities.

Because of their previous service, many of these troops were not required to go to Iraq. They had already answered the call to defend this great land, and they could have let others take their turn this time, but that is not the spirit of the 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 34th Infantry. Instead, with the same commitment that their unit has shown since the Civil War, these troops donned their uniforms, made their arrangements, kissed their moms and dads, husbands, wives, and children goodbye, and returned to the fray to serve their country.

For 6 grueling months, these soldiers conducted their mandatory ''uptraining'' on the other side of our country at Camp Shelby in Mississippi and Fort Polk in Louisiana. And just like their Minnesota 1st infantry comrades who mustered at Fort Snelling 144 years earlier, the 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 34th Infantry received ratings of ''outstanding,'' ''excellent,'' and ''perfect'' on their various training demonstrations throughout the winter of 2005.

In March of 2006, when the unit had already been away from home for half a year, it was time to travel the 6,000 miles to the Middle East and Iraq. Before they left, I had the pleasure of attending their departure ceremony in Mississippi alongside my colleagues of the Minnesota congressional delegation and our Governor. There were steaks, music, beer cans, smiles, flags, hugs, and sadly, a lot of tears.

But there was one clear thing everyone had in common that day at Camp Shelby: Pride. Pride in serving their country. Pride in defending our freedom. Pride that their loved one was going to perform their duty in a manner consistent with the finest traditions of the U.S. military.

And off they went. Different units and different companies fanned out in locations across Iraq. Some of them in Fallujah and Taqaddum in Anbar Province, some at Camp Scania near Nippur, and the largest number at Camp Adder in Talil.

And the 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 34th Infantry didn't take much time to make an impact on the ground. By the end of May, when the ink on their transfer authority had barely dried, the 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 34th Infantry had already built a reverse osmosis water plant for the people of al-Feiz. It would be the first of many success stories they would accomplish and be proud of.

Over the course of the next few months, the 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 34th Infantry endured the trials of a unit at war. With every successful patrol, there was a longing for far away loved ones. For every completed reconstruction project, there was anticipation of a return trip home. And on the hardest of days, there was the mourning of a fallen comrade.

And so it went with these selfless soldiers through the end of 2006 and into 2007. When the New Year broke, it brought with it a new energy and a refocused eye on their March 2007 return. But their March return was not to be, as the story of these men and women veered onto a different path.

On January 10, of this year, these soldiers and their families endured a shock that none of them expected. Afternoon reports from CNN and Fox News began to trickle through our State and Nation, indicating that the unit would be extended until this summer. When the official word from the Pentagon confirmed this fact later that day, it shook all of us to our core and left us with more questions and concerns than we could find answers to.

But like Minnesotans always do, they somehow found a way to move forward. The support of their families strengthened them. The spirit of their communities rallied around them. And the countdown from January to July gradually went from months to weeks to days while the moment that seemed like it would never get here finally did: Their return.

Their deployment kept them in Iraq 25 days longer than any other unit serving in this war. During their time, they drove over 4,500 round trip convoy missions completing 99 percent of them on time. That's over 2.2 million miles of convoys in Iraq from the south central part of the country to the Jordanian and Syrian borders. And I don't think anyone needs a reminder of the dangers of IEDs on these convoys, but just for the record, this unit discovered over 350 of them before they were detonated. In other areas they fought al-Qaida and provided critical security to our military bases, saving countless lives of their comrades in arms.

They also worked hard to win the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. In their time in Iraq, the 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 34th Infantry completed over 90 reconstruction projects from water and powerplants to road construction and media expansion.

And now, after nearly 2 years of sacrifice and dedication, on behalf of a grateful State and Nation we have the privilege to welcome these fine men and women back to the North Star State. With their return will come new challenges. As MAJ John Morris, Chaplain of the Minnesota National Guard, often says, we have to support our troops before, during, and after their deployments. I look forward to joining with my colleagues in the Minnesota delegation to do our part to energize the State to bring these troops all the way home.

I have no doubt there will be plenty of handshakes, hugs, and welcome home ceremonies across our State in the coming days and weeks for this admirable group of Americans. I hope I am there to personally welcome home as many as I can, but because I know I can't make it to all of them—and because I would rather they get home and

go fishing than spend their time talking to me—I want to express in the RECORD the eternal appreciation I have for the service of the 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 34th Infantry.

You gave up time, income, and family togetherness. You risked everything so all our lives could be safer and more free from fear. When your Nation called you to serve, you didn't take a poll, you didn't equivocate, you didn't even question why. You served because you were called to and you did your duty with perseverance, excellence and strength. Your active duty service is now complete, but our debt of gratitude will never end. On behalf of all Minnesotans, we welcome you home.

Thank you and may God Bless you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF R&R MARKET

• Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Colorado's oldest family-owned business—the R&R Market in the town of San Luis, in Costilla County, CO. My family has ranched and farmed in the San Luis Valley for five generations just a few miles west of San Luis. I grew up knowing the R&R Market as one of the treasures of the valley, a great symbol of our shared history and heritage.

Colorado was built upon the ingenuity, hard work, and entrepreneurial spirit of people like Don José Dario Gallegos, who traveled from the San Luis Valley by mule train over the Santa Fe Trail to trade centers in St. Louis and Independence, Missouri. Don Dario Gallegos was among the founders of the town of San Luis in 1851 and helped establish some of the first water rights in the area. The irrigation ditches—or acequias—that he and the settlers dug are still in use today.

When Don Dario Gallegos opened his store in San Luis in 1857, Colorado was still a young territory, and statehood was nearly 20 years away.

Though the physical foundation of Don José Dario Gallegos's original adobe structure would be destroyed in an 1895 fire, the people of San Luis came together to form the indestructible foundation rooted in a commitment to community and family that sustains the R&R Market to this very day.

It is this commitment that the people of San Luis will celebrate on June 30, 150 years after the original R&R Market opened its doors. I congratulate the Gallegos descendants—who still own and operate the market—and the people of San Luis on this momentous anniversary.

I have a painting of the R&R Market hanging in my Washington, DC, office. It serves as an everyday reminder of the place I come from—a place where community and family mean everything, a place where the spirit of Colorado was born and continues to thrive. I am honored to represent that place and the people who come from it.•

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE M. VAN TASSEL

• Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to George M. Van Tassel, who passed away on Monday, June 18, 2007. For 13 years, George served as mayor of my hometown, Tuscaloosa, AL. He was a personal friend of mine and along with the entire town of Tuscaloosa, I mourn his passing.

In the 1930s George moved south from New York to attend the University of Alabama School of Law. There, he met a fellow student, Juarine Berrey, with whom he quickly fell in love. They married in 1934. Several years after his gradation in 1939, George was drafted by the U.S. Army to serve in the European theater during World War II. On D-Day, George was among the soldiers who landed on the beach at Normandy, France.

Upon returning to the States, George began his law practice. In 1956, he was elected to serve as mayor of Tuscaloosa, filling the unexpired term of mayor Hal McCall. Although George oversaw many changes that took place in Tuscaloosa during his three terms as mayor, perhaps his most notable achievement was his initiative to dam the North River and create a 5,885-acre water supply reservoir we call Lake Tuscaloosa.

In 1969, George decided not to run for reelection. An avid hunter and fisherman, he wanted more time to enjoy his hobbies. He returned to the law, managing a successful practice until he retired at age 75.

George is loved and will be missed by his daughter, Linda Ayers of Tuscaloosa, and his son, George M. Van Tassel, Jr., of Birmingham. He was an inspiration to many and will be remembered for his dedication and many contributions to the city of Tuscaloosa. I ask this entire Senate to join me in recognizing and honoring the life of George M. Van Tassel.•

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE WESTERN BALKANS AS DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13219 OF JUNE 26, 2001—PM 19

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication stating that the Western Balkans emergency is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2007. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on June 23, 2006, 71 FR 36183.

The crisis constituted by the actions of persons engaged in, or assisting, sponsoring, or supporting (i) extremist violence in the Republic of Macedonia and elsewhere in the Western Balkans region, or (ii) acts obstructing implementation of the Dayton Accords in Bosnia or United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999, in Kosovo, that led to the declaration of a national emergency on June 26, 2001, in Executive Order 13219 and to amendment of that order in Executive Order 13304 of May 28, 2003, has not been resolved. The acts of extremist violence and obstructionist activity outlined in Executive Order 13219, as amended, are hostile to U.S. interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to the Western Balkans and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 22, 2007*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 11:53 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1352. An act 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''.

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Brandon, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2764. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2771. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2764. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal

year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2771. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2359. An act to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2339. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Importation of Fruit from Thailand'' ((RIN0579-AC10)(Docket No. APHIS-2006-0040)) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2340. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pine Shoot Beetle; Addition of Cumberland County, New Jersey, to the List of Quarantined Areas'' (Docket No. APHIS-2007-0067) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2341. A communication from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to Bank Secrecy Act Regulations Regarding Casino Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements'' (RIN1506-AA29) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2342. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones (including 6 regulations beginning with CGD01-07-002)'' (RIN1625-AA00) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2343. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones (including 6 regulations beginning with CGD01-07-043)'' (RIN1625-AA00) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2344. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operations (including 5 regulations beginning with CGD01-07-058)'' (RIN1625-AA09) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2345. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations (including 2 regulations beginning with CGD05-07-017)'' (RIN1625-AA08) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2346. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anchorage Regulations; Port of New York and Vicinity'' ((RIN1625-AA01)(CGD01-06-023)) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2347. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones (including 8 regulations beginning with CGD09-07-039)'' (RIN1625-AA00) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2348. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones (including 8 regulations beginning with CGD09-07-042)'' (RIN1625-AA00) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2349. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicability of Federal Power Act Section 215 to Qualifying Small Power Production and Cogeneration Facilities'' (Docket No. RM07-11-000) received on June 20, 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2350. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Application of Section 6404(g) of the Internal Revenue Code Suspension Provisions'' ((RIN1545-BG64)(TD 9333)) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2351. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Haitian Hemisphere Opportunity Through Partnership Encouragement Act of 2006'' (RIN1505-AB82) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2352. A communication from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Semiannual Report relative to its activities and accomplishments during the period of October 1, 2006, through March 31, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2353. A communication from the Director, Strategic Human Resources Policy Division, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Locality Pay Areas'' (RIN3206-AL27) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2354. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Department's Inspector General for the period of October 1, 2006, through March 31, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2355. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a change in previously submitted reported information for the position of Administrator for the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2356. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's review of legislation entitled ''Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2357. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, the report of a draft bill entitled ''Veterans' Authorities Expansion Act of 2007''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–2358. A communication from the Director of Regulations Management, Office of Information and Technology, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Data Breaches'' (RIN2900-AM63) received on June 21, 2007; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 535, a bill to establish an Unsolved Crimes Section in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, and an Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office in the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–88).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 1682. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the management of medical care for members of the Armed Forces, to improve the speed and efficiency of the physical disability evaluation system of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the harbor maintenance tax certain commercial cargo loaded or unloaded at United States ports in the Great Lakes Saint Lawrence Seaway System; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1684. A bill to establish the Return of Talent Program to allow aliens who are legally present in the United States to return temporarily to the country of citizenship of the alien if that country is engaged in post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. DOLE (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 249. A resolution honoring the life of Ruth Bell Graham; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mrs. DOLE):

S. Res. 250. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate condemning the military junta in Burma for its continued detention of Aung San Suu Kyi and other political prisoners; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DODD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 251. A resolution honoring the firefighters and other public servants who responded to the fire in Charleston, South Carolina, on June 18, 2007; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. INOUYE):

S. Res. 252. A resolution recognizing the increasingly mutually beneficial relationship between the United States of America and the Republic of Indonesia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. OBAMA, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. Con. Res. 40. A concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of observing the National Day of Human Trafficking Awareness on January 11 of each year to raise awareness of and opposition to human trafficking; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 41

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 41, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to improve America's research competitiveness, and for other purposes.

S. 156

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 156, a bill to make the moratorium on Internet access taxes and multiple and discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce permanent.

S. 185

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to restore habeas corpus for those detained by the United States.

S. 206

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 432

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 432, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for kidney disease education services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation.

S. 777

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 777, a bill to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

S. 838

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 838, a bill to authorize funding for eligible joint ventures between United States and Israeli businesses and academic persons, to establish the International Energy Advisory Board, and for other purposes.

S. 912

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 912, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the incentives for the construction and renovation of public schools.

S. 940

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 940, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income.

S. 1060

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1060, a bill to reauthorize the grant program for reentry of offenders into the community in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to improve reentry planning and implementation, and for other purposes.

S. 1243

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1243, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce the age for receipt of military retired pay for nonregular service from 60 years of age to 55 years of age.

S. 1257

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1257, a bill to provide the District of Columbia a voting seat and the State of Utah an additional seat in the House of Representatives.

S. 1259

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1259, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for developing countries to promote quality basic education and to establish the achievement of universal basic education in all developing countries as an objective of United States foreign assistance policy, and for other purposes.

S. 1267

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1267, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1406

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to strengthen polar bear conservation efforts, and for other purposes.

S. 1418

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1418, a bill to provide assistance to improve the health of newborns, children, and mothers in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 1544

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) were added as cosponsors of S. 1544, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the quality and efficiency of health care, to provide the public with information on provider and supplier performance, and to enhance the education and awareness of consumers for evaluating health care services through the development and release of reports based on Medicare enrollment, claims, survey, and assessment data.

S. 1592

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1592, a bill to reauthorize the Underground Railroad Educational and Cultural Program.

S. 1661

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1661, a bill to communicate United States travel policies and improve marketing and other activities designed to increase travel in the United States from abroad.

S. 1681

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1681, a bill to provide for a paid family and medical leave insurance program, and for other purposes.

S. J. RES. 16

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. J. Res. 16, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

S. RES. 235

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 235, a resolution designating July 1, 2007, as ''National Boating Day''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 1682. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the management of medical care for members of the Armed Forces, to improve the speed and efficiency of the physical disability evaluation system of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to proudly join my friend and colleague Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN in the introduction of the Servicemembers' Healthcare Benefits and Rehabilitation Enhancement Act of 2007.

In March, I was able to visit one of Maine's returning soldiers who has been assigned outpatient care at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. We spoke about the many issues and obstacles faced by our wounded troops as they struggle not only to recover from their injuries, but to prepare themselves for their future. During our meeting, this soldier covered many of the pitfalls faced by troops as they confront the bewildering processes of medical and physical evaluation boards without the benefit of anyone to advocate on their behalf. In fact, he aptly described the process as an ''adversarial'' system that onerously demands wounded soldiers to provide the ''burden of proof'' for their claims.

In response, we have crafted this legislation in order to remedy a variety of flaws that currently plague the military health care system, including: inequitable disability ratings, a lack of advocacy within military outpatient facilities, inadequate mental health treatment, and inefficient transition from the DOD to the VA.

First off, our bill would address the concerns I have heard from a number of returning troops from my home state of Maine and across this Nation who have gone without the proper advocacy and case management for medical benefits during their stay at military outpatient facilities. It is inexcusable that our returning heroes are often forced to navigate the esoteric physical disability evaluation system, PDES, within an adversarial atmosphere.

The measure we are proposing would require the Secretary of Defense to provide each recovering servicemember in a military medical treatment facility with a medical care manager who will assist him or her with all matters regarding their medical status, along with a caseworker who will assist each servicemember and his or her family in obtaining all the information necessary for transition, recovery, and benefits collection. Further, provisions we included will create a DOD-wide Ombudsmen Office to provide policy guidance to, and oversight of, ombudsman offices in all military departments and the medical system of the DOD. Only then, will our returning servicemembers recover within an atmosphere that is based upon advocacy.

Additionally, recent news reports and independent analysis have revealed troubling statistics regarding rampant inaccuracies within the military disability ratings system. According to Pentagon data analyzed by the Veterans' Disability Benefits Commission, since 2000, 92.7 percent of all disability ratings handed out by physical evaluation boards, PEBs, have been 20 percent or lower. Under the current policy, those who receive disability ratings under 30 percent and have served less than 20 years of military service are discharged with only a severance check, deprived of full military retirement pay, life insurance, health insurance, and access to military commissaries.

Further evidence of a troubled disability ratings system shows that since America went to war in Afghanistan and Iraq, fewer veterans have received disability ratings of 30 percent or more, inferring that the DOD may have lowered the ratings for injured troops who would have otherwise received a host of lifelong benefits. On top of that, it currently takes an average of 209 days for troops to complete the PDES process by receiving notification of potential discharge and a subsequent disability rating.

As a means of fixing these blatant flaws within the military disability ratings system, this legislation consolidates the physical evaluation system by placing the informal and formal physical evaluation boards under one command, as a method of streamlining and expediting the process. Our troops deserve timely care and efficient treatment upon their return home, and therefore, no recovering servicemember should be forced to endure lengthy delays in a medical hold or holdover status due to bureaucratic inefficiencies.

The bill also requires that physicians preparing each individual medical case for all PEBs report multiple diagnosed medical impairments that, in concert, may deem a servicemember to be unfit for duty. Under the current system, the U.S. Army, for example, only rates physical impairments that individually cause a servicemember to be deemed unfit for duty, ultimately dismissing ailments that may significantly hinder a servicemember's ability to continue his or her service in the military or find gainful employment in the civilian sector.

Over the past year, the American public has also become acutely aware of the effects of traumatic brain injury, TBI, which has become the signature injury of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, affecting thousands of returning servicemembers. Therefore, it is now more imperative than ever for both the DOD and the VA to implement mental health treatment policies that accurately diagnose and adequately treat debilitating mental health injuries among our injured troops.

Our bill addresses these issues by including a provision that requires all servicemembers who are expected to deploy to a combat theater to receive a mental health assessment that tests their cognitive functioning within 120 days before deployment, a mental health assessment within 60 days after deployment, to include a comprehensive screening for mild, moderate, and severe cases of TBI. Additionally, all servicemembers will receive a third mental health assessment at the time of their predischarge physical.

The measure we are putting forward today also aims to update the current disability ratings system used by the military and the VA to include the effects of TBI and post traumatic stress disorder, along with any other mental health disorders that may affect our Nation's returning warriors. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs would be required to issue a report to Congress detailing a plan to update the Veterans' Administration Schedule for Ratings Disabilities, VASRD, to align its disability ratings to more closely reflect the effects of mental halth disorders, including TBI and PTSD on the modern workforce.

The Servicemembers' Healthcare Benefits and Rehabilitation Enhancement Act of 2007 also calls on the Secretaries of Defense and Veterans Affairs to provide Congress with a report detailing plans to increase the role of eligible private sector rehabilitation providers for assisting the VA in providing comprehensive post acute inpatient and outpatient rehabilitation for TBI and PTSD, if in certain instances the VA is unable to provide such services.

The Veterans Health Administration is, unequivocally, the foremost expert in providing mental health treatment for our recovering servicemembers, yet in varying circumstances, the VA may require additional health care coverage in remote areas. All of our returning heroes, despite the severity of their mental health ailments, or their location geographically, deserve every

available option for rehabilitative services, to ensure that they never go untreated.

Additionally, to help ease the transition from the military health care system to the VA system, both the DOD and the VA must adopt and implement a unified electronic medical database. Interagency database compatibility would not only increase medical efficiency, but it would significantly ease the transition into civilian life for injured or retiring servicemembers who deserve timely and effective health care. Therefore, our legislation establishes and implements a single electronic military and medical record database within the DOD that will be used to track and record the medical status of each member of the Armed Forces in theater and throughout the military health care process, and will be accessible to the VA through the Joint Patient Tracking Application, JPTA. This electronic records system will be identical to the VistA system, currently used by the VA, which has served as a model of excellence for electronic medical databases among our Nation's health community.

I have nothing but the utmost respect for those brave Americans who served in uniform with honor, courage, and distinction. The obligation our Nation holds for its servicemembers and veterans is enormous, and it is an obligation that must be fulfilled every day. We must always remain cognizant of the wisdom laid forth by President George Washington, when he stated, ''The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional as to how they perceive the Veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their country.''

At a time when over 600,000 courageous men and women have returned from combat in both Iraq and Afghanistan, I believe it is now up to Congress to do everything in its power to answer the call of our men and women who have nobly served our Nation in uniform, to ensure that they receive the heroes' treatment they rightly earned and rightly deserve. Again, I want to thank my colleague, Senator LINCOLN, for her assistance in making this a stronger bill and bringing it before the Senate. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1684. A bill to establish the Return of Talent Program to allow aliens who are legally present in the United States to return temporarily to the country of citizenship of the alien if that country is engaged in post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, two of the greatest challenges we face today are how to address the needs of postconflict countries, and countries that are suffering from large-scale natural disasters. These are critical issues, and ones that we cannot afford to get wrong, for the sake of the people living in those nations, and for the sake of our own security.

On the post-conflict front, a recent commission organized by the Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Association of the U.S. Army found, to no one's surprise, that ''failed states matter—for national security as well as for humanitarian reasons. If left to their own devices, such states can become sanctuaries for terrorist networks, organized crime and drug traffickers, as well as posing grave humanitarian challenges and threats to regional stability.''

Currently, the most obvious case in point is the reconstruction of Iraq. In addition to Iraq, unfortunately, we can talk about many other states that are either unstable, or are tenuously recovering from past conflicts including Afghanistan, East Timor, Kosovo, Haiti, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Earthquakes, floods, drought and landslides often have the most dire impacts in developing countries that are the least equipped to respond. The countries ravaged by the 2004 tsunami are recovering, but there is still a long way to go: Indonesia lost over 150,000 people, with half a million left homeless. In India, almost 20,000 people lost their lives and 2.79 million people were affected, losing homes, land, and livestock. The tsunami set back development in the Maldives by 20 years, devastating the country's economic backbone and tourism industry.

We need comprehensive, and creative, strategies to help countries rebound from conflicts or natural disasters. One such strategy is to allow, and indeed encourage, immigrants to the United States to use their skills, talents, and knowledge to help rebuild their native lands. The diaspora is an extraordinary collective resource. These individuals know the communities. They know the culture. They know the language, more than any contractors, and more than any humanitarian workers from the outside, no matter how well-trained they may be or how much expertise they may have.

So today, I am introducing legislation, as I did in the last Congress, that would create a ''return of talent'' visa program.

The idea is simple: to allow legal immigrants in the United States to return home to help with reconstruction efforts, without jeopardizing their immigration status. Legal permanent residents will be able to return temporarily to their countries after a conflict or a significant natural disaster to help rebuild, without their time out of the United States affecting their ability to meet the requirements for U.S. citizenship.

Under current law, a legal permanent resident who wants to apply for U.S. citizenship is required to be physically present in the United States for at least half of the 5 years immediately preceding the date of filing the naturalization application.

This residency requirement could be particularly difficult to meet for those who have family and friends in their countries of origin who are in desperate need of help, and whose skills are especially in demand to help their countries of origin rebuild, for example, teachers, engineers, translators, and health care workers. We should not stand in their way of returning, bringing their talent and expertise home, and helping them help others at a time of greatest need.

This legislation would encourage skilled and committed individuals to return to their countries of origin to revive the business, industry, agriculture, education, health and other sectors that have been weakened or destroyed after years of conflict or devastating disasters.

The program would apply to immigrants from countries where U.S. Armed Forces have engaged in armed conflict or peacekeeping, or countries where the United Nations Security Council has authorized peacekeeping operations in the past 10 years. Immigrants from countries which received funding from the U.S. Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance also would be eligible to participate in the program.

Estimates of the number of individuals who could participate in this program are relatively low. For example, the United States admitted 4,749 Afghani and 4,077 Iraqi immigrants in 2005 who are now legal permanent residents eligible to pursue U.S. citizenship. Immigrants from Indonesia numbered 3,924 and Bangladesh, 11,487 in the same year. Yet while the program would have a small impact on the U.S. naturalization process, the contributions of even a few hundred individuals could have a tremendous positive effect on reconstruction work.

At this moment the Senate is seized with finding a resolution to the massive and critical question of immigration reform. A return of talent program would fit well with whatever decisions we reach because, simply put, everybody wins: The United States is able to support badly needed rebuilding efforts without increasing foreign aid; immigrants are able to use their skills and resources to help communities without disrupting their path to U.S. citizenship; and communities abroad that are recovering from conflict and disaster receive much-needed assistance.

A return of talent program is an important piece of our overall strategy to stabilize and rebuild countries torn by conflict and devastated by natural disaster. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1684

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Return of Talent Act''.

SEC. 2. RETURN OF TALENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 317 the following:

''TEMPORARY ABSENCE OF PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN THE RETURN OF TALENT PROGRAM

''SEC. 317A. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall establish the Return of Talent Program to permit eligible aliens to temporarily return to the alien's country of citizenship in order to make a material contribution to that country if the country is engaged in post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction activities, for a period not exceeding 24 months, unless an exception is granted under subsection (d).

''(b) ELIGIBLE ALIEN.—An alien is eligible to participate in the Return of Talent Program established under subsection (a) if the alien meets the special immigrant description under section 101(a)(27)(N).

''(c) FAMILY MEMBERS.—The spouse, parents, siblings, and any minor children of an alien who participates in the Return of Talent Program established under subsection (a) may return to such alien's country of citizenship with the alien and reenter the United States with the alien.

''(d) EXTENSION OF TIME.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may extend the 24-month period referred to in subsection (a) upon a showing that circumstances warrant that an extension is necessary for post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction efforts.

''(e) RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS.—An immigrant described in section 101(a)(27)(N) who participates in the Return of Talent Program established under subsection (a), and the spouse, parents, siblings, and any minor children who accompany such immigrant to that immigrant's country of citizenship, shall be considered, during such period of participation in the program—

''(1) for purposes of section 316(a), physically present and residing in the United States for purposes of naturalization within the meaning of that section; and

''(2) for purposes of section 316(b), to meet the continuous residency requirements in that section.

''(f) OVERSIGHT AND ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall oversee and enforce the requirements of this section.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 317 the following:

''317A. Temporary absence of persons participating in the Return of Talent Program''.

SEC. 3. ELIGIBLE IMMIGRANTS.

Section 101(a)(27) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (L), by inserting a semicolon after ''Improvement Act of 1998'';

(2) in subparagraph (M), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(N) an immigrant who—

''(i) has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence;

''(ii) demonstrates an ability and willingness to make a material contribution to the post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction in the alien's country of citizenship; and

''(iii) as determined by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security—

''(I) is a citizen of a country in which Armed Forces of the United States are engaged, or have engaged in the 10 years preceding such determination, in combat or peacekeeping operations;

''(II) is a citizen of a country where authorization for United Nations peacekeeping operations was initiated by the United Nations Security Council during the 10 years preceding such determination; or

''(III) is a citizen of a country which received, during the preceding 2 years, funding from the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance of the United States Agency for International Development in response to a declared disaster in such country by the United States Ambassador, the Chief of the U.S. Mission, or the appropriate Assistant Secretary of State, that is beyond the ability of such country's response capacity and warrants a response by the United States Government.''.

SEC. 4. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to Congress that describes—

(1) the countries of citizenship of the participants in the Return of Talent Program established under section 317A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 2;

(2) the post-conflict or natural disaster reconstruction efforts that benefitted, or were made possible, through participation in the program; and

(3) any other information that the Secretary of Homeland Security determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall promulgate regulations to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services for fiscal year 2008, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 249—HONORING THE LIFE OF RUTH BELL GRAHAM

Mrs. DOLE (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 249

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham returned to the United States to attend Wheaton College, where she met and fell in love with her future husband, Billy Graham, who would become one of the most acclaimed evangelists in the world;

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham married Billy Graham on August 13, 1943 at Montreat Presbyterian Church in her beloved Western North Carolina;

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham was the devoted mother of five children (Virginia, Anne, Ruth, Franklin, and Nelson Edman) and the grandmother of 19 grandchildren;

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham was a renowned author and poet who penned 14 books that have moved and inspired people around the globe;

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham and Billy Graham were recognized with the Congressional Gold Medal in 1996 for their ''outstanding and lasting contributions to morality, racial equality, family, philanthropy, and religion''; and

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham touched countless lives worldwide by sharing her tremendous faith, her deep compassion for the less fortunate, her great talents and her lighthearted wit.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the life, work, and legacy of Ruth Bell Graham, a loyal companion who shined with grace and courage beside her husband Billy Graham, and a dedicated mother who fostered individuality and humility in her five children.

SENATE RESOLUTION 250—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE CONDEMNING THE MILITARY JUNTA IN BURMA FOR ITS CONTINUED DETENTION OF AUNG SAN SUU KYI AND OTHER POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mrs. DOLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 250

Whereas Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi has dedicated her life to the peaceful, non-violent movement for democracy and reconciliation in the Union of Burma;

Whereas Aung San Suu Kyi and the National League for Democracy won a majority of parliamentary seats in Burma's last election held in 1990;

Whereas the State Peace and Development Council of Burma refuses to cede power and permit representative government and has detained Aung San Suu Kyi under house arrest for 11 of the last 17 years;

Whereas the ruling military junta has committed numerous, well-documented atrocities against the people of Burma;

Whereas Aung San Suu Kyi continues to promote peaceful dialogue and reconciliation despite mistreatment from the State Peace and Development Council;

Whereas the United States recognizes and supports the dedication and commitment to freedom demonstrated by Aung San Suu Kyi: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi for her courage and devotion to the people of the Union of Burma and their struggle for democracy; and

(2) calls for the immediate release of Aung San Suu Kyi and other political prisoners by the State Peace and Development Council.

SENATE RESOLUTION 251—HONORING THE FIREFIGHTERS AND OTHER PUBLIC SERVANTS WHO RESPONDED TO THE FIRE IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA, ON JUNE 18, 2007

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DODD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr.

BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 251

Whereas at approximately 7:00 P.M. on June 18, 2007, a tragic fire started at the Sofa Super Store in Charleston, South Carolina;

Whereas despite the flames that engulfed the building, the brave men and women of the Charleston Fire Department (Department) fulfilled their duty by rushing inside as others fled for their lives;

Whereas the fire quickly grew out of control and trapped 2 store employees inside;

Whereas the firefighters attempted to punch through the building walls in a selfless effort to save the lives of these employees;

Whereas the roof of the building collapsed, trapping the firefighters inside;

Whereas Captain William ''Billy'' Hutchinson, a 30-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Captain Mike Benke, a 20-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Captain Louis Mulkey, an 11-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Engineer Mark Kelsey, a 12-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Engineer Bradford ''Brad'' Baity, a 9-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Assistant Engineer Michael French, a 1½-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Fire Fighter James ''Earl'' Drayton, a 32-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Fire Fighter Brandon Thompson, a 4-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Fire Fighter Melven Champaign, a 2-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas the extraordinary courage and sacrifice of these firefighters reflects the spirit of South Carolina, as well as the spirit of our great Nation;

Whereas the United States has not experienced such a devastating loss of firefighters since the horrific events on September 11, 2001; and

Whereas a grateful Nation mourns the loss of these heroes and vows that their sacrifices were not made in vain: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors William ''Billy'' Hutchinson, Mike Benke, Louis Mulkey, Mark Kelsey, Bradford ''Brad'' Baity, Michael French, James ''Earl'' Drayton, Brandon Thompson, and Melven Champaign, who lost their lives in the course of their duty as firefighters, and recognizes them for their bravery and sacrifice;

(2) extends its deepest sympathy to the families of these 9 brave heroes;

(3) honors all the firefighters and other public servants who contributed to battling the fire; and

(4) pledges to continue to support and to work on behalf of the firefighters who risk their lives each day to ensure the safety of all Americans.

SENATE RESOLUTION 252—RECOGNIZING THE INCREASINGLY MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. INOUYE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 252

Whereas the historical ties between the United States and the Indonesia go back to the period of Indonesian struggle for independence and the early years of its independence in 1945;

Whereas the constitutionally required ''free and active'' foreign policy of Indonesia has largely resulted in a close relationship with the United States, and this relationship reflects the growing connections between the developed and the developing world;

Whereas, following the effects of the Asian financial crisis in 1998, Indonesia has instituted numerous democratic reforms, including—

(1) amending the country's constitution in order to be more democratic and transparent;

(2) holding the country's first ever direct presidential election in 2004 and direct, nationwide local elections starting in 2006; and

(3) giving the judicial branch independent administrative and financial responsibility for all courts in 2004;

Whereas the government of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, the first directly elected President of Indonesia, is strongly committed to strengthening the country's democracy and remains focused on developing good governance and promoting and protecting human rights, civil liberties, a free press, and a vibrant civil society;

Whereas the Government of Indonesia continues to reform its military in accordance with internationally accepted democratic principles;

Whereas Indonesia signed a peace agreement in August 2005 ending the conflict in Aceh, met its obligations under the agreement, oversaw the return of normalcy to Aceh, and held free, transparent, and peaceful elections for local government leaders in December 2006;

Whereas the Government of Indonesia has worked and continues to work toward peaceful solutions to other internal conflicts, including Papua, with concern for the welfare and security of the entire population;

Whereas, in parallel with the recovery of Indonesia's economic and political stability following the 1998 Asian financial crisis, the country has regained its pivotal role in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and continues to work toward a secure, peaceful, and vibrant Southeast Asia, particularly by proposing successfully the ASEAN Security Community, the ASEAN Economic Community, and the ASEAN Socio-cultural Community;

Whereas the Government and people of Indonesia have endured several terrorist bombings, have shown resilience in the fight against international terrorism by apprehending and bringing to justice numerous perpetrators, and remain open to international cooperation in this area;

Whereas the Government of Indonesia, together with the Governments of Malaysia and Singapore as fellow littoral states and user-countries, has maintained and is further strengthening efforts to secure the important international shipping lane in the Malacca Strait;

Whereas, as shown in international fora, the Government of Indonesia remains committed to addressing the problems related to the control of the spread of weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas the Government of Indonesia has deployed a military battalion to support the United Nations Interim Force In Lebanon (UNIFIL) peacekeeping operations, and as the world's largest Muslim democracy, has made important contributions to the facilitation of various dialogues among Islamic factions in the Middle East; and

Whereas, though the Government of Indonesia has shown significant progress in the areas of democracy, good governance, human rights, and counter terrorism, there remains much to be done and many reforms yet to be implemented: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the progress made by the Government of Indonesia in its efforts to promote democracy;

(2) expresses ongoing support for further democratic reform in Indonesia and the efforts of the Government and the people of Indonesia toward developing good governance;

(3) encourages the Government and the People of Indonesia to continue working to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights, civil liberties, a free press, and a strong civil society in Indonesia; and

(4) encourages the President, the Secretary of State, and other officials of the United States Government to continue assisting the Government of Indonesia in its efforts to promote democracy and ensure the liberty and welfare of the people of Indonesia.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate who has traveled every year to Southeast Asia and met frequently with government leaders from that region when they visited the United States, I believe America has great interests in that region, and that we need to pay more attention here in Washington, DC and across the Nation, to our allies and partners in Southeast Asia.

This region, economically, politically, strategically important, it is our 5th largest in total volume trading partner. Serving as a cornerstone to SE Asia and the lynchpin to its stability, prosperity and security lie in Indonesia.

When I have asked leaders from all over Southeast Asia how they are doing, they always include a reference to Indonesia. Indonesia is the world's largest Muslim country and as a democracy, that makes it the largest Muslim democracy as well.

On the darker side, it is also a key country in what many in the intelligence community, and I agree, is the second front in the war on terror that we confront. It is home to the Islamist terrorist group, Jemah Islamiya, which next to al-Qaeda, is one of the greatest threats to American security and peace in the world.

Indonesian President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono has been executing an ambitious agenda for anticorruption, political and economic reform. He represents Indonesia's best hope for continuing down a path towards stability, prosperity, pluralism, democracy and security. Such a path is not only in our own economic interests, but is also essential to control the terrorist threat and the reach of al-Qaeada and Jemah Islamiah in Southeast Asia.

Since the fall of President Suharto, the Indonesian people have elected three new presidents, impeached one, and experienced several peaceful transfers of power. They have held direct elections of a president. They have amended their constitution in order to

be more democratic and transparent. They have given the judicial branch independent administrative and financial authority. They continue to reform their military in accordance with democratic, civilian-controlled principles.

They have recently provided a battalion to support the UNIFIL forces in Lebanon; and Indonesia was recently cited by Freedom House as Southeast Asia's only truly ''free'' nation.

But despite all the progress being made, we in Congress seem to continue to look for every transgression to put our relationship on hold and move it backwards.

The truth is that as a country, Indonesia has made truly remarkable progress in a very short period of time. As such, they deserve continued support and engagement, not restrictions and retractions.

We should recognize the accomplishments of the Indonesian people and encourage them in their pursuit of a successful transformation to a democratic nation.

This is why I, along with my distinguished colleague Senator INOUYE, am proud to introduce a resolution recognizing Indonesia's accomplishments and the increasingly mutually beneficial relationship between Indonesia and the U.S.

As an archipelago of over 200 million people, if Indonesia were superimposed over the top of the United States, it would span from Florida to Alaska. The size of Indonesia and the fact that they have 17,000 islands at low water, 13,000 at high tide, presents a tremendous challenge in defending its borders and dealing with potential terrorist activities on its distant islands or remote jungles.

The Indonesian armed forces are a necessary partner in this battle. When Jemah Islamiah bombed the Bali nightclub in 2002, killing 202 people, Indonesia's military, policing and intelligence capabilities were in poor condition. Of late however, Indonesia's security forces have ''gained the upper hand,'' according to the Economist, June 16th, 2007 with the capture and arrest of some of Jemah Islamiah's top commanders.

Leadimg the fight against terror is Indonesia's new police unit 88, which was set up with the help of American and Australian Security forces. Among the terrorists captured was Abu Dujana, one of Indonesia's most wanted terrorists. Dujana apparently took over as military leader of JI when their former leader and bomb maker, Azahari Husin, was in 2005 killed and had earned the dubious honor of being named the most wanted terrorist in the country. And over the last 12 months, the Indonesians have captured or killed 47 terrorists, including several key leaders.

The article also went on to say. . . .

No large-scale attacks have taken place since 2005. With the help of their Australian and American counterparts, Indonesia's national police have greatly improved their tracking of militants and have rounded up some of JI's top leaders.

In the recent past, there have been various forms of restrictions on our relations with the Indonesian military in light of terrible abuses that were committed by the TNI in East Timor. However, our reinstatement of military relations and the restoration of International Military Education & Training or IMET, has resulted in continued positive trends.

It is interesting to note that the current President, when he was a military leader, was in the last class of IMET leaders from Indonesia to come to the United States. He, in his own person, demonstrates the appreciation of civilian control. Some in this body and the other body want to impose new restriction to hinder, not help, the productive influence our military can and has had on the TNI.

We must expand and continue to improve our relations with the TNI, not restrict and retract. IMET provides for adherence to the Code of Military Justice, civilian of the military, respect for human rights, and proper treatment of population principles that should be instilled in military forces.

Further, IMET establishes important relationships and alliances among our military leaders and commanders of friendly foreign forces. It assures they understand how to conduct military or relief operations together. and, it keeps the U.S. engaged in a region where China is increasingly, extending its influence. When I visited the North Western province of Ache, right after the Tsunami, the fact that their military had not trained with us caused us great military operational difficulties.

Some in Congress apparently want to reimpose sanctions on IMET participation because of the past and perceived military abuses, but as Walter Lohman, Director of Asian Studies at the Heritage Foundation, has said:

accountability for past human rights abuses and the proper role of the militia are legitimate. But the United States needs to get to a point where it addresses these concerns with the same respect it affords other democratic partners, like the Europeans or the Japanese

Many leaders in that region have told me, privately, they believe U.S. active engagement and association with their countries is essential to stop China from extending hegemony over the region. Whether China is viewed as a threat or an opportunity, they are actively courting their neighbors in SE Asia; They are sending official trade missions, signing trade agreements and investing their large reserves in securing sources of energy and natural resources. Make no mistake about it, they are aggressively building up a military force navy capable of extending beyond the straits of Taiwan.

The opportunities and the challenges related to China seeking to extend its influence over Southeast Asia should concern us both economically and militarily. States of Southeast Asia, notably Indonesia, Singapore, and Malaysia, control the important Malacca Straits; Straits through which one quarter of all the shipping in the world passes and one half of the petroleum products carried by ocean-going vessels pass.

Beyond those interests, it remains my thesis that we should pay attention to Southeast Asia—particularly Indonesia—as the second front in the war on terrorism.

Indondsia represents the best hope for fostering a moderate Islam that recognizes the true peaceful nature of that religion in opposition to the radical terrorist-inspiring versions of Islam.

With Southeast Asia and its large Muslim population, we have an opportunity through constructive forms of engagement; to ensure they become a solid foundation for peace, security and economic prosperity in this critical part of the world. Whether it is more peace corps volunteers, education initiatives, leadership exchanges, IMET or sending Navy ships such as the USS Mercy and USS Peleliu on humanitarian missions to the region.

We can do it without the need for massive military actions such as those we have undertaken in Afghanistan and Iraq to root out the terrorists and in those cases, the governments that harbored them. In other words, more sandals on the ground now, will prevent having to put boots on the ground in future.

I urge my colleagues to support countries like Indonesia in their path towards peace, democracy and pluralism, as opposed to restricting and pushing them towards more radical, terrorist-inspiring versions of Islam.

I ask or behalf of Senator Inouye and myself that the resolution be sent to the desk and ask that it be referred appropriately.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the articles from the June 16th Economist and from Walter Lohman of the Asian Studies Center at the Heritage Foundation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Economist, June 16, 2007]

WOUNDED BUT STILL DANGEROUS

When Jemaah Islamiah (JI), a South-East Asian Islamist group, bombed nightclubs on the Indonesian island of Bali in 2002, killing 202 people, it exposed the poor state of the country's anti-terrorist intelligence and policing. And the attack did not seem to lead to much improvement. The bombers struck again in 2003, at an American-run hotel in Jakarta, and in 2004 at the Australian embassy there. In 2005 they returned to Bali to attack three tourist restaurants. Of late, however, Indonesia's security forces seem to have gained the upper hand over JI.

No large-scale attacks have taken place since 2005. With the help of their Australian and American counterparts, Indonesia's national police have greatly improved their tracking of militants and have rounded up some of JI's top leaders. This culminated on June 13th with confirmation that they had

arrested Abu Dujana, a JI leader whom police had recently begun to describe as their ''most wanted''.

Mr. Dujana is said to have fought in Afghanistan and hobnobbed with Osama bin Laden. He is believed to have taken charge of one of JI's military wings, and control of its weapons and explosives, after the death of the group's chief bombmaker, Azahari Husin, in a shoot-out with police in 2005. It has even been suggested that Mr. Dujana is JI's emir, or paramount leader. Another leading figure, Noordin Muhammad Top, is still on the run. But the capture of Mr. Dujana and several other terrorists in recent days follows the discovery of a huge arsenal of guns and bomb-making materials in March. It marks a ''very significant'' blow against JI, says Sidney Jones, in Jakarta for the International Crisis Group (ICG), a think-tank.

Indonesia's arrests came shortly after Singapore revealed that it was detaining four JI members, arrested between last November and April, and freeing five detained earlier who had ''responded positively to rehabilitation''. However, the Philippines' army admitted last weekend that another JI leader, known as Dulmatin, suspected of involvement in the 2002 Bali bombs, had again escaped its clutches. The army believes he is hiding in the Tawi-Tawi Islands, off Borneo. He and other fugitives in the southern Philippines are suspected of teaching local Islamist militants how to make bombs.

Indonesia's recent policing successes are a tribute to two new units set up after the 2002 bombings. One, which has stayed out of the spotlight, is an intelligence-gathering taskforce. The other, Detachment 88, is a high-profile anti-terrorist squad, trained by American and Australian federal police in making arrests and gathering forensic evidence. Since their formation Indonesia's terror-fighting capabilities have ''come on in leaps and bounds'', says Nigel Inkster, an analyst at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London and until recently the deputy head of the British external-intelligence service, M16. Indonesia's army and its domestic-intelligence agency, BIN, are not much good at anti-terrorism work, says Mr. Inkster, so until the new police units were formed, foreign agencies had no competent Indonesian counterparts.

Despite Detachment 88's successes, Ms. Jones says the unit is too small. When it raids terrorist bases it must rely on help from Brimoh, a poorly trained paramilitary-police unit. In January, for example, the two forces combined to storm a JI hideout on Sulawesi, an Indonesian island plagued by conflict between Muslims and Christians. Fifteen suspected militants and one policeman died. An ICG investigation found that the heavy casualties made local Muslims see extremists as victims. Such incidents are counter-productive, encouraging civilians to shelter JI militants.

Another worry is lenient sentencing by Indonesia's courts. JI's spiritual leader, Abu Bakar Basyir, was let out of jail after serving 26 months of a 30-month sentence for his alleged involvement in the 2002 bombings. The courts later overturned his conviction altogether. The country's prisons, riddled with corruption and incompetence, may serve as recruiting and training centres for JI. Bringing terrorism convicts together in a specially built new jail, as is planned, may simply make the job of JI's ''tutors'' easier.

For all the success in tracking down JI's military leaders, the group's current plans and the extent of its network remain something of a mystery. Unlike many terrorist groups worldwide, JI lacks an overground political wing to elaborate its demands. A study by the ICG last month reckoned the group may still have around 900 members. But the scale of its recruitment in universities and Islamic boarding schools in unclear. There are signs that, as its bomb-planting and fund-raising activities are more successfully curbed, the group is simply turning to cheaper and easier forms of terrorism, such as assassinations.

Along with the arrests and the seizure of weapons in March, Indonesian police found a handwritten diagram showing that JI operatives on Java, Indonesia's most populous island, had been reorganised into a sariyah (possibly meaning ''platoon''), implying that this was part of a new military structure covering South-East Asia. But there have recently been few signs of activity outside the group's Indonesian heartland. Last week a general in Thailand's military-backed government implied that Cambodian Muslims linked to JI were somehow involved in the insurgency in Thailand's mainly Muslim southern provinces. But he backtracked after the Cambodian government furiously denounced his comments.

There has been little recent evidence that JI or, for that matter, al-Qaeda, has a hand in the Thai south's rising violence. But it is just the sort of strife-torn place, full of alienated, angry Muslims, where those seeking to organise jihad find fertile ground. Police have pruned JI's top ranks. But its roots may still be spreading.

[From the Economist, June 16, 2007]

STREET LIFE

Filthy children and fingerless lepers, tapping on car windows and pleading for ''paisa, khana'' (cash, food), hang around every busy traffic junction and market in Delhi. Begging in Delhi is illegal though few are locked up. But if the authorities have their way, it will soon be wiped out, as part of a big clean-up before the capital hosts the Commonwealth Games in 2010.

Plans to obliterate other familiar features of Delhi ahead of the games are controversial. A ban on some 300,000 stalls selling freshly cooked snacks has enraged well-off foodies and the poor alike. Animal-rights activists protested when hundreds of unruly monkeys were rounded up and shut in cages. A new scheme to herd the city's stray cows into a vast dairy complex will doubtless anger many cow-revering Hindus.

A radical plan to corral Delhi's beggars, in contrast, has provoked little reaction. After an order from the High Court that begging be stamped out, a report commissioned by Delhi's Department for Social Welfare recommends that beggars be rounded up by a special police squad and placed in beggar's homes, which resemble jails more than hostels. The report, by academics at the University of Delhi, also wants the public to be educated about the ''evils of alms-giving'', which ''promotes parasites''.

The report entailed the fullest survey ever conducted of Delhi's beggars. It offers revealing insights into their earning potential. Of the 58,570 beggars counted, 5,003 were interviewed in depth. Nearly half the adults earned between 50 and 100 rupees ($1.20–$2.40) a day, not much less than the income of many daily wage labourers. About 3% said they earned 100 to 500 rupees a day.

Tales of high-earning beggars have often been used in India to justify intolerance. But the survey also hints at the underlying injustices. One-third of adult beggars were disabled; 88% said they had no skills; almost all were migrants from other parts of India—mostly the poor northern states of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh—and had taken up begging because they could not find work.

More than one-third were under the age of 18, like Mohammed Alam, a ten-year-old orphan, who left Bihar with his aunt and uncle a month ago. On arriving in Delhi, Mohammed's aunt found a job ironing clothes; the boy, whose polio has left him with a deformed leg and a limp, works a busy traffic intersection for five hours at a stretch, earning between 10 and 20 rupees. The rest of the time he spends at home (''in that park over there''). He has not been to school since he was seven, he says, his small face a complete blank.

[From the Economist, June 16, 2007]

A MUSEUM BOOM

Cities and towns across China are rushing to build museums. These are not the dour edifices of the Mao era that until recent years were the dreary repositories of the nation's historical treasures. Governments, and even some individuals, are lavishing huge sums on vast and exotic new buildings. Sadly, this does not imply a new-found respect for history.

In 1977, a year after Chairman Mao's death, there were only 300-odd museums. Most of them were little more than displays of Communist Party propaganda. Within a decade, say official press reports, the number had grown to nearly 830. By the turn of the century there were more than 2,000 of them. By 2015, officials estimate, there will be around 3,000.

Beijing alone now has at least 131 museums, up from 96 a decade ago. In January the Stalinist-looking National Museum overlooking Tiananmen Square was closed down for a three-year makeover costing $330m. Last year saw the formal opening of the city's new Capital Museum, which cost more than $160m. Shanghai is fast catching up. It plans to have 150 museums by 2010, up from 106.

Local governments, caught up in what the Chinese press call a ''museum fever'', are vying to outdo one other with architectural wonders. Most are paid for out of government budgets. But near the city of Chengdu, in south-western China, a local businessman, Fan Jianchuan, opened a 33-hectare (82-acre) museum complex two years ago. Its exhibits are boldly revisionist, highlighting the contributions made by the Kuomintang, the party's enemy, in the anti-Japanese war of the 1930s and 40s.

Officials worry that the museum boom is getting out of control. The country has a dearth of people qualified to run them. Local governments are often unwilling to subsidise running costs, forcing museums to rely on ticket sales. Prices are often too high for many ordinary townspeople.

The museum fad is a refreshing contrast to the culture-destroying ethos of Mao's rule. But the penchant for vandalism still lurks. This week Qiu Baixing, a deputy minister of construction, said historical architecture and cultural sites were being ''devastated'' by rapid urban construction. He even compared this to the destruction wrought by Mao's Great Leap Forward and Cultural Revolution. The museums may look splendid, but, around them, history is being pulverised.

ADJUSTING TO THE REALITY OF A NEWLY DEMOCRATIC INDONESIA

(By Walter Lohman)

JAKARTA, JUNE 18, 2007—In Washington, inertia often carries the day on even the most anachronistic policy ideas. Congress proved this axiom on June 5 when appropriators in the House of Representatives slashed and conditioned the Administration's request to provide military assistance to Indonesia.

Indonesia today is a large, vibrant democracy and a key piece of the geostrategic puzzle in Asia. It is also among the United

States' most important partners in the War on Terror. Approached wisely, the U.S.-Indonesian relationship embodies a convergence of interests on values, geopolitics, and security that is rare among U.S. relationships in the developing world.

The House Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations has charted a strikingly unwise course. Under the leadership of Representative NITA LOWEY (D–NY), it has covered its collective ears to the history of the last decade and has forged ahead with a policy that ignores reality and the vital American interests at stake in the region.

Military assistance to Indonesia first became a matter of contention in Washington following the Dili Massacre of 1991, in which hundreds of protestors in East Timor were murdered by the armed forces of East Timor's erstwhile ruler, Indonesia. The debate was stoked in 1999 by the scorched earth reaction of Indonesian troops and pro-Indonesia militias to East Timor's overwhelming vote in favor of independence. For good reason, these unconscionable abuses strained relations between the United States and Indonesia.

But since 1999, the world has been turned upside down. An emerging, unstable democracy then, Indonesia is now a flourishing democracy. In October 1999, Indonesia elected a president—albeit indirectly—for the first time in 50 years. Five years later, an astounding 350 million votes were cast in three national elections—including a direct election for president.

The final round of the 2004 presidential election, involving 117 million voters and 77 percent of eligible voters, was the largest single election day in history. Among the many remarkable facets of Indonesia's democracy, the 2004 elections produced 61 women members of the 550-seat lower house and 27 out of 128 in the upper house.

Acknowledging that elections do not necessarily equal democracy, it should also be pointed out that Indonesians have taken to vigorously exercising their civil liberties. There are 16 political parties, hundreds of newspapers and magazines, independent television and radio outlets, and countless web sites commenting on Indonesian politics. Lively political debate reverberates across many forums and media. According to Freedom House, Indonesia is the freest country in Southeast Asia. Symbolic of Indonesia's progress, in 2005, Indonesian President Bambang Susilo Yudhoyono visited the site of the 1991 Dili Massacre to pay his respects. The East Timorese Prime Minister reciprocated by telling his countrymen to ''Forget the past and look to the future.'' Today, Indonesia and East Timor enjoy a close, cooperative relationship due in major part to the effort of former president and independence-hero Xanana Gusmao.

The same week that House appropriators were taking Indonesia to task, in fact, the current president of East Timor, Jose Ramos Horta, was in Jakarta echoing the same sentiment offered by his government in 2005, saying, ''The important thing is we don't allow ourselves to be hostage of the past but look forward with courage.''

Despite its searing, up-close experience in the 1990s, East Timor has come to peace with Indonesia. Yet, its well-meaning supporters in the U.S. Congress seem unable to acknowledge new realities.

STRATEGIC CONCERNS FOR THE UNITED STATES

Two other things have changed since 1999.

First, the meteoric rise of China has made the presence of a strong, U.S.-friendly ASEAN—the association of 10 Southeast Asian nations on China's strategic doorstep—a critical U.S. interest. Indonesia, straddling waters that accommodate half of the world's commercial cargo transit, is an important part of U.S. geopolitical calculations in its own right. But, as a nation of 235 million people and 17,000 islands, it is also ASEAN's indispensable power.

Every day, China becomes a more effective competitor for the region's interests. Particularly since 2002, its focus in Southeast Asia has shifted from its territorial claims in the South China Sea to lavishing the region with diplomatic attention. Without due vigilance, commitment, and wise policy choices, the time is not far off when the U.S. role as guarantor of regional security and stability will be up for grabs. The United States needs friends in the region; and Indonesia, by wholeheartedly embracing universal democratic ideals, has made being friends as easy as any nation in the world.

Second, the United States is six years into waging the good fight on global terrorism. Indonesia and the U.S. share fundamental interests in this war. Indonesians themselves have been victims of terrorism. Terrorists have directed major acts of violence against the country's tourism industry and foreign communities, killing many innocent foreigners as well as Indonesians.

For many years, the terrorists have sought to inflame sectarian divisions in the same way that al-Qaeda has done so effectively elsewhere in the world. Terrorists have also sought to establish training beachheads in Indonesia's far-flung territories. But the terrorists in Indonesia are losing: There have been no major acts of terrorism in Indonesia since October 2005. Moderation is in the DNA of Indonesia's national character. Certainly, there is a battle going on for Indonesia's soul, as is being waged in much of the Muslim world.

But in Indonesia, the extremists are faced with an extraordinarily resilient foe in Indonesia's famously syncretic, diverse, and tolerant culture. Congress can help strengthen the Indonesian government's hand through assistance and partnership, or it can hamper it by caveating its assistance. Indonesia will fight the war against terror without the United States; but American cooperation certainly improves its prospects. It is in the national interest for the United States to be there for its natural partners.

None of this is to suggest that the United States does not have differences with Indonesia. Indeed, Representative Lowey's concerns about accountability for past human rights abuses and the proper role of the military are legitimate. But the United States needs to get to a point where it addresses these concerns with the same respect it affords other democratic partners, like the Europeans or the Japanese.

Limiting and legally conditioning military-to-military relations is not the best way to address differences; it is a page from the past. The recent action by House appropriators is counterproductive and damaging to vital American interests in Asia.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senator BOND in submitting a resolution, which recognizes the mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and the Republic of Indonesia.

Indonesia is the world's fourth most populous country, the third largest democracy, and the most populous Muslim nation. It possesses extensive natural resources, and a considerable amount of trade passes through the straits of Malacca. Without question, Indonesia is a valuable partner to the United States in the global war on terror.

Indonesia has made great strides in continuing to democratize and develop its civil society as well as rule of law, particularly under the leadership of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. This resolution acknowledges many of the Government's positive reforms and encourages the Republic of Indonesia to continue its commitment to human rights, democratic principles, and good governance.

Mr. President, it is my hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing this very important nation in Southeast Asia.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF OBSERVING THE NATIONAL DAY OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS ON JANUARY 11 OF EACH YEAR TO RAISE AWARENESS OF AND OPPOSITION TO HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. OBAMA, and Mr. LUGAR) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON RES. 40

Whereas the United States has a tradition of advancing fundamental human rights;

Whereas because the people of the United States remain committed to protecting individual freedom, there is a national imperative to eliminate human trafficking, including early or forced marriage, commercial sexual exploitation, forced labor, labor obtained through debt bondage, involuntary servitude, slavery, and slavery by descent;

Whereas to combat human trafficking in the United States and globally, the people of the United States and the Federal Government, including local and State governments, must be aware of the realities of human trafficking and must be dedicated to stopping this contemporary manifestation of slavery;

Whereas beyond all differences of race, creed, or political persuasion, the people of the United States face national threats together and refuse to let human trafficking exist in the United States and around the world;

Whereas the United States should actively oppose all individuals, groups, organizations, and nations who support, advance, or commit acts of human trafficking;

Whereas the United States must also work to end human trafficking around the world through education;

Whereas victims of human trafficking need support in order to escape and to recover from the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual trauma associated with their victimization;

Whereas human traffickers use many physical and psychological techniques to control their victims, including the use of violence or threats of violence against the victim or the victim's family, isolation from the public, isolation from the victim's family and religious or ethnic communities, language and cultural barriers, shame, control of the victim's possessions, confiscation of passports and other identification documents, and threats of arrest, deportation, or imprisonment if the victim attempts to reach out for assistance or to leave;

Whereas although laws to prosecute perpetrators of human trafficking and to assist

and protect victims of human trafficking have been enacted in the United States, awareness of the issues surrounding human trafficking by those people most likely to come into contact with victims is essential for effective enforcement because the techniques that traffickers use to keep their victims enslaved severely limit self-reporting; and

Whereas the effort by individuals, businesses, organizations, and governing bodies to promote the observance of the National Day of Human Trafficking Awareness on January 11 of each year represents one of the many examples of the ongoing commitment in the United States to raise awareness of and to actively oppose human trafficking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress supports the goals and ideals of observing the National Day of Human Trafficking Awareness on January 11 of each year and all other efforts to raise awareness of and opposition to human trafficking.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1867. Mr. REID (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 6, to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the production of clean renewable fuels, to protect consumers from price gouging, to increase the energy efficiency of products, buildings, and vehicles, to promote research on and deploy greenhouse gas capture and storage options, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

SA 1868. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1639, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1869. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1639, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1870. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1639, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1867. Mr. REID (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 6, to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the production of clean renewable fuels, to protect consumers from price gouging, to increase the energy efficiency of products, buildings, and vehicles, to promote research on and deploy greenhouse gas capture and storage options, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the production of clean renewable fuels, to protect consumers from price gouging, to increase the energy efficiency of products, buildings, and vehicles, to promote research on and deploy greenhouse gas capture and storage options, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.''.

SA 1868. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1639, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ELIGIBILITY OF AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY WORKERS FOR CERTAIN LEGAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 305 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note; Public Law 99–603) is amended—

(1) by striking ''section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a))'' and inserting ''subparagraph (H)(ii)(a) or subparagraph (Y) of section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15))''; and

(2) by inserting ''or forestry'' after ''agricultural''.

SA 1869. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1639, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VI, insert the following:

SEC. 6___. MANDATORY DISCLOSURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An alien may not be granted Z nonimmigrant status under this title unless the alien fully discloses to the Secretary all the names and Social Security account numbers that the alien has ever used to obtain employment in the United States.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a Z nonimmigrant has not complied with the requirement under subsection (a), the Secretary shall revoke the alien's Z nonimmigrant status.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF RIGHTFUL ASSIGNEES.—The Secretary may disclose information received from aliens pursuant to a disclosure under subsection (a) to any Federal or State agency authorized to collect such information to enable such agency to notify each named individual or rightful assignee of the Social Security account number of the alien's misuse of such name or number to obtain employment.

SA 1870. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1639, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 672, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. 704A. LOSS OF NATIONALITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 349(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1481(a)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) entering, or serving in, the armed forces of a foreign state if—

''(A) such armed forces are engaged in, or attempt to engage in, hostilities or acts of terrorism against the United States; or

''(B) such person is serving or has served as a general officer in the armed forces of a foreign state; or''.

(b) SPECIAL RULE AND DEFINITIONS.—Such section 349 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(c) SPECIAL RULE.—Any person described in subsection (a), who commits an act described in such subsection, shall be presumed to have committed such act with the intention of relinquishing United States nationality, unless such presumption is overcome by a preponderance of evidence.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ARMED FORCES OF A FOREIGN STATE.—The term 'armed forces of a foreign state' includes any armed band, militia, organized force, or other group that is engaged in, or attempts to engage in, hostilities against the United States or terrorism.

''(2) FOREIGN STATE.—The term 'foreign state' includes any group or organization (including any recognized or unrecognized quasi-government entity) that is engaged in, or attempts to engage in, hostilities against the United States or terrorism.

''(3) HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.—The term 'hostilities against the United States' means the enticing, preparation, or encouragement of armed conflict against United States citizens or businesses or a facility of the United States Government.

''(4) TERRORISM.—The term 'terrorism' has the meaning given that term in section 2(15) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101(15))''.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—NOMINATIONS DISCHARGED

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session and the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of the following: Lorne W. Craner, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation; Alan J. Patricof, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation; Dell Dailey, to be Coordinator for Counterrorism with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large; Reuben Jeffery III, to be Under Secretary of State; that they and the nominations on the Executive Calendar, Nos. 155 through 160, be considered and agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

Lorne W. Craner, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of three years.

Alan J. Patricof, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of three years.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dell L. Dailey, of South Dakota, to be Coordinator for Counterterrorism, with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large.

Reuben Jeffery III, of the District of Columbia, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic, Energy, and Agricultural Affairs).

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

Marylyn Andrea Howe, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2008,

Lonnie C. Moore, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2008.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Kerri Layne Briggs, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Jerome F. Kever, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2008.

Michael Schwartz, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2012.

Virgil M. Speakman, Jr., of Ohio, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2009.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate returns to legislative session.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RUTH BELL GRAHAM

CONDEMNING THE MILITARY JUNTA IN BURMA

HONORING THE FIREFIGHTERS IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed en bloc to the consideration of three resolutions submitted earlier today, S. Res. 249, S. Res. 250, and S. Res. 251, that the resolutions be considered and agreed to en bloc, the preambles be agreed to en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table en bloc, the consideration of these items appear separately in the RECORD, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

The resolutions, with their preambles, read as follows:

S. RES. 249

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham was born on June 10, 1920 in Qingjiang, China, the daughter of Presbyterian medical missionaries;

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham returned to the United States to attend Wheaton College, where she met and fell in love with her future husband, Billy Graham, who would become one of the most acclaimed evangelists in the world;

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham married Billy Graham on August 13, 1943 at Montreat Presbyterian Church in her beloved Western North Carolina;

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham was the devoted mother of five children (Virginia, Anne, Ruth, Franklin, and Nelson Edman) and the grandmother of 19 grandchildren;

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham was a renowned author and poet who penned 14 books that have moved and inspired people around the globe;

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham and Billy Graham were recognized with the Congressional Gold Medal in 1996 for their ''outstanding and lasting contributions to morality, racial equality, family, philanthropy, and religion''; and

Whereas Ruth Bell Graham touched countless lives worldwide by sharing her tremendous faith, her deep compassion for the less fortunate, her great talents and her lighthearted wit.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the life, work, and legacy of Ruth Bell Graham, a loyal companion who shined with grace and courage beside her husband Billy Graham, and a dedicated mother who fostered individuality and humility in her five children.

S. RES. 250

Whereas Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi has dedicated her life to the peaceful, non-violent movement for democracy and reconciliation in the Union of Burma;

Whereas Aung San Suu Kyi and the National League for Democracy won a majority of parliamentary seats in Burma's last election held in 1990;

Whereas the State Peace and Development Council of Burma refuses to cede power and permit representative government and has detained Aung San Suu Kyi under house arrest for 11 of the last 17 years;

Whereas the ruling military junta has committed numerous, well-documented atrocities against the people of Burma;

Whereas Aung San Suu Kyi continues to promote peaceful dialogue and reconciliation despite mistreatment from the State Peace and Development Council;

Whereas the United States recognizes and supports the dedication and commitment to freedom demonstrated by Aung San Suu Kyi: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi for her courage and devotion to the people of the Union of Burma and their struggle for democracy; and

(2) calls for the immediate release of Aung San Suu Kyi and other political prisoners by the State Peace and Development Council.

S. RES. 251

Whereas at approximately 7:00 p.m. on June 18, 2007, a tragic fire started at the Sofa Super Store in Charleston, South Carolina;

Whereas despite the flames that engulfed the building, the brave men and women of the Charleston Fire Department (Department) fulfilled their duty by rushing inside as others fled for their lives;

Whereas the fire quickly grew out of control and trapped 2 store employees inside;

Whereas the firefighters attempted to punch through the building walls in a selfless effort to save the lives of these employees;

Whereas the roof of the building collapsed, trapping the firefighters inside;

Whereas Captain William ''Billy'' Hutchinson, a 30-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Captain Mike Benke, a 20-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Captain Louis Mulkey, an 11-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Engineer Mark Kelsey, a 12-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Engineer Bradford ''Brad'' Baity, a 9-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Assistant Engineer Michael French, a 1½-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Fire Fighter James ''Earl'' Drayton, a 32-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Fire Fighter Brandon Thompson, a 4-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Fire Fighter Melven Champaign, a 2-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas the extraordinary courage and sacrifice of these firefighters reflects the spirit of South Carolina, as well as the spirit of our great Nation;

Whereas the United States has not experienced such a devastating loss of firefighters since the horrific events on September 11, 2001; and

Whereas a grateful Nation mourns the loss of these heroes and vows that their sacrifices were not made in vain: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors William ''Billy'' Hutchinson, Mike Benke, Louis Mulkey, Mark Kelsey, Bradford ''Brad'' Baity, Michael French, James ''Earl'' Drayton, Brandon Thompson, and Melven Champaign, who lost their lives in the course of their duty as firefighters, and recognizes them for their bravery and sacrifice;

(2) extends its deepest sympathy to the families of these 9 brave heroes;

(3) honors all the firefighters and other public servants who contributed to battling the fire; and

(4) pledges to continue to support and to work on behalf of the firefighters who risk their lives each day to ensure the safety of all Americans.

NATIONAL DAY OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of a concurrent resolution submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) supporting the goals and ideals of observing the National Day of Human Trafficking Awareness on January 11 of each year to raise awareness of and opposition to human trafficking.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that any statements in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 40

Whereas the United States has a tradition of advancing fundamental human rights;

Whereas because the people of the United States remain committed to protecting individual freedom, there is a national imperative to eliminate human trafficking, including early or forced marriage, commercial sexual exploitation, forced labor, labor obtained through debt bondage, involuntary servitude, slavery, and slavery by descent;

Whereas to combat human trafficking in the United States and globally, the people of the United States and the Federal Government, including local and State governments, must be aware of the realities of human trafficking and must be dedicated to stopping this contemporary manifestation of slavery;

Whereas beyond all differences of race, creed, or political persuasion, the people of the United States face national threats together and refuse to let human trafficking

exist in the United States and around the world;

Whereas the United States should actively oppose all individuals, groups, organizations, and nations who support, advance, or commit acts of human trafficking;

Whereas the United States must also work to end human trafficking around the world through education;

Whereas victims of human trafficking need support in order to escape and to recover from the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual trauma associated with their victimization;

Whereas human traffickers use many physical and psychological techniques to control their victims, including the use of violence or threats of violence against the victim or the victim's family, isolation from the public, isolation from the victim's family and religious or ethnic communities, language and cultural barriers, shame, control of the victim's possessions, confiscation of passports and other identification documents, and threats of arrest, deportation, or imprisonment if the victim attempts to reach out for assistance or to leave;

Whereas although laws to prosecute perpetrators of human trafficking and to assist and protect victims of human trafficking have been enacted in the United States, awareness of the issues surrounding human trafficking by those people most likely to come into contact with victims is essential for effective enforcement because the techniques that traffickers use to keep their victims enslaved severely limit self-reporting; and

Whereas the effort by individuals, businesses, organizations, and governing bodies to promote the observance of the National Day of Human Trafficking Awareness on January 11 of each year represents one of the many examples of the ongoing commitment in the United States to raise awareness of and to actively oppose human trafficking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress supports the goals and ideals of observing the National Day of Human Trafficking Awareness on January 11 of each year and all other efforts to raise awareness of and opposition to human trafficking.

ROOSEVELT CAMPOBELLO INTERNATIONAL PARK COMMISSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 209, S. 1099.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1099) to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to make individuals employed by the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission eligible to obtain Federal health insurance.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1099) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1099

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

SECTION 1. HEALTH INSURANCE.

Section 8901(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (I), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by inserting before the matter following subparagraph (I) the following:

''(J) an individual who is employed by the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission and is a citizen of the United States,''.

THANKING STAFF

Mr. REID. This morning, I talked about the Energy bill and the work of Democrats and Republicans to get it passed. I failed—and I apologize—to mention two of the most important people for getting that passed, two staff members.

Chris Miller, who works in my office, is such a wonderful, hard-working public servant. Chris is originally from Detroit. He has worked in Congress for 20 years, 18 years with the Senate. He worked for Senator JEFFORDS and for me on the Environment and Public Works Committee. His work ethic is unsurpassed. He has become a resource for the entire Senate, Democrats and Republicans. During the Energy bill, staff members came to him and some Members themselves came to him, asked where we were. He gave them information as to where we were, where we were going. Chris has a master's degree from the University of Michigan. That is in natural resource management. He has a bachelor's also from the same institution in political science. I told him personally last night, after the bill passed, how much I appreciated his hard work. I want the record spread with the fact that he is an exemplary employee.

I also want to talk about someone I have worked with over the years because he has been in the Senate for a long time, and that is Bob Simon. Bob has a Ph.D. in inorganic chemistry from MIT in 1982. He is a person with a wide range of knowledge. Before coming to the Senate about 14 years ago or so, he worked at the Department of Energy and the National Research Council for the National Academies of Science and Engineering. He has served in a variety of science- and technology-related positions in the Senate since 1993. He became a staff director for the overall committee the month the Democrats won the majority. He works very well with Senator DOMENICI, the ranking member and until recently the chairman of that committee.

He is really a good person, works so hard—another example of people we have here on Capitol Hill who are here because they believe in public service. That is why he is here. He is a person who works extremely hard, and his work on this bill was instrumental to its passage.

I ask if the distinguished Republican leader has anything to say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader. Let me just make the point that we have recently adopted S. Res. 250, which condemns the military junta in Burma and calls for the immediate and unconditional release of Aung San Suu Kyi. The State Peace and Development Council, which rules Burma, is a truly outrageous, pariah regime that deserves universal condemnation. I only wish there were more countries that would join us in publicly criticizing the regime and in taking action to help bring about positive change in this troubled nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2007

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 1 p.m., Monday, June 25; that on Monday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 800, with the time until 7 p.m. for debate with respect to the motion, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators KENNEDY and ENZI or their designees; that at 7 p.m. Senator SESSIONS be recognized to speak for up to 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2007, at 1 P.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:16 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 25, 2007, at 1 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Friday, June 22, 2007:

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

MARYLYN ANDREA HOWE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2008.

LONNIE C. MOORE, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2008.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

KERRI LAYNE BRIGGS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

JEROME F. KEVER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 28, 2008.

MICHAEL SCHWARTZ, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 28, 2012.

VIRGIL M. SPEAKMAN, JR., OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 28, 2009.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DELL L. DAILEY, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE COORDINATOR FOR COUNTERTERRORISM, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR AT LARGE.

REUBEN JEFFERY III, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (ECONOMIC, ENERGY, AND AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS).

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

LORNE W. CRANER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS.

ALAN J. PATRICOF, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes:

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hinchey-Wolf amendment. My constituents need electricity in their homes, their businesses and their communities. This amendment will deprive my constituents and the people of Pennsylvania of low-cost energy.

In 2005, the Republican-led Congress passed the bipartisan Energy Policy Act, 275–156. In section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act, the Department of Energy was required to identify and report a National Transmission Congestion and Constraint Study.

The study identified two areas as inadequate: the Mid-Atlantic region, which encompasses my district, and the southwest-southern California region. With no coincidence, in 2002 these same areas were identified as problem areas. They were identified in two separate studies, 5 years apart, because there is an overwhelming need to build the infrastructure to supply the increasing demand for energy. The lack of necessary infrastructure in these areas imposes billions of dollars on consumers annually and leaves the citizens of the country vulnerable to rolling blackouts.

On April 26, 2007, the Department of Energy issued two draft versions for transmission corridors, one traversing my home State and its neighboring regions and the other in southern California. The public comment period remains open for written submissions until July 6. In addition, the Energy Policy Act requires studies every 3 years.

This amendment would require a needless, burdensome study, which in effect, would study two previous and congruent studies. At best, with this amendment, we are questioning whether or not to repeal sections of a successful, bipartisan bill, extensively debated and enacted less than 2 years ago, when the process so clearly works, the need is clearly there and the effects of inaction are so clearly dire. Let's allow the process to work. Let us have faith in our positive work in the Energy Policy Act.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL L. PULTE

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael L. Pulte for his years of service to community and country.

That exemplary record began when he served as a member of the armed services from 1955 to 1957, with particular duties in Fort Knox and in Germany.

After his military service, he joined Hudson's Department Store and opened the second department store branch in the country. Following, his time at Hudson's, Mr. Pulte was employed by O'Neill's in Akron, Ohio and then Horne's Department Store. Rising through the ranks at Horne's, he eventually was appointed Director of Stores in 1977, Vice President of Operations in 1980, and, in January of 1991, President, Chairman, and CEO of Joseph Horne Company.

During his presidency, Mr. Pulte served as member and president of the Golden Triangle Association, a member of the Board of Directors of the Civic Light Opera, and a member of the Board of Directors of the Cultural District. He is also a member of the Duquesne Club. In June of 1994, Mr. Pulte retired.

During his retirement, he became active in local politics and was appointed Vice Chair of the Pine Township Planning Commission, Vice Chair of the Township Police Board, and was elected to the Township Board of Supervisors.

In addition to this community involvement, he served on the Board of Directors of the U.S. Leather Co. in Milwaukee and taught classes at IUP Business School.

Mr. Pulte currently resides in Naples, FL and continues to remain active in the community of Island Walk, where he has served on a number of committees and is past chairman of finance for the Homeowner's Association.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in honoring Mr. Michael L. Pulte for his many years of success within the business community and for his outstanding contributions to the quality of life of the communities in which he has lived and worked.

IN SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 2764 and want to convey my appreciation to Chairwoman LOWEY for the inclusion of international family planning provisions in the State-Foreign Ops FY08 Appropriations bill. In total, H.R. 2764 allocates $441 million for such programs, which represents an increase of $116 million above the President's request. This increase is designed to ease restrictions on access to contraceptives and family planning information that is crucial to help women and men throughout the developing world make informed decisions on their reproductive health needs.

Since 1984, U.S. international family planning assistance has been stymied by the Mexico City Policy or the ''Global Gag rule.'' The Mexico City Policy prevents any U.S. funding for reproductive health from going towards family planning organizations that provide abortions. H.R. 2764 and the Lowey amendment allows non-governmental organizations to receive U.S. donated contraceptives—not funds—for distribution to millions of people in need of these products. The bill does nothing to alter or weaken the ten provisions in the bill that ban federal funds for abortion overseas. Providing contraceptives to men and women in the developing world helps prevent abortions and unwanted pregnancy as well as sexually transmitted diseases like HIV/AIDS. I urge my colleagues to support a saner foreign assistance package that allows for families throughout the world that are in desperate need of contraception the ability to make important, personal decisions about their families and reproductive health.

TRIBUTE TO 1ST BATTALION, 11TH MARINES

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute a group of individuals whose dedication and sacrifice for our country are exceptional. On Saturday, June 23, 2007, the City of San Juan Capistrano, located in my congressional district, will host a pre-deployment send-off for its adopted Mines and their families. I regret I will not be able to attend the event to shake the hands of these outstanding men and women as they deploy to Iraq.

The 1st Battalion, 11th Marines have existed since World War I and have participated in every U.S. conflict since. Their mission is to provide continuous, all-weather, close artillery support to infantry and armor forces conducting combat operations.

Military service is not easy but it is necessary. These Marines have chosen a profession that demands sacrifice and they go forth willingly to serve a greater purpose. In the months ahead, the battalion will be facing challenging and dangerous missions. My thoughts and prayers are with each of them as they embark on their deployment and also with their families who have a different burden to bear in their absence. I look forward to the day when I can welcome home each member of the 1st Battalion, 11th Marines and witness the happy reunions of families separated for too long.

TRIBUTE TO WARREN LODGE NO. 310 OF COLLEGEVILLE, PA

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a local Mason's Lodge, the Warren Lodge No. 310 located in Collegeville, PA, for its 150th anniversary this Saturday, June 23, 2007. Dr. J. Warren Royer, a well-respected doctor who was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, founded the Warren Lodge in 1857. Since its inception, the Warren Lodge has held a position of distinction in American Freemasonry. Most recently, one of Warren Lodge's officers, Mr. Marvin A. Cunningham, Sr., was elected to the highest position in Freemasonry, that of Right Worshipful Grand Master of Pennsylvania from 2002–2003. Throughout his term, he helped fellow Masonic Villages improve their organizations and uphold the traditions and customs of the Freemasons, including those located in Elizabethtown, Lafayette Hill and Sewickley, PA. He also supervised the restoration of the historic Memorial Arch located at Valley Forge National Park.

The Warren Lodge continues to maintain an impressive facility called the R.W.G.M. Marvin A. Cunningham, Sr. Museum. One of the many treasures on display is an exact replica of the 1752 Philip Syng Inkstand, the original of which is currently on display at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. Philip Syng was the R.W.G.M. of Pennsylvania in 1743, and it was his inkstand that was used by the signers of the Declaration of Independence. In addition, George Washington called for its use once again when the U.S. Constitution was signed in Philadelphia.

At this year's anniversary celebration, the Warren Lodge's special guest of honor will be the current Right Worshipful Grand Master of Pennsylvania, Mr. Ronald A. Aungst, Sr. The members and officers of Warren Lodge will present to Mr. Aungst, Sr. an exact replica of the Syng Inkstand, honoring his exemplary service and dedication to upholding the ancient tradition of Masons helping Masons daily.

Madam Speaker, I am sure my fellow Members join me today in congratulating the Warren Lodge, No. 310 for this historic milestone and wish them 150 more years of honorable service to their lodge and community. Thank you.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes:

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fiscal Year 2008 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, through which this Congress and this government speak to the world about our international priorities.

The past decade has seen this nation pull into a shell like a turtle, something the rest of the world took as not caring about the fundamental challenges elsewhere in the world . . . before those challenges became full-fledged hot spots. We are a great Nation, a leader among nations. We must only act in that fashion. Today, we begin a new direction in foreign policy.

While this Foreign Operations bill deals specifically with our global footprint, it also has benefit for those that live near international borders. For instance, I am pleased the bill includes $15.5 million for the Rio Grande Flood Control System Rehabilitation, a matter my border colleagues and I have been working on for several years.

These funds will allow the International Boundary and Water Commission to begin repairing and restoring the 270 miles of levees along the Rio Grande River. This is only a first step to fully restore the integrity of the levees, the cost for restoration is estimated at $125 million. These funds were requested by the South Texas Delegation, including Congressman HINOJOSA and Congressman CUELLAR.

Over the last few years, budget limitations have not allowed the IBWC to properly maintain the levees. Used by Border Patrol to patrol the border and farmers to manage their land, the levees have severely deteriorated to the point that some areas are flat. In their current form, the IBWC is unable to certify the levees meaning the 1.3 million residents along this area are in danger of severe flooding. Hurricane Katrina showed us the awesome and dangerous power of Mother Nature. This funding is critical to prevent an international flooding disaster . . . a disaster that will remain possible until all the levees are repaired so IBWC can certify them. This is—quite literally—the least we can do to begin to fix this damage.

I thank the appropriators for including this funding and their recognition of the danger that is as far away as a powerful flooding event. I urge the House negotiators to keep this amount of funding included in this bill through conference.

IN MEMORY OF ANDREW GOODMAN, JAMES CHANEY AND MICHAEL SCHWERNER

HON. ROBERT WEXLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. WEXLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today before the House to honor the memory of 3 young men: Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Michael Schwerner. Forty-three years ago, today, these young men paid the ultimate price when they were ruthlessly murdered by those who wished to silence their outcry for equality.

On June 21, 1964, in Neshoba County, Mississippi, Goodman, Chaney and Schwerner were pulled over and subsequently arrested for allegedly speeding. After being denied their basic rights as prisoners, they were fined $20 and released. But Mississippi in 1964 was a dangerous place for civil rights workers; they were followed and assaulted by a group of Ku Klux Klan members. The young activists were never seen alive again.

The summer of 1964 became known as Freedom Summer. Students from around the country were united in a single vital struggle against racial inequality. Over 1,000 young volunteers traveled to Mississippi that summer with the intention of registering African American voters. They defied the local authorities, who were determined to undermine their efforts and succeeded in establishing dozens of quality summer schools and registering thousands of voters.

These volunteers came for various reasons. Some, like Schwerner and Goodman, came to Mississippi from the North to express their commitment to social justice. Others, like Chaney, volunteered because they were dedicated to the improvement of their own community. However, the unlikely trio of 2 New York Jews and an African American from the South were united in their unwavering devotion to ensure civil rights for all.

Even today, we must continue in the struggle for universal civil rights, as our society is not yet free from bigotry and injustice. The terrible murders of Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Michael Schwerner acted as sparks that further ignited the passion of everyday Americans to take a public stand against prejudice. As we remember these heroes of the civil rights movement, we must also aspire to emulate their tireless commitment to fairness and equality.

Madam Speaker, I hope Americans today will remember the sacrifices of these 3 young men to underscore our commitment to the continuing efforts towards achieving the full potential of our great Nation.

THE EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE ACT OF 2007

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak about the Education for Public Service Act of 2007, which I introduced earlier this week. In short, the Education for Public Service Act would make it easier for college graduates and those with advanced degrees to choose careers in government or non-profit enterprise. It will give those young people who attend higher education aspiring to become teachers, first responders, law enforcement officers, nurses, and civil servants a real chance to realize their dreams.

The rising cost of higher education has led to greater and greater student debt that in turn has become an impediment for many young people who would otherwise choose a career in service. Physicians who might choose to work in community health centers or individuals who want to inspire our Nation's youth as teachers are unable to follow their passion as a result of staggering debt. Our best and brightest are increasingly driven by this debt to choose entry-level positions based on salaries that will enable them to repay loans. Career choices should not be made this way.

In my home State of Maryland, the average starting salary for teachers is $36,000; nationally, the average starting salary is $30,377.

According to CRS, the average cost of tuition, other fees, and room and board at a public 4-year university exceeds $48,000. At a private university that figure climbs to almost $120,000. Predictably, fewer graduates are entering the teaching profession. In fact, more than 50 percent of teacher education program graduates never even enter the teaching profession. More than 50 percent of new teachers leave the profession within their first 5 years in the field. We are also facing a crisis of human capital in the Federal workforce. Approximately half of the Federal workforce is eligible for retirement or early retirement. Federal agencies like the Social Security Administration and Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services are bracing for serious worker shortages resulting from attrition. Madam Speaker, these are such important jobs and yet we have done very little to replenish these ranks. Clearly more can be done to provide sufficient incentives to young workers—the next generation of public servants—to join the civil service. But we ought to start by removing the barriers that affirmatively preclude young people from joining.

In 1993, Congress created the income-contingent repayment option to help individuals earning lower salaries deal with the burden of student loans. Under this plan, borrowers' repayment obligations are capped at a percentage of their annual income and any remaining principal is forgiven at the end of 25 years. But because 25 years of repayment seems so daunting to an individual just finishing college, this initiative has not resolved the underlying problem. The Education for Public Service Act of 2007 would modify the current income-contingent repayment program to provide loan forgiveness after 10 years rather than 25 years, so long as the borrower has worked for a government agency or a charitable or tax-exempt organization during the repayment period.

Madam Speaker, the Education for Public Service Act of 2007 will help ensure that service to one's Nation and community will no longer be out of reach for our next generation. In closing, I would like to acknowledge the leadership of Congressman GEORGE MILLER whom I have worked with in developing this legislation. Chairman MILLER has led the Education and Labor Committee with a focus on American families and American students and I am very pleased that he has included the Education for Public Service Act as part of his College Cost Reduction Act of 2007, which will increase support for students and families with no new costs to taxpayers. If we enact this legislation, idealistic students will be able to attend our institutions of higher learning knowing that they will be able to realize their dreams.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 406 and the far reaching achievements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, also known as the Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act. There is no question that women in this country have come a long way in the past 35 years, and there is little doubt that much of that progress is a result of title IX.

Prior to the passage of title IX, it was commonplace for colleges and universities to refuse admission to women simply on the basis of their gender. Of the handful of female college professors, most taught at all-female colleges, received salaries lower than their male counterparts, and very few were ever awarded tenure. Back then, schools could deny women training in fields deemed ''inappropriate'' such as woodworking or automotive repair, and girls ere discouraged from studying math and science. Only 1 in 27 girls played high school sports, and female college athletes received only 2 percent of overall athletic budgets.

This landmark legislation, passed in 1972, prohibits gender-based discrimination in federally funded education programs and activities. Its effects have been felt far beyond the classroom and athletic field.

Today, women earn undergraduate and graduate degrees at much higher rates, even comprising a majority of undergraduate and graduate school enrollment. Women can no longer be denied access to the vocational courses of their choice, and girls now take upper-level math and science classes at the same rate as boys. Additionally, female participation in intercollegiate athletics has increased by 400 percent over the past 30 years. In high school athletics, female participation has increased by 800 percent.

Title IX's passage has allowed girls and women to see no boundaries to their potential. Today, they can look around and see female doctors, lawyers, astronauts, CEOs of Fortune 500 companies, Nobel laureates and NASCAR drivers. They even have a female Speaker of this House to serve as their role model. Title IX has led to the advancement of women in countless areas of our society. However, the work of title IX is not yet complete.

Still today, women, on average, earn only 75 cents for every $1 a man earns. Even more, women continue to lag behind men in earning doctoral and professional degrees. In academia, women earn less, hold lower ranking positions and are less likely to be awarded tenure than men. Despite comprising over 50 percent of the student population, women make up only 42 percent of high school and college varsity athletes, and male athletes receive $137 million more than female athletes in college athletic scholarships. That does not even take into account the barriers that title IX does not address. Negative stereotypes, subtle discrimination, and workplace practices that indirectly adversely affect women are still pervasive in our society.

Mr. Speaker, even in this great body, which is supposed to be representative of the American people, only 17 percent of our Members are female. Therefore, while we celebrate title IX's accomplishments over the last 35 years, it is necessary to remember that the struggle for gender equity continues.

I proudly commend Congresswoman HIRONO for introducing this resolution which celebrates the far reaching accomplishments of title IX. I look forward to the day that all Americans are able to achieve their promise regardless of their gender.

ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE WAR ON TERROR

HON. PATRICK J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the continued need for accountability in the war on terror. I support the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, but must register my concerns about the money we pledge to send to Pakistan.

Clear rules and accountability are vital to winning the war on terror. Just as we attach benchmarks and set goals for the money the United States sends to Iraq and Afghanistan, we must do the same for Pakistan—especially if Pakistan is to continue as a true partner in this fight.

While Iraq continues to smolder, Osama bin Laden—the murderer of more than 3,000 innocent Americans is still at large. President Bush said at a press conference 5 years ago, that he ''didn't spend much time on him.''

Recently, when asked why bin Laden hadn't been brought to justice yet he said: ''Why is he still at large? Because we haven't got him yet . . . That's why. And he's hiding, and we're looking, and we will continue to look until we bring him to justice.''

This is not good enough.

Meanwhile, the Taliban is resurgent in Afghanistan and American commanders on the ground are asking for more troops to fight terror, hunt down al Qaeda and kill Osama bin Laden.

Madam Speaker, we need to win the war on terror—and that means hunting down bin Laden and al Qaeda wherever they are. That means—above all else—success in Afghanistan.

Our troops over there are doing an amazing job and they deserve our continued support. It is getting harder for them, especially along the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan—and in some of the areas where we believe bin Laden is still at large.

I have always said that we needed to be tough and smart in fighting the war on terror. That means asking tough questions—even of our friends. One question that needs to be asked—especially as we prepare to send them $300 million dollars—is about Pakistan's President Musharraf.

Right now we can count President Musharraf as an ally but is he doing all he can

to hunt bin Laden? We cannot afford to let a mass murderer slip through our fingers again.

The U.S. has sent $5.6 billion in military reimbursements to Pakistan for counterterrorism efforts—this is $80 million a month. We are about to vote to send them even more.

In the early days of the war in Afghanistan, President Bush decided to out-source the hunt for bin Laden in Tora Bora. Now we need to examine—are we relying too much on Pakistan and their accord with tribal warlords near the Afghan border for the same reason?

Why do we, the United States of America, continue to send roughly $1 billion per year to Pakistan if they are going to slash patrols through the area where al Qaeda and Taliban fighters are most active?

Why, as Senator REED has said, are we reimbursing Pakistan for their efforts instead of, ''paying for specific objectives?''

Is it true, as two American analysts and one American soldier reported—that Pakistani security forces fired in direct support of Taliban ground attacks on Afghan Army posts?

Families in the 8th District of Pennsylvania voted me here to ask tough questions and demand accountability.

I hope over the coming weeks and months this Congress gets answers to these vital questions so we can effectively prosecute the war on terror.

We can win the war on terror but after more than 4 years in Iraq and nearly 6 years in Afghanistan, we need to demand more results.

Madam Speaker, by asking the tough questions we can continue to support the troops who are fighting bravely to secure our Nation.

IN HONOR OF MICHAEL RUCKA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the achievements of a man who is a true defender of the needs and interests of injured workers. Michael Rucka's long and distinguished career has proven him to be worthy of the Workers Injury Litigation Group Lifetime Achievement Award, which he will receive on June 23, 2007.

As a senior founding partner of the Rucka, O'Boyle, Lombaro & McKenna Attorney practice, Michael proves to be an outstanding and committed leader. Not only does his hard work make him shine as a perfect candidate for the Lifetime Achievement Award, but Michael's pursuit of reform in worker's compensation systems in the United States also highlights his devotion to his career but especially to his clients—the working man and woman.

Madam Speaker, Michael Rucka exemplifies exceptional skill and service to a worthy social cause and I am honored to be able to acknowledge him as one of the most valuable lawyers of our time. The contributions and efforts that he has made and will continue to make are invaluable.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH BIRTHDAY OF LEO Y. LEE

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 50th birthday of Mr. Leo Y. Lee, and to honor his past, present, and future contributions to the Asian-American community. We celebrate his first 50 years, his energy, determination, and lifelong service to our diverse communities.

Mr. Lee immigrated to the United States in 1975 from Hong Kong. Mr. Lee attended Vincennes University in Indiana in 1975 and Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art on full tuition scholarships. He became a licensed engineer with a master's degree in mechanical engineering.

Mr. Lee was elected president of the Chinese American Association of the City of New York from 1994 through 1996. This group is a fraternal organization of 4,000 Chinese-American managerial and civil service employees for the city of New York.

In June 1996, Mr. Lee was selected to participate in the Coro Partnership Leadership Enhancement and Networking Program for his demonstrated leadership, commitment, and community involvement.

Since 1996, Mr. Lee has been a member of the Organization of Chinese Americans, OCA—New York Chapter. OCA is a national organization that promotes equal opportunity and equal treatment of Asian Americans. Mr. Lee has served as president of the New York Chapter from 1999 through 2002, during which time he advocated for fair treatment and justice for Dr. Wen Ho Lee, mentored Chinatown youth initiatives, a fledgling leadership organization, and organized candidate forums to address the concerns of the Chinese immigrant community.

He was elected to the OCA National Executive Council in October 2002 on which he served as the vice president of membership. In 2005, he was the recipient of OCA National Unsung Heroes Award. Today, Mr. Lee continues to serve on the board of directors of OCA's New York chapter.

Earlier this year, Mr. Lee was selected to serve on the New York City Council's Discrimination and Harassment Task Force.

Mr. Lee is also a loving father, engaged in his community as a parent. In 2006, Mr. Lee was elected a member-at-large of the Parents' Association of Stuyvesant High School. Finally, Mr. Lee has been elected co-president of the Parents' Association for the fall 2007—spring 2008 school year.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. Lee for his leadership and continued service to the community, and wish him a very happy birthday.

DEDICATED TO PROVIDING QUALITY HEALTH CARE—A TRIBUTE TO BETTY JEAN KERR

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, today I am proud to honor Betty Jean Kerr as she celebrates 30 years of successful service as CEO of People's Health Centers, PHC. Under her dedicated leadership, the medically underserved and uninsured receive comprehensive medical treatment daily across the St. Louis Metropolitan Area. The St. Louis community will celebrate Ms. Kerr during a very special Gala Weekend, which includes a historical renaming of PHC to the Betty Jean Kerr People's Health Centers. This is a fitting tribute for an extraordinary woman who has been credited with taking her vision of community health to an international level.

PHC Health Centers, PHC, has a 35 year history of providing essential primary care and prevention health education risk reduction services. Under Kerr's leadership, the PHC campus is now a sprawling community of apartments for the elderly, housing for persons with disabilities, social security services, primary health care, dental services, a pharmacy, affordable homes, small businesses, and school-based sites that provide increased access to health in conjunction with health center locations. All health services are provided by clinicians who are accountable for addressing the personal health needs of the residents in St. Louis. The success of PHC is a true reflection of Kerr's commitment and dedication to ensuring that primary care and prevention services are efficiently provided, regardless of a patient's socioeconomic status.

Kerr has also ventured beyond medical treatment by incorporating medical research into PHC. By partnering with government agencies, teaching institutions, and a host of other participants, PHC is able to conduct clinical research trials in an effort to improve health outcomes for medically underserved persons with chronic diseases. And reduce health disparities. Ms. Kerr has a strong belief that every citizen has the right to a long and healthy life. She continues creating unique programs, such as the Sharing the Care Program, which allows eligible PHC participants to receive life-saving drugs free of charge.

Kerr has recently extended her mission of serving the underserved through the Betty Jean Kerr Scholarship. These College Family Life Assistant Scholarships are awarded to African American students with an interest in higher education in the fields of health and health related professions.

Madam Speaker, it is with great privilege that I recognize Betty Jean Kerr today before Congress. She is not only a local hero, but is indeed a national treasure. Her tireless work to make healthcare affordable and accessible to all makes her more than worthy of this honor. It is with great privilege that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Betty Jean Kerr.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. TOM AND MRS. LOIS MILLER ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the institution of marriage is one of the most effective traditions in civilized society which organizes, holds together and perpetuates continuation of

civilized humanity and to many it is both a civil and religious act and whereas, Tom and Lois Miller have shared 50 years of holy matrimony, I am pleased to pause and wish them well as they reach this important milestone. Tom and Lois met in McCool, Mississippi while teenagers and were married after coming to Chicago by Rev. Daniel A. Williams on January 14, 1957. Tom worked at CELO Steel and later went to the R.C. Cola Company where he retired after a long and satisfying career. Lois pursued a career in cosmetology, became one of the best in her field and subsequently opened her own business, the L & L Beauty Salon which has been in existence for 47 years.

Mr. Speaker, Tom and Lois Miller became and still are pillars of their community. They raised 4 daughters, have 4 grandchildren and 2 great grandchildren. Ever since their marriage they have been rocks of the Greater Zion MB Church. They were founding members of the 4500 W. Congress Block Club in Chicago, have been active in many other civic and social endeavors and for the past 10 years have lived in Westchester, Illinois, where they have immersed themselves into community life.

Madam Speaker, 50 years is a long time and when you can spend those 50 years in a state of peace, happiness and productive engagement, you have been truly blessed, just as you have blessed others. I have been told that "to those to whom much is given, much is expected in return."

The Millers have been fortunate to have a great family, great children, grandchildren, friends and other relatives. Their children, grandchildren, other relatives and friends have been fortunate to have the Millers in their lives and I close my comments with congratulations to Tom and Lois Miller, wish them well and trust that they will have many more years of happy and blissful marriage.

COMMEMORATING 45 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE CITY MANAGER JACKIE WILSON HAS GIVEN TO THE COMMUNITY OF DOUGLAS, GEORGIA

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I wish to commemorate the 45 years of dedicated service City Manager Jackie Wilson has given to the community of Douglas, Georgia.

From the beginning, Jackie Wilson has raced out of the gate full speed with a pragmatic approach to community development. She started as Executive Secretary to the City Manager of Douglas in 1962. In 1972, she transferred to the Urban Renewal Department as Assistant Director, and in 1974 became the Director of Urban Renewal. In 1975 when Urban Renewal was phased out, she became the Director of Community Development. In 1995, she was named Assistant City Manager. In January of 2002, when the former City Manager resigned, she was appointed City Manager.

During her time of service she has received numerous outstanding awards. In 1985, she received the Douglas-Coffee County Outstanding Leadership and Service Award. In 1992, the Georgia Municipal Association Eighth District Community Leadership Award. In 2006, she received the Douglas-Coffee County Chamber of Commerce and Economic Development Authority Women In Leadership Award. This award will now be given annually and has been named the "Jackie L. Wilson Women In Leadership Award". In 2007 she has been selected as an Honored Member of the Heritage Registry of Who's Who 2007–2008 Edition.

On June 30, 2007 Jackie Wilson will retire and spend time with her five grandchildren. Through her hard work and dedication she has been a great example for the community of Douglas, Georgia.

JOHN ISNER—TENNIS GREAT FROM GREENSBORO

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, it is well known that Greensboro, NC, has produced some fine tennis players. Some around Capitol Hill, for example, might be acquainted with my sometimes adequate "old man's game of tennis." That being acknowledged, I can safely say that I am glad to have never faced the overpowering serve of John Isner, Greensboro's own collegiate tennis champion. Even on my best day on the court, I think I might have a tough time returning one of his 130 mile-per-hour rockets.

John, hailing from Greensboro's Page High School, helped lead the 2007 NCAA Champion University of Georgia Men's Tennis team as a senior while playing in the number one singles position. Just this week, John and his teammates were lauded by President Bush at the White House.

John's personal accomplishments this season were also extraordinary. He entered the NCAA individual singles championship as the number one ranked college player in the nation, before losing the finals in three sets. Over the course of this spectacular season, he also set the University of Georgia record for career singles victories at 143. While his career tournament victories are too numerous to list, I must mention that he won the NCAA doubles championship as a sophomore.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of the Sixth District of North Carolina, I would like to wish John the best of luck in the pro ranks. And I know that if we ever teamed up for a doubles match, it is safe to say that we would be unbeatable.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CHILDREN'S MERCURY EXPOSURE ACT OF 2007

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. LoBIONDO. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing the "Children's Mercury Exposure Act of 2007" along with my colleague, Representative ROBERT E. ANDREWS. This necessary and important piece of legislation will establish a program of research at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) regarding the risks posed by all levels of exposure of children to mercury from mercury contaminated industrial sites; require the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), working in coordination with state departments of health, to conduct a study on the prevalence of the exposure of children to mercury from mercury contaminated industrial sites and present to Congress a preliminary report of the prevalence of such occurrences 1 year from the date of enactment; and provide block grants through CDC to state departments of health to conduct initial and long-term testing of children exposed to mercury from mercury-contaminated industrial sites.

I introduce this legislation today as a direct result of an incident that occurred last summer in my Congressional District. Last July, to my amazement and disbelief, I learned that a day care center in Franklin Township, New Jersey had been opened mistakenly on a site that was previously used by a thermometer manufacturer with a history of mercury contamination and had not been properly cleaned up. As a result of this, children who innocently played on the grounds and slept on the floors of he day care were diagnosed with mercury contamination.

I worked with the CDC and state agencies to ensure that these children received the testing and care they needed and deserved, but there were many questions that could not be answered about the risks to these children and children like them who were exposed to mercury, nor were answers about whether similar incidents of mercury exposure in children were occurring in communities across the country.

The answers I did find out though were alarming. I learned that mercury, a potent neurotoxin that can affect the nervous system, lungs, brain, and kidneys, is present at a number of contaminated industrial sites in the United States. I also learned that children's unique behaviors, such as soil ingestion from normal hand-to-mouth contact, puts them at particular risk of exposure from these mercury contaminated industrial sites, and that the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry (ATSDR), has determined this risk has emerged as an important public health issue.

This incident has taught me that children can, and unfortunately will be exposed to mercury from contaminated industrial sites. The "Children's Mercury Exposure Act of 2007" attempts to ensure that children and parents have knowledge about the risks posed by this exposure; that the scope of this problem is determined; and that the appropriate level of testing and care is provided. I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in working to help those children who have been, and may be, exposed to mercury and to support the "Children's Mercury Exposure Act of 2007."

TRIBUTE TO FRANCE A. CÓRDOVA, CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Riverside, California, are exceptional. Riverside has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Chancellor France Córdova is one of these individuals. On Wednesday, June 27, 2007, Chancellor Córdova will be honored at a farewell dinner in her honor.

Chancellor Córdova began her dynamic career conducting anthropological field work in a Zapotec Indian pueblo in Oaxaca, Mexico, after graduating cum laude from Stanford University with a bachelor's degree in English. She went on to obtain her Ph.D. in physics from the California Institute of Technology. For 10 years, Córdova worked as a staff member of the Space Astronomy and Astrophysics Group at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. In 1989, Córdova moved across the U.S. to serve as department head of astronomy and astrophysics at Pennsylvania State University. In 1993, Córdova accepted a position as the Chief Scientist at NASA which she held until 1996. In this role, she served as the primary scientific advisor to the NASA Administrator and the principal interface between NASA headquarters and the broader scientific community.

In 1996, Córdova returned to her home state of California to serve as professor of physics and vice-chancellor for research at UC Santa Barbara. In 2002, Chancellor Córdova accepted the position of chancellor at the University of California, Riverside and the university has undergone dramatic changes under her leadership. The campus itself has been augmented and improved with the addition of new state-of-the-art buildings and parking for students. Academically, Chancellor Córdova has worked towards bringing a school of medicine to UCR which is expected to become a reality in the near future.

Chancellor Córdova's tireless passion for education has contributed immensely to the betterment of the University of California, Riverside. Many students, community leaders and residents are thankful for her service and leadership. I am proud to call Chancellor Córdova a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many are grateful for her service and salute her as she moves to Indiana to lead Purdue University as their new chancellor.

HONORING CANYON MIDDLE SCHOOL OF CASTRO VALLEY

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the students, faculty, and staff of Canyon Middle School in Castro Valley, California for its clear record of success. Canyon Middle School has now been named one of the top performing middle schools in the country.

Today through June 23 in Arlington, Virginia Canyon Middle School will be recognized with 55 other high-performing schools across the nation as a School to Watch by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform at their annual conference.

The faculty and staff at Canyon Middle School have clearly set high standards for performance. They have made it their daily mission to be academically excellent, developmentally responsive, and socially equitable. They challenge all of their students to use their minds, and as teachers and adult mentors to our young people, they are sensitive to the unique developmental challenges of early adolescence. As a whole, Canyon Middle School strives to provide every student, regardless of background or life obstacles, with high-quality teachers, resources, and a viable support system.

Canyon Middle School's accomplishments represent its dedication and commitment to bolstering the success of our youth early on in their academic careers, so that they may achieve successful and productive lives as individuals. The service that Canyon Middle School provides to its students, their families, and the Castro Valley community is undeniable.

I salute Castro Valley Middle School's students, faculty, and staff for their exemplary performance, and I thank them for their outstanding service to the 9th Congressional District and to our country.

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF KAREN HOLBROOK DURING HER TENURE AS THE PRESIDENT OF THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. DEBORAH PRYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, it is a distinct honor for the central Ohio delegation to rise today to commend the leadership and accomplishments of Karen Holbrook during her tenure as the President of the Ohio State University. Holbrook became Ohio State's 13th president in October 2002, and has served the University and the greater university community nobly for 5 years by guiding Ohio State towards ever-increasing prominence in research initiatives and funding, higher academic standards, and enhanced community partnerships.

Ohio State has steadily risen in national rankings of universities since 2002, climbing to 19th among the Nation's public universities in U.S. News and World Report's 2007 edition of ''America's Best Colleges.'' Under Holbrook's watch, the quality of the student body has also increased dramatically. Fifty-two percent of Ohio State's incoming freshmen in the fall of 2007 are expected to be in the top 10 percent of their high school class and 90 percent will be in the top 25 percent. Average ACT scores have also increased. Thanks to better-prepared incoming students and a nationally recognized First-Year Experience program, freshman-sophomore retention has risen to 91.5 percent, well above the average among similar universities.

The completion of the South Campus Gateway project, a mixed-use development of retail, entertainment, offices and housing, has revitalized the edge of campus through the Campus Partners initiative. These improvements have enhanced student life, revitalized an urban neighborhood and provided high-quality destinations for the campus community and visitors alike.

With annual research expenditures now at $652 million a year, Ohio State is ranked 8th among public research universities in the Nation by the National Science Foundation based on the amount of sponsored research. Also, the University has risen from 5th to 3rd among public universities in industry-sponsored research. Holbrook presided over the creation of the Undergraduate Research Office to encourage and enable undergraduate students to connect to research projects as part of their educational experience. As a result, more than 300 students now participate in the annual Denman Undergraduate Forum.

Finally, Holbrook has led the University into strong partnerships in the community, especially with renowned research institute Battelle, which includes the Metro High School for students interested in science, technology, engineering and math, the Urban Arts Center, WOSU@COSI (a collaboration of the university's public media stations and the Center for Science and Industry), and the Battelle Center for Mathematics and Science Education Policy at the John Glenn School of Public Affairs. These partnerships and initiatives are already bearing fruit, and their impact and importance will only increase down the road.

It is truly a pleasure to have worked with President Holbrook over the last 5 years and to have joined her in efforts that increased the prominence and reputation of a great institution. The Ohio State University is a better place because of Holbrook's leadership, and for that, all Buckeyes are forever in her debt.

Go Bucks! Beat Michigan!

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF KAREN HOLBROOK DURING HER TENURE AS THE PRESIDENT OF THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. DAVID L. HOBSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. HOBSON. Madam Speaker, it is a distinct honor for the central Ohio delegation to rise today to commend the leadership and accomplishments of Karen Holbrook during her tenure as the president of the Ohio State University. Holbrook became Ohio State's 13th president in October, 2002, and has served the University and the greater university community nobly for 5 years by guiding Ohio State towards ever-increasing prominence in research initiatives and funding, higher academic standards, and enhanced community partnerships.

Ohio State has steadily risen in national rankings of universities since 2002, climbing to 19th among the nation's public universities in U.S. News and World Report's 2007 edition of ''America's Best Colleges.'' Under Holbrook's

watch, the quality of the student body has also increased dramatically. Fifty-two percent of Ohio State's incoming freshmen in the fall of 2007 are expected to be in the top 10 percent of their high school class and 90 percent will be in the top 25 percent. Average ACT scores have also increased. Thanks to better-prepared incoming students and a nationally recognized First-Year Experience program, freshman-sophomore retention has risen to 91.5 percent, well above the average among similar universities.

The completion of the South Campus Gateway project, a mixed-use development of retail, entertainment, offices and housing, has revitalized the edge of campus through the Campus Partners initiative. These improvements have enhanced student life, revitalized an urban neighborhood and provided high-quality destinations for the campus community and visitors alike.

With annual research expenditures now at $652 million a year, Ohio State is ranked 8th among public research universities in the nation by the National Science Foundation based on the amount of sponsored research. Also, the University has risen from 5th to 3rd among public universities in industry-sponsored research. Holbrook presided over the creation of the Undergraduate Research Office to encourage and enable undergraduate students to connect to research projects as part of their educational experience. As a result, more than 300 students now participate in the annual Denman Undergraduate Forum.

Finally Holbrook has led the University into strong partnerships in the community, especially with renowned research institute Battelle, which includes the Metro High School for students interested in science, technology, engineering and math, the Urban Arts Center, WOSU@COSI (a collaboration of the university's public media stations and the Center for Science and Industry), and the Battelle Center for Mathematics and Science Education Policy at the John Glenn School of Public Affairs. These partnerships and initiatives are already bearing fruit, and their impact and importance will only increase down the road.

It is truly a pleasure to have worked with President Holbrook over the last five years and to have joined her in efforts that increased the prominence and reputation of a great institution. The Ohio State University is a better place because of Holbrook's leadership, and for that, all Buckeyes are forever in her debt. Go Bucks. Beat Michigan.

INVEST IN EDUCATION, INVEST IN THE FUTURE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, forty years ago, the U.S. was number one in the world in high school graduation rates. Today it ranks 17th.

About ⅓ of the students who enter 9th grade each fall will not graduate from high school with 4 years, if at all now in 2007. High school students living in low-income families drop out of school at 6 times the rate of their peers from high income families. Dropout rates are especially high in communities of color: Only about 55 percent of African American students and 52 percent of Hispanic students graduate on time from high school with a regular diploma, compared to 78 percent of white students. In my hometown of Oakland, CA, the dropout rate for Black males is 74 percent.

In this country, there are about 2,000 high schools that produce the majority of dropouts. Six million students throughout America are currently at risk of dropping out of school. Students who fail to graduate from high school are more likely to participate in criminal activity than students who do graduate. Likewise, students with low levels of achievement in high school are more likely to engage in crime than students with high levels of achievement.

For example, the Harvard University Civil Rights Project and the Urban Institute Education Policy Center conducted a study on K–12 schools in California. The center estimated that Oakland's 52 percent dropout rate costs the state $14 billion in lost wages, crime and jail time.

Investing in education would save millions of dollars in crime-related expenditures annually, not to mention ensuring a quality of life that young people deserve or America's standing in the world.

The statistics are staggering and tell the story. Approximately 75 percent of state prison inmates did not complete high school. High school dropouts are 3.5 time more likely than high school graduates to be arrested in their lifetimes. And a mere one percent increase in high school graduation rates would save approximately $1.4 billion in costs associated with incarceration costs, or about $2,100 for each male high school graduate.

We must do better by our children. Nothing less than the future of this country is at take. That is why I am committed to effective reform that can transform high schools and keep students at the greatest risk of dropping out on the path to graduation.

I'm proud to support authorizing legislation that will soon be introduced which will help address some of the reforms that are needed and that is why I'm proud to be an advocate on the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education subcommittee working to appropriate funding to address the crisis in dropouts that our country is facing. Clearly, we need increased investments in programs that keep kids in school and learning.

School counseling bill: On the Labor, Health and Human Services subcommittee, I worked with my colleagues to include $61.5 million for elementary and secondary school counseling in the FY08 bill that is currently working its way through our committee. This is a 77.5 percent increase in a program that the President would have eliminated. These funds enable school districts to hire academic counselors, psychologists, and social workers. The additional resources will be targeted to improving and expanding academic and mental health counseling to middle and high school adolescents. This significant increase is a tremendous step toward addressing the crisis in counseling in our schools.

After School programs: Another critical tool we have in our arsenal to fight drop out and to keep kids off the street and for preventing youth violence is our nation's after school programs. The fact of the matter is that between 3–6 p.m. the rate of juvenile crime triples.

On LHHS subcommittee, we were able to provide a $125 million increase over FY07 levels for a total of over a billion dollars for the 21st century community learning centers. This program is a formula grant to states which in turn distribute 95 percent of the funds on a competitive basis to local school districts, community based organization and other organization for after school activities that make sure that young people have alternatives to getting into trouble.

UPWARD BOUND/Trio and Gear UP: I want to echo the comments of my colleagues here tonight about the problems we are fighting as it relates to the Absolute Priority regulation and the concerns over the loss of funding for numerous previously funded grantees including 30 percent of our HBCU's and Mills College in my district. I know that working together we will resolve these critical issues and I want to specifically thank BOBBY SCOTT and GWEN MOORE for their leadership on the Education committee and on this issue.

We all understand just how critical these programs that provide a variety of outreach and support services to encourage low-income students to enter an complete college. That is why I'm pleased our LHHS subcommittee was able to provide a $40 million increase in funding for the TRIO programs and a $20 million increase for the GEAR UP program.

It is time that our policy and funding priorities take a new direction for our children. That means investing in education. When we do that, we invest in our future.

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF KAREN HOLBROOK DURING HER TENURE AS THE PRESIDENT OF THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. TIBERI. Madam Speaker, it is a distinct honor for the central Ohio delegation to rise today to commend the leadership and accomplishments of Karen Holbrook during her tenure as the President of The Ohio State University. Holbrook became Ohio State's 13th president in October, 2002, and has served the University and the greater university community nobly for five years by guiding Ohio State towards ever-increasing prominence in research initiatives and funding, higher academic standards, and enhanced community partnerships.

Ohio State has steadily risen in national rankings of universities since 2002, climbing to 19th among the nation's public universities in U.S. News and World Report's 2007 edition of ''America's Best Colleges.'' Under Holbrook's watch, the quality of the student body has also increased dramatically. Fifty-two percent of Ohio State's incoming freshmen in the fall of 2007 are expected to be in the top 10 percent of their high school class and 90 percent will be in the top 25 percent. Average ACT scores have also increased. Thanks to better-prepared incoming students and a nationally recognized First-Year Experience program, freshman-sophomore retention has risen to 91.5 percent, well above the average among similar universities.

The completion of the South Campus Gateway project, a mixed-use development of retail, entertainment, offices and housing, has

revitalized the edge of campus through the Campus Partners initiative. These improvements have enhanced student life, revitalized an urban neighborhood and provided high-quality destinations for the campus community and visitors alike.

With annual research expenditures now at $652 million a year, Ohio State is ranked 8th among public research universities in the nation by the National Science Foundation based on the amount of sponsored research. Also, the University has risen from 5th to 3rd among public universities in industry-sponsored research. Holbrook presided over the creation of the Undergraduate Research Office to encourage and enable undergraduate students to connect to research projects as part of their educational experience. As a result, more than 300 students now participate in the annual Denman Undergraduate Forum.

Finally, Holbrook has led the University into strong partnerships in the community, especially with renowned research institute Battelle, which includes the Metro High School for students interested in science, technology, engineering and math, the Urban Arts Center, WOSU@COSI (a collaboration of the university's public media stations and the Center for Science and Industry), and the Battelle Center for Mathematics and Science Education Policy at the John Glenn School of Public Affairs. These partnerships and initiatives are already bearing fruit, and their impact and importance will only increase down the road.

It is truly a pleasure to have worked with President Holbrook over the last 5 years and to have joined her in efforts that increased the prominence and reputation of a great institution. The Ohio State University is a better place because of Holbrook's leadership, and for that, all Buckeyes are forever in her debt.

Go Bucks. Beat Michigan.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICARE MEDICAL NUTRITION THERAPY ACT OF 2007

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the bipartisan Medicare Medical Nutrition Therapy Act (MMNTA) of 2007. This legislation is cosponsored by my friends and colleagues Representatives MICHAEL CASTLE (R–DE), DIANA DEGETTE (D–CO) and MARK KIRK (R–IL).

The MMNTA of 2007 authorizes Medicare to expand the use of medical nutrition therapy to treat any disease for which empirical research has shown clinical value. The American Dietetic Association has endorsed this important legislation.

In 2000, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) of the National Academy of Sciences found that medical nutrition therapy is effective as part of a comprehensive approach to the treatment and management of the following conditions: diabetes, heart failure, kidney failure, dyslipidemia (a total cholesterol condition as well as other abnormalities in blood lipid levels) and hypertension. In response to this study, Congress allowed Medicare to reimburse medical nutrition therapy for beneficiaries with diabetes and renal diseases.

Specifically, the benefit Congress added includes an initial assessment of a beneficiary's nutrition and lifestyle, nutrition counseling, information regarding managing lifestyle factors that affect diet and follow-up visits to monitor the beneficiary's progress. Medicare covers three hours of one-on-one counseling services the first year, and two hours each year after that. The benefit provides additional treatment hours when the beneficiary's condition, treatment, or diagnosis changes and a physician refers the beneficiary. A physician must prescribe these services and renew them yearly if continuing treatment is needed.

In 2004, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) released a report that reiterated that medical nutrition therapy is effective as part of a comprehensive approach to the management and treatment of dyslipidemia (referred to as hyperlidemia in the HHS report) and hypertension. This study's corroboration of 10M's earlier findings demonstrates that many Medicare beneficiaries who could benefit from this treatment cannot access it through Medicare.

Moreover, expanding the use of medical nutrition therapy has the potential to be a cost effective means of providing health care. Recently, the Pfizer Corporation piloted a 6-month nutrition and exercise intervention program for employees with hyperlipidemia. The study concluded that this intervention reduced Low-density Lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol 12 months later. And, the participating employees had their risk for heart disease reduced by 19 percent. The intervention could save an estimated $728,722 annually if offered to the entire Pfizer population.

Unfortunately, the method that Congress established to determine eligibility for medical nutrition therapy is flawed. Congress specified in law which diseases should receive medical nutrition therapy instead of leaving that judgment to the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) as is the custom for other benefits provided by the program.

CMS has the experts and infrastructure to make these important decisions based on empirical research. As part of its administration of the Medicare program, CMS determines the items and services that are reasonable and necessary for the diagnosis or treatment of an illness or injury suffered by Medicare beneficiaries. CMS makes national coverage determinations by evaluating medical literature and data and information on the effectiveness and appropriateness of medical items and services that are being considered for Medicare coverage. During this process, the public has the opportunity to provide comments. In some cases, CMS' own research is supplemented by an outside assessment and/or consultation with a Medicare Evidence Development & Coverage Advisory Committee (MedCAC). A MedCAC consists of outside experts who supplement CMS career staff examination of an issue. These committees examine the strength of available evidence and make recommendations to CMS on coverage decisions.

By passing this legislation, Congress would increase access to medical nutrition therapy to Medicare beneficiaries through a thoughtful and scientific approach. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and ensure that Medicare beneficiaries have the appropriate access to medical nutrition therapy.

CONGRATULATING JIMMIE GOLDEN ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise today to commemorate the 80th birthday of Mr. Jimmie Golden. Mr. Golden is a highly-regarded figure and establishment in the "McDonald's Coffee" group, and his contributions to the group are immeasurable.

The McDonald's Coffee group meets every morning in Milton, a city in my district in Northwest Florida. It is there that a regular group meets to discuss news and current affairs, and Jimmie Golden is a consistent presence. Jimmie is not just there to listen, though- his knowledge in both domestic and foreign affairs is vast. His awareness of the events going on, how the past has affected these events, and the possible implications for the future is worldly by any standard. Those that listen to his input pay close attention as they know Jimmie puts a lot of thought and knowledge into what he says.

Jimmie Golden is not only a great contributor of knowledge and information; he is also a great listener. This listening is not just at the McDonald's Coffee group, either. Jimmie is someone always willing to help others, and he would bend over backwards to better the life of another. Calling Jimmie a humanitarian could be an understatement; he would help every single person if he could. In fact, his service in the United States Navy protecting the freedom our country enjoys accomplished that goal.

Madam Speaker, it is not often enough that a person of Jimmie Golden's caliber comes along, and I am grateful that he calls Northwest Florida home as we recognize and congratulate him on his 80th birthday. Our Nation is a better place because of people like Jimmie.

IN MEMORY OF ROY P. LEWSADER, JR.

HON. BRAD ELLSWORTH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor S. Sgt. Roy P. Lewsader, Jr. of Clinton, Indiana, who died on June 16, 2007. While fighting for our country in Afghanistan, a rocket-propelled grenade detonated near his vehicle in Tarin Kowt.

Roy was born in Terre Haute, Indiana. He joined the U.S. Army in 1988 and served until his death as part of Operation Enduring Freedom.

To serve our country in the U.S. military is an honorable and noble profession. Ray's service to our country in life, as well as in death, epitomizes what it means to be an American hero.

During his more than 13 year service to our country, Roy distinguished himself as soldier and leader. He received the Bronze Star and Purple Heart, as well as the Army Achievement Medal three times and the Army Commendation Award.

Roy Lewsader, Jr. gave the ultimate sacrifice in service to our country and will be remembered as a hero, a father, and a husband. On behalf of all of the people of the 8th District, I extend my deepest condolences to his wife, Melissa; daughters, Briana, Ozzra'D, Cheyenne, and Keebee; son, Billy; and the rest of his family and friends who love and miss him today.

SENATOR BYRD'S HISTORIC 18,000th VOTE

HON. NICK J. RAHALL, II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, today is an historic date in the United States Congress, and for my State of West Virginia. Today, our State's senior Senator—the senior Senator of all Senior Senators—and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, ROBERT C. BYRD, has just cast his 18,000th vote.

On April 30, 1990, Senator BYRD cast his 12,134th vote, surpassing Senator William Proxmire, the previous record holder.

Now, he has cast 18,000 votes. Talk about a record. They say records are made to be broken. I will be very surprised if anyone ever breaks this one. It would take a Senator on super steroids!

Madam Speaker, I take this opportunity, not only to congratulate my fellow West Virginian, and my mentor, but to say how proud the people of West Virginia are of him.

Senator BYRD was a virtual orphan boy raised by his aunt and coal-mining uncle in the hills of southern West Virginia. Through hard work, determination, a strong religious belief, an unrelenting drive to gain knowledge, and his belief that the United States is indeed the land of opportunity, he has climbed to the highest pinnacle of political success. He went from a coal miner's shack to the ornate Appropriations Committee Suite he now occupies in the U.S. Capitol. Unable to afford college after graduating from high school, he became the first person to begin and complete law school while serving in the United States Congress.

He has worked pumping gas and as a butcher in a local grocery store, and as a welder in the shipyards of Baltimore and Tampa during World War II. After the war, he owned and operated a grocery store in Sophia, West Virginia. These are unlikely jobs for someone with the kind of power our Senator has come to wield in Washington. But I believe they helped to mold the man in a way that I think would be of benefit to more of our leaders, and, in turn, to our nation. I think the world of politics would have a better reputation if more politicians lived the kind of hard-scrabble life that Senator BYRD endured in his younger days. Certainly, it would be better if more of us had a wonderful woman like his gracious Erma—his angel in heaven—by our sides, giving us counsel and encouragement.

Now Senator BYRD has cast more votes than any other U.S. Senator, and he has done so approaching each vote with depth of thought and breadth of experience.

He has held more Senate leadership positions than any other Senator, including two stints as the Senate Majority Leader. And, as I have already mentioned, he is the President Pro Tempore of the Senate.

While he is the longest serving Senator in history, I am pleased to point out that on December 2, 2009, he will have served in the U.S. Congress for a total of 56 years, 10 months, and 29 days, making him the longest serving member of Congress in history. I am already preparing my remarks for that historic day.

HONORING MY MOTHER

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

Ms. LINDA SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my personal heroes, my mother, Maria Sánchez, on her retirement yesterday after 30 years teaching in the classroom. I can honestly and proudly say that my mother is a true American success story.

An immigrant, she came to this country without knowing English, without much money in her pocket, and without a job waiting for her.

Her life's been hard, and we kids didn't make it any easier. But she and my father taught us to work hard, persevere, and play by the rules.

My mother raised seven children and sent them all to college. She is the only mother in U.S. history to send two daughters to Congress.

And she did this while going to night school to get her A.A., then her B.A., then a teaching credential and, ultimately, a master's degree. She cleaned houses in her "spare time," and found creative ways to make ends meet for a family of nine.

As an English/Spanish dual-immersion teacher, she helped children better express themselves and communicate with each other—shaping our community one student at a time.

Her teaching career may be ending, but she'll keep leading and touching lives. Mom, here's to you!

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration 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:

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, during times of crisis, the United States has always supported her friends. Egypt is our friend. Egypt is not only our friend, Egypt is our strategic partner, our peace partner and our military partner in the Middle East. It is shameful how we are treating our friend with the restrictions on military aid to Egypt in this bill. As such, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment by Rep. ANTHONY WEINER removing $200 million in military aid to Egypt, and in strong support of the amendment by Rep. CHARLES BOUSTANY allowing military support to continue to Egypt without conditions. Egypt and the United States have a valuable, key and strategic partnership, one that has been underscored by the recent developments in the Gaza Strip. It would be toxic to the relationship that the United States has with Egypt, and our relationship to those moderate Arab states in the Middle East, for this bill to be adopted with these restrictions.

In April of this year, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said that: "I have long considered Egypt one of America's most important, even indispensable, partners. . . Security challenges in the Middle East are significant, but can be overcome by Egypt and the United States working closely together in the region." Just last week, the world saw Hamas take over the Gaza Strip. Hundreds, if not thousands, of men, women, children, senior citizens, and the disabled are fleeing this region as refugees, many ending up in Egypt.

In response to this crisis, Egypt's President, Hosni Mubarak, has invited Israel's Prime Minister, Ehud Olmert, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas, and Jordan's President King Abdullah II for a summit this Monday, June 25, 2007 in an effort to negotiate peace in this region. I commend to my colleagues the following portion of an article dated June 21, 2007 from the Associated Press that goes into more detail about the summit:

RAMALLAH, WEST BANK.—Closing ranks against Hamas, Egypt's president invited Israeli, Palestinian and Jordanian leaders to a peace summit, officials said Thursday, the biggest show of support yet by moderate Arab states for beleaguered Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas.

The meeting will take place Monday in the Red Sea resort of Sharm el-Sheikh, said Israeli government spokeswoman Miri Eisin. Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak has invited Abbas, Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and Jordan's King Abdullah II. Jordan confirmed Abdullah would attend.

Abbas will call for a resumption of peace talks with Israel, arguing that only progress toward Palestinian statehood can serve as a true buffer against Hamas, which took control of Gaza by force last week, Abbas aide Saeb Erekat said.

"The most important thing to realize is that time is of the essence," Erekat said. "We need to deliver the end of occupation, a Palestinian state. If we don't have hope, Hamas will export despair to the people."

As immediate steps, Abbas will ask Israel to remove West Bank checkpoints that disrupt daily life and trade, and to transfer hundreds of millions of dollars in Palestinian tax funds Israel froze after Hamas came to power last year.

Also on Thursday, Palestinian dual nationals and foreigners working in Gaza were allowed to pass through Israel for other points. About 60 Palestinian-Americans left Gaza for Jordan, and eight World Bank employees left the coastal strip, an Israeli army spokeswoman said.

Late Wednesday, 35 Gazans who had been stuck at the main Gaza-Israel passenger crossing for several days were sent to Egypt via Israel, the spokeswoman said. Among those who left were gunmen from Abbas' Fatah movement, their wives and children.

Hundreds of men, women and children rushed to the crossing after the Hamas takeover, among them Fatah loyalists who feared

they'd be harmed by Hamas, despite the militants' offer of amnesty. By Thursday, the passage, rank with the stench of urine and garbage, was nearly empty after it became clear that a mass exit to the West Bank was not approved.

Earlier Wednesday, Israel took in several of the sick and wounded in the crowd.

In Washington, Olmert said he would propose to his Cabinet on Sunday that it unlock frozen funds, though he did not say how much money he thought Israel should free. Israel is holding about $550 million in tax revenues it collects on behalf of the Palestinians.

Despite the talk about peace, however, the Hamas takeover has dealt a setback to statehood efforts, with the Islamic militants in charge of Gaza and Abbas in charge of the West Bank.''

This Amendment is even opposed by the President. In a statement of White House policy, the Office on Management and Budget says:

''The Administration opposes the prohibition on a portion of the foreign military financing to Egypt contained in section 699. Military assistance is critical to our strategic partnership with Egypt and has contributed to a broad range of U.S. objectives in the region. Such a restriction will undermine the U.S. relationship with Egypt and send the wrong message to this important ally in the region.''

As a former Member of this subcommittee, I personally appreciate the challenges that Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Minority Member WOLF not only face, but surpass. This bill provides significant funding increases for many programs that I have, and will continue to, support.

My objection is to Section 699 of the bill, a new provision, which sets conditions on $200 million of the $1.3 billion in military assistance to Egypt. This assistance is pending certification of the Secretary of State that Egypt is taking steps toward enactment of a new judicial law, including the principal components of the law and separation of the budget of the judiciary from that of the Ministry of Justice; steps to review criminal procedures and mass demonstrations by Egypt's police force; and steps to detect and destroy the smuggling network into the Gaza strip.

The Thirteenth Congressional District of Michigan contains one of the highest concentrations of Arabs in the United States. These tax-paying, hard-working Americans demand that the United States respect not just their homeland, but the past, present and future effort that Egypt has made manifest over the years as a strategic partner and toward peace. To remove this key support from Egypt, at this point, would signal an unnecessary reticence by the United States toward one of the few allies we have in the Middle East.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support Egypt, to support peace in the Middle East, and to support the amendment offered by my colleague from Louisiana, Congressman BOUSTANY and oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from New York, Congressman WEINER.

HONORING FRED S. PYLE

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, today at Arlington National Cemetery, my constituent and friend Fred Pyle of Ormond Beach, Florida was laid to rest. It was my honor to have had the opportunity to know Fred and his family. His service to our country through our Armed Forces and law enforcement is a shining example of American patriotism.

The son of Martin and Mae Emma Pyle, he was born in Somerset, Pennsylvania on April 17, 1920.

Fred was one of six sons, five of whom served in the United States military during World War II and were recognized as being the first family of five brothers to serve our Nation's armed services in that conflict. He first entered into the service in 1938 joining the National Guard in his hometown of Somerset. He was later selected to serve as an MP and saw combat with the 726th Police Battalion in World War II during what was known as the ''Red Ball Express,'' when Allied Forces landed at Normandy and began their push towards Germany. His service later took him to Okinawa, Japan where his responsibilities included the overseeing of Japanese Prisoners of War. In addition to his service in World War II, Fred served in the Korean War and at the prestigious Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland where he served as Chief Master of Arms.

Fred achieved the rank of Staff Sergeant and was a recipient of several prestigious awards including the Victory Medal of World War II, American Theatre Ribbon, American Defense Ribbon and the Good Conduct Medal. He was also recalled during the Korean conflict where he honorably served as an instructor in a NCO academy and earned himself the Occupational Medal (Germany). He left the Army in 1952 with an honorable discharge.

After his service, Fred graduated from the Institute of Applied Science in Chicago and became a police officer with the Somerset Police Department where he worked for more than 10 years.

With the passing of Fred Pyle, America has lost an outstanding citizen and a shining example of a family's commitment and service to our Nation. He will be remembered as a patriotic American, a pillar of our community and a compassionate husband and a loving father. To his wife of 67 years, Stella, his son Bruce, his three grandchildren and one great-grandson, in addition to his loving family, we offer our deepest sympathy.

Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Fred Pyle's contributions and to ask all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives of the 110th Congress to join me in remembering a great American hero.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 2007

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 changed everything about our college admissions process. Led by the late Representatives Patsy T. Mink and Edith Green, Congress established a principle we often take for granted today—the prohibition of gender discrimination in any federally funded educational program. The effects of the law have been substantial.

In 1972, only 42 percent of Bachelors of Arts degrees were earned by women; by 2004 that number rose to 57 percent. Only 9 percent of medical degrees were awarded to women; now it's above 45 percent. Not surprisingly, law degrees were the most imbalanced. In 1972, only 7 percent of law degrees were held by women and by 2004 almost 50 percent went to women. Only 15 percent of PhD's went to women before title IX and that number is now close to 50 percent.

This progress is worth celebrating but we have plenty more to do. Title IX has as much utility now as it did in 1972. Women continue to face substantial barriers, especially in high wage fields such as science, technology, engineering and math. Sexual harassment remains pervasive in schools and on college campuses. Women and girls' sports teams still do not receive an equal share of resources.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF VACCINATED AND UNVACCINATED POPULATIONS ACT OF 2007

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, today I am reintroducing very important bipartisan legislation that I hope will resolve the question of whether or not there is a link between the increased incidence of autism and the use of thimerosal in vaccines. Many parents have raised concerns about the effect that thimerosal, which is made of mercury—a known neurotoxin that is widely used as a preservative in vaccines—may have had on a child's chances of developing autism and other neurological disorders. The study mandated by this new legislation would try to help resolve this controversy once and for all. While vaccines have been instrumental in reducing the incidence of many once-common diseases, we owe it to parents and children to study and resolve the question of the possible link between thimerosal in vaccines and autism. What is ultimately needed to resolve this issue one way or the other is a comprehensive national study comparing outcomes between vaccinated and unvaccinated children.

As the most scientifically advanced country in the world, we should be jumping at the chance to conduct a comprehensive national study and ensure absolute trust in our Nation's vaccine program. Parents deserve answers, and children deserve no less than absolute certainty and safety, which is why I am pleased to reintroduce this legislation today.

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 2007

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 155, which recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and expresses 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.

June 19th also known as Juneteenth, is the oldest nationally celebrated commemoration of the ending of slavery in the United States. From its Galveston, Texas origin in 1865, the observance of June 19th as the African American Emancipation Day has spread across the United States and beyond, yet it is still not a nationally recognized holiday.

On January 1, 1980, Juneteenth became an official Texas state holiday through the efforts of Al Edwards, an African American state legislator. The successful passage of this bill marked Juneteenth as the first emancipation celebration granted official state recognition. Representative Edwards has since actively sought to spread the observance of Juneteenth all across America.

Today, Juneteenth commemorates African-American freedom. This special day emphasizes education and achievement. It is a day, a week, and in some areas, a month marked with celebrations, guest speakers, picnics and family gatherings. It is a time for reflection and rejoicing. It is a time for assessment, self-improvement and for planning the future. Its growing popularity signifies a level of maturity and dignity in America long overdue. In cities across the country, people of all races, nationalities and religions are joining hands to truthfully acknowledge a period in our history that shaped and continues to influence our society today. Sensitized to the conditions and experiences of others, only then can we make significant and lasting improvements in our society.

The Civil Rights movement of the 50's and 60's yielded both positive and negative results for the Juneteenth celebrations. While it pulled many of the African American youth away and into the struggle for racial equality, many linked these struggles to the historical struggles of their ancestors. This was evidenced by student demonstrators involved in the Atlanta civil rights campaign in the early 1960's, who wore Juneteenth freedom buttons.

Again in 1968, Juneteenth received another strong resurgence through the Poor People's March to Washington, DC, Rev. Ralph Abernathy's call for people of all races, creeds, economic levels and professions to come to Washington to show support for the poor. Many of these attendees returned home and initiated Juneteenth celebrations in areas previously absent of such activity. In fact, two of the largest Juneteenth celebrations founded after this march are now held in Milwaukee and Minneapolis.

Throughout the 80's and 90's Juneteenth has continued to enjoy a growing and healthy interest from communities and organizations throughout the country. Institutions such as the Smithsonian, the Henry Ford Museum and others have begun sponsoring Juneteenth-centered activities. In recent years, a number of National Juneteenth Organizations have risen to take their place alongside older organizations—all with the mission to promote and cultivate knowledge and appreciation of African American history and culture.

Juneteenth today celebrates African American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures. As it takes on a more national and even global perspective, the events of 1865 in Texas are not forgotten. The future of Juneteenth looks bright as the number of cities and states come on board and form local committees and organizations to coordinate the activities.

Now in 2007, I push forward with the hope that my colleagues will remember with compassion the African American citizens who helped build this country, but were still held in illegal bondage due to the hatred, bigotry and cruelty of others. I ask that my colleagues help support this resolution and its efforts in making Juneteenth a nationally recognized holiday.

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 155. This resolution recognizes Juneteenth's significance in crafting a rich African American legacy. Juneteenth, also known as Freedom or Emancipation Day, is an informal observance in fourteen states in the United States. It marked the beginning of a new phase in African-American history, when emancipated slaves along with their former owners began, slowly and haltingly, to travel the long road to equality and integration.

Celebrated on June 19th, Juneteenth is the name given to emancipation day by African Americans in Texas. On that day in 1865, Union Major General Gordon Granger read General Order #3, officially proclaiming freedom for slaves in that state. Granger's ride through Galveston culminated a two-and a half-year trek through America's deep south to liberate the enslaved.

Juneteenth is an expression and extension of American freedom, and like the Fourth of July, is a time for all Americans to celebrate our independence, human rights, civil rights and freedom. It is an occasion where time, history and culture conspire to celebrate such a symbolic event.

The celebration of June 19th as emancipation day spread from Texas to the neighboring states of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. It has also appeared in Alabama, Florida, and California as African American Texans migrated to those regions. Juneteenth's commemoration did not only extend its geographic reach but it also embraced participants from all political and civic segments of the black community.

Unfortunately, my home state does not officially recognize Juneteenth but has an unofficial commemoration on May 20th in the capital, Tallahassee. Even as we acknowledge the evils of slavery and the ravages it wrought upon our society while paying tribute to those who suffered with no recompense, Juneteenth challenges us to strengthen our bonds of unity and to offer support to one another.

Even more importantly, Juneteenth does not polarize black and white Americans. Rather, it has become an annual cultural observance primarily devoted to civic affairs because it encourages us to be sensitive to others' conditions and experiences, so that we can make significant and lasting improvements in our society. Like the African Sankofa, we must acknowledge and honor our past. But we must always fervently forge to solidify a hopeful future.

Regrettably, the African American community continues to confront many challenges in mitigating and eventually eliminating institutional racism. Emancipation did not bring equality. We still live in a society plagued by prejudices and stereotypes. I find it unfathomable that such a momentous occasion is seldom acknowledged, much less celebrated. We must not let our past dictate our present. After all, we owe it to the thousands of lives that were mercilessly destroyed by an elitist society designed to subject and suppress them. Let us take the initiative to finally tend to a gashing wound that has crippled the African American community. Let us honor our ancestors and build a future noteworthy of their legacy.

Mr. Speaker, Juneteenth is a significant event that addresses the paradoxical race relations in our nation! It recognizes the impediments faced by the black community yet continues to inspire us to strive for an egalitarian society. We should set precedence on addressing past atrocities and present disparities so that we can truly embody democracy. I am honored to support this resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I was absent from the chamber late last night. Had I been present for the seven rollcall votes that were taken on amendments to H.R. 2764, the Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2008, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 535, "no" on rollcall No. 536, "no" on rollcall No. 537, "no" on rollcall No. 538, "no" on rollcall No. 539, "yes" on rollcall No. 540, and "no" on rollcall No. 541.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, June 21, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 536. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on agreeing to the McGovern of Massachusetts Amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 553, H. Amdt. 367 offered by Representative LOWEY to H.R. 2764, the Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2008, I was unavoidably detained and unable to vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration 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:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern-Lewis amendment. It is time to close the School of the Americas, or WHINSEC. After so many decades of human rights abuses and threats to democracy, the U.S. should not be giving a privileged position to Latin American militaries by maintaining a special school in the United States just for them. Nearly every month in Latin America, a perpetrator of human rights crimes, corruption, or drug-trafficking is found to have attended the School of the Americas. There's a reason that the SOA has been called the "School of the Atrocities."

WHINSEC, as well as current U.S. foreign policies, are making the United States lose ground with the people of Latin America. Our relations with Latin America are at their lowest ebb in several decades. The Abu Ghraib scandal, the doctrine of preemptive war, secret prisons and the debate over detentions in Guantanamo Bay are reported widely and critically in Latin American media. I have traveled to Latin America and seen for myself that the WHINSEC, as the direct heir of the School of the Americas, is viewed throughout Latin America as a symbol of the U.S. priority of strengthening brutal military regimes instead of encouraging development.

Suspending part of the aid to the WHINSEC would show that the United States wants to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past. Such a move would be a significant and positive step forward in repairing our damaged image and credibility. It would also be a blow to those who have strengthened themselves politically by accusing the United States of hypocrisy on human rights and democracy. A more cooperative, less unilateral foreign policy, including the suspension of funding for WHINSEC, will clearly demonstrate our respect for international human rights standards and would help the United States regain influence and build connections in Latin America.

The United States should work with Latin American nations on common solutions to common problems, and our programs should invest in helping Latin American communities help themselves. Instead of providing funds to train human rights abusers, we should provide assistance for clean water, vaccinations for children, micro-credit, technical assistance for small farmers and small business, shelter for refugees and generous disaster relief to build goodwill with our neighbors.

Just last month Nobel Peace Prize Recipient Oscar Arias, President of Costa Rica, announced that Costa Rica would no longer send its police to the WHINSEC for training. We should join Costa Rica (and other Latin American countries who have withdrawn their police from training at WHINSEC) in changing course by withdrawing funding from this criminal training ground.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL ROGER P. LEMPKE

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure today to rise in honor of Major General Roger P. Lempke, the Adjutant General of the Nebraska National Guard since December of 2000. Earlier this morning, General Lempke announced his retirement. I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with General Lempke for a number of years. He is a true Nebraskan and the very definition of a great American.

A graduate of the United States Air Force Academy, General Lempke became a pilot and flew more than 1600 flying hours primarily as an instructor pilot. He has earned the Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal, Armed Forces Service Medal, and the Nebraska National Guard National Defense Service Medal among many other awards and decorations throughout his years of service to our country.

General Lempke served all of Nebraska and the people of the United States as Commandant of the State's military forces, the Nebraska Emergency Management Agency, and as President of the Adjutants General Association of the United States.

Time and time again, our State has needed his leadership when faced with a natural disaster and time and time again, General Lempke has risen to the occasion. He has served his country with dedication and honor during a time of war. The Nebraska National Guard and the United States Armed Forces have been made better through the tireless efforts of General Lempke, and I thank him for his service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, June 21, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 535. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on agreeing to the Boustany of Louisiana amendment.

SBA WOMEN'S BUSINESS PROGRAMS ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 2007

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2397, to reauthorize the women's entrepreneurial development programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

I would first begin by applauding my esteemed colleague from Oklahoma, Congresswoman MARY FALLIN, for her work on, and undertaking of this important piece of legislation. The SBA Women's Business Programs Act of 2007 will help to restore the goal of the Federal Government to award grants to Women's Business Centers, originally operating as a non-profit organizations in conjunction with institutions of higher learning. This bill will also restore the balance of funding between new and existing Women's Business Centers, originally envisioned at the start of the program.

Women Business Centers (WBCs) are community-based projects that are funded by the U.S. Small Business Administration through grants that require matching funds. They provide long-term business skills training, counseling, and mentoring to benefit emerging and existing small businesses that are owned and controlled by women, especially those who are socially or economically disadvantaged. Its goal is to continually ensure that those WBC's that are indeed serving an unmet need in their underserved communities remain sustained. They also work to provide valuable technical assistance to women entrepreneurs.

The SBA's Women's Business Programs Act of 2007 authorizes the National Women's Business Council to conduct annual studies on problems hindering the success of women entrepreneurs and to submit reports to the President and the House and Senate Small Business committees. By offering a three-tiered system of funding and lower caps on spending for older business centers, SBA hopes to make certain that a balanced percentage of the funding is used to support both new and existing business centers. This system will offer assistance to newly established centers, while slowly reducing the older centers dependency on federal grant funds.

Grants awarded to these business centers in their first 5 years were awarded with the intention that after this 5-year period had ended,

the center would be financially self-sustaining. These grants were not intended to be a source of permanent funding. With that said, one of the main objectives of the SBA has been to provide direction and resources to those desiring to start and expand their small business firms.

As once stated by the House Small Business Committee Chairwoman NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, ''today's small business owners are leading the way when it comes to job creation and economic development in communities nationwide. [H.R. 2397] will ensure that the needs of the drivers of our economy—small businesses—are met.'' This legislation dedicates resources to strengthen centers and ensure stability in the program.

I rise today to support, as well as to encourage my other colleagues to join Representative FALLIN and myself in helping to increase the effectiveness of Women's Business Centers nationwide by supporting the SBA Women's Programs Act of 2007, H.R. 2397. I thank you once again, Representative FALLIN, for introducing this important piece of legislation. I am looking forward to witnessing the tremendous effects and positive results that this bill has to offer.

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF NATIONAL CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 148 which declares June as National Caribbean American Heritage Month. I am honored to be a cosponsor of this bill because it recognizes the contributions of Caribbean Americans to the social, economic and cultural landscape to the United States of America. The West Indies represents a diverse melting pot with each island bringing its own unique enriching element to this country's background. With approximately 34 million people and 16 independent nations sharing an African ethnic heritage, the Caribbean is a cosmopolitan region.

Some may wonder, what are we really celebrating during Caribbean Heritage Month? What makes these dynamic groups of people so distinct? Since the 17th century, West Indian slaves were shipped to the Americas. The Caribbean region continued to suffer slavery's wrath long after its abolition. Colonialism continued to strangle the region's independence, creating fragmented and dependent economies. However, in just over 40 years of independence, the region has established democratic governments and strengthened ties with the United States. Despite extenuating circumstances, these former colonies are now rising states which continue to infuse American mainstream culture.

According to the 2005 American Community Survey, some 2.2 million American residents have a West Indian background. Moreover, approximately 32 percent of the Caribbean-American population is currently enrolled in college or graduate school, and 33 percent of the West Indian population is employed in educational, health care, and social services. In my home state of Florida, there is an estimated 649,000 Caribbean Americans. Approximately 30 percent of this population is currently enrolled in college or graduate school and 25 percent are employed in educational, health care, and social services.

Large, dynamic and remarkable communities with Caribbean ancestry exhibit this diversity in Florida's 23rd Congressional District. I am so privileged to represent people of virtually every single Caribbean heritage. From Lauderhill to Miramar to West Palm Beach to Oakland Park, I am honored to work on behalf of all of these communities and many more. There are approximately 153,000 Caribbean Americans currently residing in Florida's 23rd District. The Haitian community is one of the largest in the United States. In Broward County, Puerto Ricans comprise the largest Caribbean group at more than 50,000.

Furthermore, the second largest concentration of Cubans in the United States is in Broward County, with approximately 50,000 Cuban-American residents. Palm Beach County has the sixth largest concentration of Cuban-American residents in the United States, with more than 25,000 Cuban-American residents. Moreover, about 25,000 Palm Beach County residents are of Puerto Rican descent, and more than 7,500 are of Dominican descent.

Mr. Speaker, the National Caribbean American Heritage Month's declaration attests to the United States' reception to Caribbean influence in our country's history and its present socio-economic structure. Undeniably, the educational, political, and artistic influences of Caribbean Americans continue to permeate several facets of our society. The American spirit is a tapestry that weaves cultures together, one in which people of all traditions and walks of life convene to better protect and educate one another. The Caribbean-American people are an invaluable part of this tapestry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed in arriving to the chamber for the series of five recorded votes taken during the evening of Tuesday, June 12, 2007, on amendments to H.R. 2638, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2008. I was therefore unable to cast my vote during the first vote in that series which was on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. CROWLEY. Had I been able to record my vote on this amendment, rollcall No. 453, I would have voted ''no''.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, June 21, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 537. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on agreeing to the Jordan of Ohio Amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 554, H. Amdt. 368 offered by Representative SMITH to H.R. 2764, the Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2008, I was unavoidably detained and unable to vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration 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:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the realignment of funding for Colombia in the FY2008 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. I would like to begin by thanking Chairwoman LOWEY for her leadership on the issues facing Colombia and for crafting such a forward-thinking piece of legislation.

I visited Colombia a few years ago, and learned so much about that beautiful country. On that trip I heard chilling accounts of the tragedy that our policies have created. A lot has changed since my trip, but many of the fundamental problems still exist, and in some cases, have worsened.

I heartily support the new balance of aid in the FY2008 Foreign Operations bill. As outlined in the bill, now 55 percent of aid for Colombia will go toward military functions while 45 percent will go to rural development, social development, and strengthening the judicial system. This new approach is a dramatic change that will help remedy the problems that our policies have caused.

Just this month, the Office of National Drug Control Policy announced that more than 387,900 acres of coca were detected in Colombia in 2006, an increase of 32,120 acres from the previous year. The increase in coca production is a huge blow to the proponents of Plan Colombia, which was created in 2000 to reduce drug cultivation.

This Foreign Ops bill recognizes the failure of past policies—especially our counter-drug initiatives, and moves U.S. policy in the right direction. The funding in this bill will help families persecuted by paramilitaries, farmers struggling to grow crops other than coca,

those displaced by fighting, and the Colombian justice system, which is valiantly struggling to bring justice to victims of violence.

Thank you, once again to Chairwoman LOWEY. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO NICK FRANKOS

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Seaker, I rise today to honor a pillar of the community of Warren, Ohio, who recently passed away. There is a well-known saying which maintains that, 100 years from now, it will not matter what kind of car a person drove or how big their bank account was. The saying affirms that in 100 years, the world may be a better place because of what one person did to help inspire and uplift a child. Very few people in the town of Warren, Ohio, had as profound an impact on so many young lives as Nick Frankos did. A 1943 graduate of Warren G. Harding High School, Frankos was an avid supporter of Warren City Schools and their affiliated athletic teams. Affectionately dubbed ''Uncle Nick,'' he had a paternal, compassionate quality that allowed him to form lifelong bonds with Warren student-athletes and to transform the lives of many of Warren's youth.

In 1956, Frankos opened his much-acclaimed Buena Vista Restaurant, famous around town for serving ''Uncle Nick's Greek Fried Chicken.'' Not only did the restaurant provide delicious meals, but it also served as a popular hangout for local student athletes, coaches, and fans. There were few, if any, high school football coaches who did not frequent the restaurant and who did not know Frankos on a first-name basis. Last year, Frankos was honored by the Warren City Council for 50 years of business excellence in the town.

In addition to his business endeavors, Frankos also served on the Warren City School Board for 12 years. Frankos was notable for his strong support of high school athletics and for his determination to provide local youth with proper athletic facilities. In particular, Frankos was instrumental in securing support for the construction of a new press box at Warren's Mollenkopf Stadium and for the replacement of part of the stadium's seating area. These improvements serve as a remembrance of the staunch support Frankos gave to Warren high school athletics throughout his life.

Madam Speaker, when ''Uncle Nick'' Frankos passed away on May 22 at the age of 82, the community of Warren, Ohio lost more than just a businessman. Many local athletes, coaches, and fans lost a friend. The Warren School Board lost a tireless advocate, and the city of Warren lost a dedicated and caring public servant. Most importantly, the area's youth lost a devoted mentor and role model. It is for his contribution to the youth of Warren, Ohio that ''Uncle Nick'' Frankos should be remembered.

SENATOR BYRD'S 18,000TH VOTE

HON. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD stood in the Senate chamber to do his duty. It was not to deliver a persuasive and enlightening speech featuring laser-focused common sense on the issue at hand. It was not to educate his colleagues on tradition and precedent as the Senate's most prolific historian. And, it was not to politely and eloquently offer an opposing opinion to another Senator's statement. It was to perform what he considers one of his most sacred duties—to cast his vote as a representative of the people.

It was not just any vote, Speaker. It was the 18,000th time that Senator BYRD responded to his duty and it was a monumental moment in the history of the Senate. No other Senator has performed that honored duty as often as the gentleman from West Virginia. He has voted nearly 3,000 more times than the next individual on the list of distinguished public servants who have cast votes in the Senate. He is, truly, the iron man of the United States Senate.

West Virginians love Senator BYRD for many reasons. He has been an avid and effective defender of and advocate for his state; an articulate representative of their views on pressing national issues; and a champion facilitator of federal assistance for thousands of important projects that make peoples' lives better. But, they also love him because of what his never-to-be-matched Senate voting record really represents—an unflinching devotion to the responsibility they have entrusted him to perform.

I have had the honor of watching Senator BYRD for most of my life. He and my father came to Washington together as freshmen members of the House in 1952. Seldom have I ever seen a public servant work so hard to honor the responsibility entrusted to him by his people and the obligation imposed upon him by the United States Constitution.

The range of topics covered by those 18,000 votes must be staggering from the critical to the mundane. But they all received equal attention from Senator BYRD as a sacred duty.

He once wrote that Senators have an obligation to this great Nation to see that the powers of democracy are used effectively to settle important issues. Democracy, he has reasoned, requires us to work together.

He wrote: ''Neither presidents nor Congress can act by fiat, but must work together, each keeping a firm eye on the other branch, and each jealously guarding its own prerogatives. At the same time, we are all judged by the American people who elect us. I have frequently said that I have full faith in the restorative powers of our democracy. What is unchecked will be balanced. What is wrong will be righted in time by our open and democratic system of government. So it has been for the first 200 years in the history of the United States Senate, and so it will be in the future.''

Madam Speaker, Senator BYRD has expressed his faith in our democracy 18,000 times. Today I humbly honor Senator BYRD not just for casting those 18,000 votes as an avid practitioner of democracy. I honor him for his faith in America, in people and in the form of government crafted by the framers of our Constitution.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF PANCREATIC CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 257, which puts the Congress on record in support of the goals and ideals of Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PLATTS, for introducing this important resolution.

Pancreatic cancer is one of the most serious of cancers, it is the fourth most common cause of cancer death in the United States; and is the fifth leading cause of cancer death worldwide. It is responsible for 90 percent of deaths for those who develop the disease.

The incidence of pancreatic cancer is 50–90 percent higher in African Americans than in any other racial group in the United States. Not only is pancreatic cancer more common among African Americans, but African Americans also have the poorest prognosis of any racial group because they often are diagnosed with advanced, and therefore, inoperable cancer. African Americans also are less likely to receive surgery than any other racial group in the United States. Many studies have been conducted to determine why there is an increased risk of pancreatic cancer among African Americans. These studies suggest that environmental and socioeconomic factors may be important. Other risk factors for pancreatic cancer that are more common in African Americans include diabetes mellitus and being overweight.

It is heartbreaking to see people of ''minority'' status suffering from pancreatic cancer. It is a very deadly disease, but not common enough for everyone to be screened for it. The symptoms are vague and non-descript usually until the disease is so advanced there is little that can be done. We know that cancer can be deadly, but early detection is crucial. We also know how tragic the diagnosis of pancreatic cancer can be because of its rapid decline in the individual that has this particular disease.

I know firsthand from a prominent citizen in my community, someone who was vibrant and contributing, who suffered through the disease of pancreatic cancer, having good days and bad days, having recoveries and then relapses.

So I believe it is extremely important that we support the goals and the ideals of Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month. The deadliness of this particular form of cancer goes far beyond the average citizen's comprehension. That is why education and awareness is crucial, and a month of Pancreatic Awareness is a good start to the educational process about the disease and the people who have it.

For these reasons I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, June 21, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 538. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on agreeing to the Price of Georgia amendment.

TRIBUTE TO STUDENTS, PARENTS, TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS OF THE WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

HON. BRAD MILLER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the students, parents, teachers and administrators of the Wake County Public School System, many of whom are in Washington today to accept the National Energy Development Project's "School District of the Year" award.

The National Energy Development Project, or "NEED," is a nonprofit education association dedicated to advancing the understanding of the scientific, economic, and environmental impact of energy. This year, after reviewing more than sixty submissions from across the Nation, the NEED National Award's Review Panel chose to recognize Wake County's public schools for their unique and outstanding work.

Madam Speaker, I am very proud of the students and faculty of the Wake County Public School System. Energy independence and combating global warming are two of the most important and challenging issues confronting our Nation. In the coming years, the goals we set and the choices we make in this area will have profound, irreversible consequences for our Nation and our planet.

More than ever before, America needs informed, innovative and energy-conscious leaders at every level of society. I congratulate the Wake County Public School System for rising to this challenge so impressively, and I commend them, and all the public school systems that participated in this program, for their commitment to this ideal.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, on Monday, June 18, 2007, I was unavoidably detained due to a prior obligation.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows:

(1) Rollcall No. 499: Yes. On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 2563.

(2) Rollcall No. 500: Yes. On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H. Con. Res. 151.

(3) Rollcall No. 501: Yes. On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H. Res. 233.

TRIBUTE TO PETER RENDINA, JR.

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the work of a man I am proud to represent in Congress and prouder still to call a close personal friend and trusted advisor, Mr. Peter Rendina, Jr. Pete is being recognized on Friday, June 22, by his colleagues, upon the occasion of his retirement from the Paterson Public Schools.

It is only fitting that he be honored in this, the permanent record of the greatest freely elected body on earth, for he has a long history of dedication and commitment to the students of our great city. Through his years of teaching history and social studies especially, he has shown countless students the magnificence and power of our great Nation and democracy in action.

Pete is a lifelong resident of Paterson. He is a graduate of School 18 and an Eastside High School Ghost. After graduation, Pete went on to continue his education at Jersey City State University, earning his degree in elementary education, working as a substitute teacher in the Paterson school system while continuing on his studies. After graduation, he became a full-time member of the Paterson Board of Education team. Since then, he has worked with many different grade levels, and taught a variety of courses. In the following years, Pete returned to Jersey City State, earning his Masters degree in Urban Education, Administration and Supervision. Soon he was serving as an adjunct professor, first at Upsala College and Passaic County Community College (PCCC), and later at Seton Hall University as well.

He has circumvented the educational bureaucracy that constricts many teachers and earned the admiration and trust of his pupils. The respect he has earned from his students is unprecedented and unmatched. He serves not only as an educator but also as a mentor; he helps his students to handle not only the academic rigors of high school, but also the many other challenges they face.

All the while, Pete has been living the lessons he teaches. His students learn about our government from someone who works in the field directly. Whether it was the 2 years he spent working as Congressman Herb Klein's district administrator, or the many years since that he has served as a special aide to me, he has been involved in the day to day affairs of our great government. His students have the benefit of learning civics from a teacher who works in the field and lives it first hand.

In addition to his work in the classroom, he has made his mark as a coach and athletic director. Pete has coached softball, basketball, football, track and volleyball on the high school level. On the collegiate level, he has led the men's basketball teams at both PCCC and William Paterson College, and served as the athletic director at PCCC. His talent for motivating his athletes to perform to the best of their ability and reach their goals makes him a successful coach. Just as when he is in the classroom, his mentoring skills with his players enable them to succeed on and off the field.

Outside of his profession, Pete has contributed greatly to the Passaic County community in a civic role. He has served as the president of the Passaic County Technical and Vocational High School Board of Education, as a member of the board of trustees of the PCCC Foundation, and as commissioner of the Passaic County Board of Social Services.

His contributions to education, in Paterson and beyond, cannot possibly all be listed. Most importantly, he is a personality who, in every sense, cannot be replaced. I value his friendship and know that although he is retiring from teaching, his service to his community will continue.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing the accomplishments of educators like Peter Rendina. I applaud the Eastside High School family for honoring Pete, and join them in wishing him a fantastic retirement.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, the members of the Eastside High School Ghost family, the Paterson Board of Education, Pete's family and friends, all those whose lives have been touched by him, and me in recognizing the outstanding and invaluable achievements of Mr. Peter Rendina, Jr.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration 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:

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment to close down the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation. It is time to stop and examine our history so that we can avoid repeating the mistakes of the past. Our relations with our neighbors in Latin America are at their lowest ebb ever. The people of Latin America think the U.S. is more concerned with achieving goals through military means no matter the consequences. They think the U.S. is not concerned with human and democratic rights in Latin America. We need to start winning over the citizens of our planet and show them our desire to bring human rights to everyone.

The time has come for our country to cease our support of this Institution, to put down the swords, and instead show our neighbors in Latin America that our actions adhere to our preaching. U.S. assistance has been increasingly weighted towards harsh and ineffective counter-narcotics and military aid.

After so many decades of human rights abuses and threats to democracy, why is the U.S. Government still giving so privileged a position to Latin American militaries, such that it maintains a special school in the United States just for them? Our neighbors need assistance for clean water, vaccinations for children, micro-credit, technical assistance for small farmers and small business, shelter for

refugees and generous disaster relief builds good will with our neighbors.

If we end this Institute once and for all, we will show that the priorities of the United States are with democratic and civil institutions. A more cooperative, less unilateral foreign policy that clearly demonstrates respect for international human rights standards would help the United States regain influence around the world.

It is time to sow the seeds of peace; we must stop sowing the seeds of war. As a great Nation and blessed people, we must heed the words of the spiritual—"I am going to lay my burden down, down by the riverside. I ain't gonna study war no more." We do not need this school. My colleagues, I urge you to vote in favor of this amendment.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JAMES ''JIM'' H. SHIMBERG

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to herald the life and philanthropic contributions of James "Jim" H. Shimberg, and to acknowledge our pride in the communities he founded in the Tampa Bay area.

A native of Syracuse, New York, Jim Shimberg served as a First Lieutenant in World War II. After he received his degree from the University of Chicago Law School, he practiced law in New York for nearly 10 years. Jim then relocated to the Tampa, Florida area in 1958 to launch a community business. By 1983, his development of over 6,000 homes, several recreation centers, schools, and shopping centers in northwest Hillsborough County laid the foundation of the Town 'N Country community.

Jim's success in community development led him to become President of the Tampa Home Builders Association and the Florida Home Builders Association, as well as Vice President of the National Association of Home Builders. He was co-founder of the National Housing Endowment and was inducted into the National Housing Hall of Fame in 1985. After developing the Town 'N Country community, Jim served as chairman for the Hillsborough County Charter Review Board and was largely responsible for the expansion and development of eastern Hillsborough County.

The philanthropic contributions of Jim Shimberg have unquestionably improved the lives of thousands of Floridians. His dedication to the well-being of Floridians led him to found the University Community Hospital in 1968. He served as the first Chairman of the Board for 9 years, and as chair of the investment committee for the duration of his life. His commitment to providing quality health care services led him to serve as Vice-President of the Judeo Christian Health Clinic for 25 years. In addition, Jim endowed the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing at the University of Florida in 1991, and funded the philanthropic National Endowment in Washington, DC.

As a result of his immense lifetime philanthropic contributions, Jim Shimberg was honored as Tampa's Outstanding Citizen of the Year in 2007. He and his wife, Amy Shimberg, were also honored as the 2003 Philanthropists of the Year by the Tampa Chapter of the Association of Fundraising Professionals.

The Tampa community honors the life of Jim Shimberg, his wife Amy, daughters Janet and Nancy, sons Jim, Richard, and Robert, and the entire Shimberg family for their outstanding contributions to the Florida community. Jim Shimberg's life serves as an inspiration to all who knew him, and will continue to benevolently impact the lives of Floridians in the future.

THE EXTENSIVELY DRUG RESISTANT-TUBERCULOSIS INCIDENT: A POORLY COORDINATED FEDERAL RESPONSE TO AN INCIDENT WITH HOMELAND SECURITY IMPLICATIONS

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for holding this very important hearing to discuss and investigate a possible breakdown in security procedures or the lack of adequate safety measures sufficient to safeguard against and minimize a potentially very serious public health security threat, namely the contraction of the extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis (XDR–TB). I would also like to take this time to welcome our witnesses, Dr. Martin S. Cetron, Dr. Jeffrey W. Runge, and Mr. W. Ralph Basham, (accompanied by Jayson P. Ahern).

Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago, Mr. Andrew Speaker, an individual known to be infected with multi-drug resistant-tuberculosis (MDR–TB) was subsequently confirmed to be infected with extensively drug resistant-tuberculosis (XDR–TB). He disregarded a recommendation from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to seek medical treatment in Italy, and returned to the United States by altering his flight itinerary, flying to Canada, and then driving through the U.S.-Canada border. A number of homeland security and public health processes were utilized to manage the situation and failed at a variety of points.

The purpose of this hearing is to provide Members with the opportunity to (1) determine where weaknesses exist with homeland security processes designed to prevent entry into the U.S., (2) explore the inefficient interactions between the Department of Homeland Security (the Department) and the CDC when addressing public health security issues, and (3) identify areas for immediate and longer term improvement.

According to current U.S. public health policy, the CDC must be apprised when MDR–TB appears also to be extensively drug resistant so that the CDC can provide laboratory confirmation of XDR–TB. A very important question immediately comes to mind in Mr. Speaker's case: given the increasing incidence and prevalence of all types of TB, including MDR– and XDR–TB, should the CDC have been apprised sooner?

Mr. Chairman, in urgent matters such as preventing the spread of potentially serious and very harmful public health risks such as XDR–TB, time is most certainly of the essence. In January, Andrew Speaker, a 31-year-old Atlanta lawyer, fell and hurt his ribs. He received an X-ray, revealing an abnormality in the upper lobe of his right lung. This suggested tuberculosis. Speaker began meeting regularly with Fulton County health officials for treatment. In early March, Speaker underwent a procedure to get a sample of sputum from his lungs. By the end of the month, lab cultures revealed he had tuberculosis (TB).

Though it is still unclear, it appears that the CDC was not notified of these events until May 17 when it was called in to test for XDR–TB. Health officials determined Speaker had a multiple-drug resistant (MDR) form of TB. According to press accounts, Fulton County health officials called the Georgia Division of Public Health (GDPH) on May 10, but gave the impression that the problem was "largely hypothetical" The GDPH then made a call to the CDC. Some questions still persist and will hopefully be answered in this hearing. It is extremely important to know when the CDC was notified about Speaker's case of MDR–TB. It is also helpful for this Committee to know what the formal procedure by which the CDC was asked to perform its analysis. It is reported that the CDC was called in to test for XDR–TB on Thursday May 17. Was this the proper protocol to follow? If not, why wasn't the CDC asked to perform the analysis earlier?

Notifying the CDC of potential public health threats in a timely manner is also important because the sooner the CDC is notified the sooner public safety authorities can put measures in place to protect the public. Had the CDC been notified, the CDC may have been able to prevent Mr. Speaker from traveling and subjecting the public to potential risks of contracting XDR–TB.

As the Chairwoman of the Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, what I find even more alarming is the fact that the Transportation Security Administration was not notified until after the incident took place; after he had already posed a threat to the lives of hundreds of Americans and non-Americans. Had the TSA received forewarning, the identity of Mr. Andrew Speaker could have been disclosed in such a manner and he would have been placed on the "no-fly" list.

Mr. Speaker was simply given too many opportunities to create a public health crisis in this country and abroad. On May 12, Speaker departed Atlanta on Air France flight 385. Speaker arrived in Paris on May 13. On May 14, Speaker flew from Paris to Athens on Air France flight 1232. Speaker flew from Athens to Thira Island on Olympic Air flight 560 the following day. The CDC called in to test for XDR–TB. On May 17, the GDPH was notified that Speaker had flown overseas. Four days later, tests came back positive for XDR–TB. Meanwhile on that same day, Speaker flew from Mykonos to Athens on Olympic Air 655 and then he flew from Athens to Rome on Olympic Air 239.

Mr. Chairman, questions still persist about the ability of the Federal Government to quarantine an individual. DHS officials told Committee staff that Federal officials do not have the authority to quarantine. This is inaccurate. The President may issue an executive order for federal isolation and quarantine for the following communicable diseases: cholera, diphtheria, infectious tuberculosis, plague, smallpox, yellow fever, viral hemorrhagic fevers,

and SARS. What are the policies and procedures to implement a quarantine/isolation, and what is the role of DHS?

We must ensure that we provide public health security policies and guidelines that result in the highest level of precautions against public health threats. There is an old saying that it is better safe than sorry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, June 21, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 539. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on agreeing to the Musgrave of Colorado amendment.

TRIBUTE TO RICK SPARROW

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, today, I come before you to honor Rick Sparrow for his decades of service to the 15th District of Illinois. Next fall will be the first time in over 30 years that Rick will not grace the basketball courts of East-Central Illinois. While the residents of Fisher, Illinois will always remember him as ''Coach Sparrow,'' Rick actually began his basketball career as a youth referee. Due to his love of the game of basketball and his commitment to the children of Fisher, Rick spent nearly 12 years as an official, refereeing hundreds of games. Even with the demands of his job as a manager with FritoLay and responsibilities as a loving husband, father and grandfather, Rick then decided to make the move to the sidelines as a youth coach where he remained for the past 18 years.

Coach Sparrow will be remembered for his dedication, loyalty, passion and friendship. While he always pushed his players to the limit on the basketball court, he did so with respect, warmth and kindness. Rick treated every player as if he was his own child, and kept strong ties with his former players long after their playing careers were over. In fact, four of his twelve current warehouse employees at FritoLay are former Fisher Bunnies.

Rick's unheralded success as both an assistant and head coach is undoubtedly a product of the relationships he formed with each player he coached. In 1996, Coach Sparrow was named the IHSA Junior High District Coach of the year. In the 90's, he coached his junior high teams to six consecutive IESA state tournaments. And just this last year, Rick was a member of the coaching staff that led St. Joseph-Ogden High School to the super-sectional finals of the Illinois High School Association basketball tournament.

Now that the Coach has graced the sidelines for the last time, there will be more time to enjoy time and activities with his beloved wife, children and grandchildren. While he may not be in the gym next fall, the impact he has made on the Fisher community will continue for years to come.

Coach, the 15th District thanks you for your 30 years of service and your commitment to our community's student-athletes. You have enriched the lives of your players and their families.

IN HONOR OF RUBEN RAMOS, JR.

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker. I rise to honor Hoboken City Councilman-at-Large Ruben Ramos, Jr. during Hoboken Cultural Week 2007. Ramos, Jr., who was born and raised in Hoboken, is the first Puerto Rican from, Hoboken to be nominated to the New Jersey State Assembly.

At age 25, Ramos, Jr. became the youngest councilman to be elected in the City of Hoboken in 1999, representing the 4th Ward. That same year, Ramos, Jr. was diagnosed with Hodgkin's disease. A proven fighter, Ramos, Jr. underwent rigorous chemotherapy treatment and was declared cancer free a year later, going on to become one of the most outstanding Hoboken citizens of Puerto Rican heritage.

Two years later, in 2001, Ramos, Jr. ran successfully for Councilman-at-Large, and became the youngest City Council President in the history of Hoboken. He was re-elected to the City Council in 2005.

During his 8 years serving on the Hoboken City Council, Ruben Ramos, Jr. has been able to work effectively with its members to bring effective development to the city and the waterfront. Ramos, Jr. took action to create more open space while expanding much needed residential parking spaces. Councilman Ramos, Jr. also helped clean up the Housing Authority and created the town's summer employment for teenagers program in city departments.

In the national arena, Ramos, Jr. was selected by Al Gore's 2000 election committee to serve on the Platform Committee of the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, where he delivered a stirring keynote speech. Ramos, Jr. was also chosen by the Democratic National Committee to serve on their credentials committee during the presidential campaign.

Councilman Ruben Ramos, Jr. is a graduate of Farleigh Dickinson University and has taught Social Studies to sixth, seventh and eighth-grade students for the last 10 years. Aware of their needs and hoping to shape the lives of young residents in the area, Ramos, Jr. has volunteered with the Hoboken Boy's and Girl's Club.

Please join me in honoring Ruben Ramos, Jr. during Hoboken Cultural Week and congratulating his wife Norma, his two beautiful daughters, and the Puerto Rican family members who helped shape the outstanding life of this young elected official that has become a role model for his fellow citizens.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hinchey-Wolf amendment, which would prohibit funds in this bill from being used to designate any area as a National Interest Electric Transmission Corridor (NIETC).

By providing a 1-year time out in the designation of NIETCs, the amendment will force the Department of Energy, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Congress, States and the public to reexamine the process for designating these areas to ensure that States' rights are upheld and people's personal property rights are protected.

Specifically, this amendment will postpone a flawed plan by the Department of Energy to designate two vast swaths of the country as NIETCs. Far from narrow ''corridors,'' these massive areas encompass 214 counties and 9 cities in 11 states, including large areas in my home State of New York.

The way these areas have been designated has come under intense scrutiny, and for good reason. In a hearing in the Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on Domestic Policy earlier this year, it was made clear that the DOE did not adequately consult with the States on this issue and that the designations would actually hinder the States' efforts to address climate change. In addition, the congestion study which the proposed corridor designations are based on was fundamentally flawed. Last, the DOE simply failed to consider the appropriate alternatives to corridor designation.

At that hearing Paul D. Tonko, Chairman, Committee on Energy, New York State Assembly said, ''There is little confidence, at this moment, that federal government officials—who are far removed from the physical and socio-economic location of local proposals—will be able to fully appreciate the environmental, economic and social impacts of long-range, high-voltage transmission lines in local communities.''

I also want to note that Governor Eliot Spitzer of New York strongly supports the Hinchey amendment. He has made clear that the NIETC designation in New York is not only unnecessary, it would actually be counter-productive because if it is finalized, the FERC would be able to preempt parts of New York's long-established and efficient process for siting transmission lines.

Most appallingly, if we do not pass the Hinchey amendment, the FERC could eventually have the ability to give energy companies the power of Federal eminent domain to force private landowners to sell parts of their property. We just cannot allow States' rights to be trampled and private property rights to be taken away.

Yes, we absolutely need to make sure that there is an efficient process in place to meet the critical energy needs of my constituents in New York City and in other large urban areas. However, that process must also be fair. It must protect the rights of private property owners, take into account environmental and historic preservation concerns, and not unnecessarily usurp States' rights. That's why I will cast my vote in favor of the Hinchey amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, June 21, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 540. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on agreeing to the Pence of Indiana amendment.

TRIBUTE TO ARMY SERGEANT CORY ENDLICH

HON. RALPH REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, with great sorrow I rise to pay tribute and recognize a dedicated soldier and citizen from my district. On Saturday, June 9, 2007, Army Sergeant Cory Endlich lost his life during hostile fire while patrolling an area northwest of Baghdad.

A 2003 graduate of Massillon Washington High School, Sergeant Endlich was a 4-year member of the Massillon Tiger Swing Band as well as a 2-year member of the cross country team. While many of his friends dreamed about becoming professional athletes, he dreamed of becoming a paratrooper for the United States Army. He was also a devoted citizen, helping in missions at home, including the rebuilding of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina before his deployment to Iraq.

This outstanding young man showed courage and a commitment to protect those who could not protect themselves. He had requested in his last letter to his mother for her to send coloring books, crayons and hard candy for Iraqi children he had befriended. Sergeant Endlich is a true hero and a reminder of the dedication evidenced by all the men and women all over the world fighting the war on terror. We must reflect on this great life and all the good that is being done in Iraq.

Army Sergeant Endlich and his family will be forever in our hearts and prayers. May we keep them in mind as they struggle through this difficult period of mourning.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes:

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday, this body debated the Energy and Water Appropriations bill for the upcoming fiscal year. During debate, I offered an amendment which would have added $192 million for the purpose of supporting and diversifying the core mission of our Nation's laboratories. Although my amendment did not pass, I remain strongly committed to the idea that a diversification of the mission of our labs is essential and must take place now if we are going to continue to face—and solve—the major national security challenges of the future.

The debate of the amendment brought up several misconceptions and misunderstandings, and I want to take this time to reiterate the purpose and substance of the amendment.

First, some said that my amendment would increase "funding for new nuclear weapon development." This is simply not true. My amendment would return spending approximately to current levels—thereby not providing for the funding of new weapons. As I stated in my previous remarks, my amendment would target funding for three programs, all of which support securing and maintaining our Nation's existing weapons and the core mission of the laboratory. In fact, two of the three programs—the Road Runner Supercomputer and the Science Campaign—help ensure our current weapons supply remains safe, reliable and accurate through computer simulations of weapons in the place of real weapons testing. In the past, I have expressed great concern with the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program, and I continue to believe that numerous important questions regarding this proposal need to be answered before it proceeds. I doubt our need for a new weapon.

Second, some said that my amendment could "terminate most of the Nation's nonproliferation programs" and that opposing the amendment would "stop terrorists from acquiring nuclear materials." This is also not true. According to the committee report, $75 million of the Office of the NNSA Administrator is set aside for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program. My amendment would have set total funding for the Office of the NNSA Administrator at $215 million, more than enough to continue to fund the nonproliferation program. Further, my amendment did not in any way stipulate that the funding would come from the nonproliferation program. It should be noted that current funding for the Office is $340 million. Clearly the $415 million provided in this bill is a substantial increase for all programs. Even if my amendment had been adopted, the agency still could have completed these important tasks.

Third, some said that my amendment indicated that "jobs in New Mexico are more important than the overall national management of these sensitive national security programs." Certainly representing the constituency needs of the Third Congressional District of New Mexico is my primary concern. And, yes, those who would lose their jobs under this bill—technical, academic and support jobs in which many have spent decades—are worried. But let me be absolutely clear about this: Neither I nor a single member of the Los Alamos community would for a moment rather protect these jobs than protect the safety and defense of our national security programs. The men and women who work at Los Alamos take great pride in their mission and service to our Nation. They understand the unique undertaking of the lab, and it is my honor to represent them.

Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday night I held a telephone town hall with the community of Los Alamos on this issue. During the town hall an informal poll question asked whether people support a diversification of the lab's mission. Eighty-four percent of the respondents—over half of whom were employees at LANL—supported such a diversification.

I do not believe that we must continue with a status quo mission for our national laboratories. Nor do I believe that creating a national security strategy in a policy vacuum without any regard for the needs of the future is the way to proceed. There is an absolute need, and, in fact, a great opportunity, for our national laboratories to diversify their missions and expand the scientific research being conducted in order to meet the challenges we are facing. From energy independence to health care to climate change modeling, we have the capacity for this diversification. I hope that in the coming months and years I will be joined by others who believe in this cause.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration 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:

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2764, the FY08 Department of State, Foreign Operations, and related appropriations Act.

I am pleased that the bill includes $75 million in funding for programs that address the needs of Afghan women and girls including the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission, the Afghan Ministry of Women's Affairs, and women-led nonprofit organizations in Afghanistan. The Committee directs $15 million of these funds to be made available as grants to support training and equipment to improve the capacity of women-led Afghan NGOs as well as their activities. This funding builds upon funding for Afghan women and girls included in an amendment that I offered to the FY2004 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill and funding included in subsequent appropriations bills.

During the past several years, the United States has invested in the reconstruction and development of Afghanistan both because it is the right thing to do and because it is critical to our security. However, I, like many of my colleagues, am troubled by the circumstances facing women in Afghanistan. We have heard from Dr. Sima Samar, head of the Afghan

Independent Human Rights Commission, that Afghan women are losing ground. Many women continue to endure hardships including targeted violence, limited mobility, illiteracy, and a high rate of maternal mortality. I also am very concerned about reports that schools continue to be targeted for violence, including dozens in the past year. Clearly, we have more work to do.

While I hope that all the aid for Afghanistan will help women, I commend the Appropriations Committee for continuing to recognize the needs of Afghan women.

I would also like to commend Chairman LOWEY for her commonsense approach to refining the Global Gag Rule. Though I support a full repeal of this harmful policy, the Lowey provision is a first step toward eliminating the Gag Rule altogether—it will allow organizations to receive contraceptives which are proven to prevent unintended pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases, It makes sense and it's the right thing to do.

As a co-chair of the Human Trafficking Caucus and a long-time proponent of increased efforts to combat this global human rights travesty, I am pleased to note the language regarding trafficking in the report that accompanies this bill. Earlier this year, I sent a letter to the Department of State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee expressing my support for these critical initiatives to combat trafficking. The committee report includes a recommendation that the Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Office at the Department of State retain control of the monies appropriated for TIP programs and not be subject to decentralized influence of field posts and to enable the TIP Office to disburse the necessary anti-trafficking funding to grantees more quickly. The committee also recommends the addition of six full-time equivalent (FTE) positions to the TIP office so that it can effectively monitor its anti-trafficking grants and can effectively fulfill the vital, congressionally assigned responsibility given to the Senior Policy Operating Group, which it chairs, of monitoring and coordinating the domestic and international anti-trafficking grants and policies of all U.S. agencies.

The committee also has directed $14,000,000 to the Trafficking in Persons program, which is $5,300,000 above the President's request, and $6,000,000 in INCLE (International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement) funding for activities to prevent trafficking in persons. I have worked closely with Ranking Member WOLF on this issue over the past few years, and I thank him for his leadership in the fight against trafficking and human rights abuses worldwide.

Finally, as a co-chair and co-founder of the Hellenic Caucus, I am pleased that the committee has restored funding for the Greek desk at Voice of America. Because Greece is located at the crossroads of Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, maintaining this critical program is vital to U.S. interests in this important region of the world.

I commend Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member WOLF for their work in bringing this bill forward, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, June 21, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 541. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on agreeing to the King of Iowa Amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 449, 500 and 501, I was absent due to flight difficulties.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on all three.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, during consideration of H.R. 2764 on the Pence Amendment thereto roll No. 540, my vote was mistakenly recorded as no; however, I intended to vote yes. I strongly support restrictions of financial aid to the Palestinian government in the West Bank and Gaza, unless the president certifies that it renounces terrorism, acknowledges the existence of Israel and abides by previous agreements reached between the Palestinians and Israel, with the exception of certain humanitarian aid. I would like the record to reflect my intent to vote yes on roll No. 540 in support of the Pence Amendment. Moreover, I voted multiple times in the 109th Congress in favor of the restrictions contained in the Pence Amendment. Furthermore, I voted in favor of final passage of H.R. 2764, which included the restrictions contained in the Pence Amendment.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY: ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF AFRICAN REFUGEES

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, two days ago, on June 20th, the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health held a hearing on the occasion of World Refugee Day. This day was designated by the United Nations General Assembly in 2001 to be commemorated each year in order to honor the contributions of refugees around the world and to call attention to the plight of those who continue to suffer as refugees. This day also coincides with Africa Refugee Day, which has been commemorated since 1975 and was established by the Organization of African Unity Commission of Ten on Refugees as a way to raise funds for assistance for refugees in Africa.

It is shocking to consider that 12 million people in the world are refugees today, and almost a quarter of those, 3.2 million, live in Africa. In addition, Africa has an estimated 12 million Internally Displaced Persons, most of whom are victims of conflicts within their countries. Floods and droughts have also contributed to the dislocation of large numbers of African people. More than half of the world's refugees have lived in camps for several years, with no foreseeable prospects for returning to their homes and a normal lifestyle.

No one can measure the suffering that often comes with being a refugee—being a stranger in a strange land, the inability of children to attend school, the frustration of parents unable to provide the basic necessities for their families, the hardships and fears that come with living in a tent, or having no shelter at all. One might forget that refugees often also are suffering the emotional trauma that results from violence inherent in the conflicts that produce refugees.

For that reason, it was particularly useful to hear the testimony of Neal Porter, the Director of International Services from the Center for Victims of Torture. Legislation that I have sponsored, including the Torture Victims Relief Reauthorization Act of 2007 which passed the House on April 25, 2007 and is now pending in the Senate, provides authorization for programming that helps refugees and others suffering the effects of torture. I would encourage my colleagues in the Senate to act on this bill so that the Center for Victims of Torture and others who provide services to torture survivors can receive the assistance they so desperately need.

The international community accomplished a major milestone when it recognized refugees as having certain rights under international law in the 1951 U.N. Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees plays a major role in ensuring that the promised resources and protection are provided. However, as laudable as international recognition and assistance are for assisting those forced to flee from their homes, far more needs to be done to prevent people from becoming refugees in the first place, and to accommodate the safe return and re-establishment of those already refugees or IDPs. This subcommittee hearing provided an important opportunity to examine what we in the United States and the world community can do in this respect.

Although I and others have devoted significant attention in recent months and years to the tragedy in Darfur, one can never over-publicize the desperate situation of the victims of the Sudanese Government's genocide. When I think of refugees, my mind immediately recalls those who I met in the Mukjar and Kalma camps, only some of the 2 million who have been displaced from their homes in that region. The term "displaced" does not begin to describe the nightmare situation that these people must live in. As we have heard through testimony at recent hearings on Darfur, these people long most of all not for food or shelter, though they have little of either, but for protection. And with good reason—over 450,000 people have died in the violence of Darfur.

On the occasion of World Refugee Day, we could not forget those who voluntarily subject themselves to the same harsh conditions in order to care for and protect refugees and displaced persons. It was necessary to pay a special tribute particularly to the men and women who have suffered violence, many to the point of death, in their efforts to assist the people of Darfur. Humanitarian groups there have reported being harassed by the Government of Sudan and deliberately attacked by rebel groups. Over a dozen humanitarian workers have been killed over the past year. In mid-December 2006, armed groups launched a major attack against NGO compounds in Gereida, South Darfur. On January 19, 2007, Sudanese Government security forces arrested and severely beat 20 UN staff members in Nyala, South Darfur. On February 5, 2007, a civilian police officer with AMIS was killed in an IDP camp in the North.

The men and women who risk their welfare and their very lives to care for these refugees truly live out the words, ''I was hungry, and you gave me food; thirsty and you gave me drink; a stranger, and you welcomed me.'' I convey to these heroic men and women my personal gratitude for lending their hands and hearts to some of our poorest brothers and sisters.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, June 21, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 542. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on agreeing to H.R. 2764, the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations for FY 2008.

HONORING MS. JILL CARPENTER NOAA TEACHER AT SEA

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Ms. Jill Carpenter, an outstanding constituent and educator from the 10th Congressional District of Virginia, for her dedication to bringing real scientific research to the classroom.

Ms. Carpenter, a fifth grade teacher at Hutchinson Farm Elementary in South Riding, VA, was chosen last summer by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Teacher at Sea Program to participate in a ten-day research cruise on the Atlantic Ocean. From aboard the NOAA Ship DELEWARE II, Ms. Carpenter not only researched fisheries, but also interviewed scientists, maintained daily logs, and engaged in dialogue with her fellow teachers, students and the general public. She took part in the Teacher at Sea experience in order to enrich her curriculum and excite her students about the sciences.

In her log, Ms. Carpenter wrote, ''It is exciting to see science experiments happening every day, with real people in a real-life context, instead of reading about it from a worksheet or having that intangible image in my mind of a mad scientist in a white lab coat stirring a beaker of something bubbling. Science is accessible to everybody! You don't have to be in a fancy laboratory or have the latest equipment. It can be done inside or out, on a boat or in your backyard. Science encompasses so many fields and is available to anyone with a curious mind. I am excited to share this realization with my students and make science more real to them. I am looking forward to returning home to my family, friends, and classroom and sharing my experience with them. This trip has been invaluable to me in so many ways. I have met with many amazing people, I have participated in recording ocean data, and I have seen how much thought, effort and talent goes into running a fisheries research vessel. I gained hands-on knowledge and experience.'' Ms. Carpenter was supported by a partnership between the Loudoun Education Foundation and the NOAA Teacher at Sea Program.

I am proud to call attention to Ms. Carpenter's dedication. I congratulate Ms. Carpenter on her spirit of adventure, her willingness to try new things, and her ability to bring this experience back to the classroom. I also commend the Loudoun County School district and the Loudoun Education Foundation for supporting the efforts of this teacher to promote scientific education in the classroom.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, on Monday, June 18, 2007 and Wednesday, June 20, 2007, I was unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall numbers 499, 500, 501, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525 and 526.

Had I been present for the votes, I would have voted ''aye'' on the following rollcall votes: 499, 500, 501, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 521 and 526, and ''nay'' on the following rollcall votes: 517, 518, 519, 520, 522, 523, 524 and 525.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE PETERS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplishments of Mike Peters and to thank him for his leadership in the fight against cancer. Through his internationally-acclaimed music, his Love Hope Strength Foundation, and through his personal victories over cancer, Mike Peters has been a source of inspiration and hope to the millions affected by cancer around the world.

Mike Peters is best known as the vocalist of the legendary Welsh rock band, The Alarm, whose music has received critical acclaim and commercial success worldwide. After being diagnosed with Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma in 1995, he could have canceled his band's upcoming tour and fought his illness in private. Instead, he courageously moved forward with the tour and, as Mike has put it, ''went to war with his mind,'' wearing his now-famous green combat fatigues throughout the tour, and keeping a positive outlook on his life. When he returned, that courage and optimism paid off—his condition had reversed and he no longer needed treatment.

Ten years after his first victory over Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma, he found out he would have another battle ahead. In 2005, he was diagnosed with Chronic Lymphocyte Leukemia. These cancers develop within a patient's lymphatic system and can be difficult to treat, depending when it is caught. Significant strides have been made in finding treatments for leukemia and lymphoma, but more must be done to prevent these diseases from occurring and to alleviate the suffering of so many who are diagnosed with these diseases every year.

With the same positive attitude and green combat fatigues that carried him through his first battle with cancer, Mike did not let his diagnosis slow him down. Using his musical talents and network of artists, Peters established the Love Hope Strength Foundation to build a support network for cancer patients worldwide. The goal of the Foundation is to increase funding for cancer research, lighten the financial strain of medical care on cancer patients and their families, and inform government officials about the concerns of cancer patients. Peters continues to maintain a busy tour schedule, giving inspired performances and raising awareness about his foundation and the fight against cancer.

Mike Peters should be applauded for not taking his diagnosis without a fight. His personal victories over cancer and his foundation's programs are giving hope to families and communities worldwide. His efforts are an example for how one person can turn his struggles into a triumph and an inspiration for others, and it is my privilege to honor him here today.

PAULA BLINCOE COLLINS' ART SELECTED FOR THE CITY OF DENTON

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, it is my greatest pleasure to announce that Paula Blincoe Collins of Denton has been selected by the Denton Public Art Committee to create its first commissioned piece of public art which is to be displayed in the lobby of the Denton Civic Center. The piece is a mural that portrays Quakertown, an African-American settlement that stood where the Denton Civic Center is before it was relocated to Southeast Denton in the 1920s.

The artist Paula Collins is well known for her skills in brick sculpture. Among her many creations are two previously completed projects for City facilities, the ''Woman of Justice'' installed in 1994 and two entrance monuments erected in Denton at the Pecan Creek Waste Management facility in 2000.

For this project, which is expected to be completed in spring 2008, Ms. Collins will consult with the descendants of the original

Quakertown residents. Together they will select a wide assortment of images that represent life in that community and which will be depicted on the brick mural.

The nine-member Public Art Committee was appointed by the City Council in 2006 to promote the cultural environment, tourism, enhance community aesthetics, improve the quality of life by allowing people to experience art in public places, showcase cultural diversity, and create a distinctive city identity. It serves as an advisory committee to the Parks, Recreation, and Beautification Board, which are also council appointed. The director of the Greater Denton Arts Council serves as an ex-officio member and the director of the Denton Parks and Recreation Department is staff liaison to the committee. Its funding comes from the hotel tax funds allocated annually for public events and projects that make Denton an attractive tourist venue.

I am honored to serve such a talented individual like Paula Collins, and I know that her art will beauty our great city.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote 543. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on ordering the Previous Question to H. Res. 502, providing for the consideration of H.R. 2771, Legislative Branch Appropriations for FY 2008.

HONORING OUTSTANDING AFRICAN AMERICAN MUSICIANS DURING BLACK MUSIC MONTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of African American musicians as we celebrate Black Music Month.

Music has a deep historical significance to African Americans, who are truly the founders and keepers of American music. The roots of gospel and blues can be traced back to the slave plantations. During slavery, African Americans sang songs and clapped hands to communicate with one another and to uplift their spirits. The music helped to sustain enslaved people and provided an outlet to express their hopes and fears. During the Civil Rights Movement, African American musicians offered encouragement and hope for an America in which all people would be treated equally. By creating and popularizing gospel, blues, jazz, funk, disco, pop, and hip-hop, they have inspired and entertained people from all races around the world.

I wish to thank President Carter, who in 1979 initiated the annual celebration of Black Music Month each June. Each succeeding president has continued to proclaim June as Black Music Month.

Among the many talented and gifted African American musicians, who have inspired us in ways that transcended their music, I have introduced legislation in the 110th Congress to honor Lionel Hampton, Lena Horne, James Brown, and Ray Charles. Their commitment to uplifting America through song and activism has made them legendary.

Lionel Hampton, an accomplished jazz musician, band leader, U.S. goodwill ambassador, became a musical icon in a career that spanned more than 50 years until his death in 2002. He composed more than 200 pieces and was honored by President Clinton with the National Medal of Arts in 1996. The University of Idaho's music school and annual jazz festival are named in his honor.

The extraordinary Lena Horne was not only a Broadway performer, world renowned singer, and actress, she was a steadfast civil rights activist. Putting her career on the line, she proudly spoke out against racial discrimination. As a result, she was blackballed.

However, her hardship was not in vain because she has been a trailblazer and role model for aspiring African American entertainers. She was honored with the Grammy Lifetime Achievement Award in 1989. Her most recent album Seasons Of Life was released in January of 2006. She currently resides in New York and on June 30, 2007, will turn 90 years old.

James Brown, the "Godfather of Soul," who passed away in December of 2006, was a monumental influence on popular music in America and around the world. During the sixties, many of his songs were more than dance hits and became anthems for the Civil Rights Movement. His music instilled pride in African Americans as they were fighting for equality. He was inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame in 1986 and was the recipient of the 34th Annual Grammy Lifetime Achievement Award in 1992.

The phenomenal Ray Charles overcame blindness and personal problems to become one of America's most inspiring artists. His music advanced the civil rights movement and united Americans. He has been credited with singing the most popular rendition of America the Beautiful. His version of Georgia On My Mind was made an official Georgia state song and he was ranked number ten in 2004 for Rolling Stone's 100 Greatest Artist of All Times list. In that same year, he passed away. I introduced legislation to award him with a Congressional Gold Medal.

These musical legends and many other African American musicians have contributed to American music and the nation's cultural identity around the world. I urge my colleagues to support legislation to honor them. I also urge my colleagues and people around the world to celebrate, honor, and cherish the contributions of African American musicians, especially during Black Music Month.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes:

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a project that deserves the support of every member of this House. The Great Lakes Energy Research Park, which is to be located in the heart of the district I represent, will be the first Integrated Gasification Combined-Cycle facility in the world to coproduce (1) over 728 Mw of electric power and (2) permanently sequester over 3.8 million tons per year of carbon dioxide which will ultimately recover over 180 million barrels of stranded oil. Let me repeat that—180 million barrels of stranded oil. I'm not talking about new drilling in environmentally sensitive areas and I'm not talking about opening up new wells. I am talking about finally tapping much needed resources that yesterday's technology simply could not drive out of the ground. Additionally, it is important to note that this bed of oil reserves is located in the geographic center of Michigan—not in the Great Lakes, and far from Hurricane Alley, where most of our crude wells lie. As we learned from Katrina, geographic diversity is as an important topic in the energy debate as is alternative energies. So, as we discuss utilizing new technologies, clean technologies to solve our dependence on foreign crude, we would be foolish to ignore the types of technology being put in place in Alma, Michigan.

This project, however, is about much more than recovering stranded oil. This facility is designed in such a way to virtually utilize every byproduct of energy production. With this type of forward thinking it is no wonder that the project has received support from a wide variety of local community groups, institutions, citizens and organizations. Included among the list of proponents are the City of Alma, Michigan, Firstbank of Alma, Michigan, the Gratiot Medical Center, Alma College, the Gratiot County Board of Commissioners and the Gratiot Area Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, as American families and businesses grapple with rising energy costs, the Great Lakes Energy Research Park can be a part of the solution. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this unique effort to produce more energy here in America.

HONORING DR. JOSEPHINE ELIZABETH SEATON FRANKLIN ON HER 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary woman, a resident of the 2nd Congressional District of Illinois, Dr. Josephine Elizabeth Seaton Franklin on her 80th birthday.

Dr. Josephine Elizabeth Seaton Franklin was born July 1, 1927, in Cleveland, Ohio. During her long career in education, she obtained a master degree and doctorate degree in education, having taught in Virginia, Michigan and Chicago, IL.

She is a founding member and the first president of Theta Rho Omega Chapter, of

Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. The chapter has given more than $90,000 to scholars, and raises these funds through the Josephine Elizabeth Seaton Franklin Foundation. The foundation provides academic scholarships and funds for community projects. Through her foundation she has worked diligently to cultivate the scholarship program for 44 years.

Dr. Franklin is the proud aunt of Maryland Delegate Marvin B. Holmes, Jr. Delegate Holmes was elected to the Maryland State Legislature in 2002 and currently serves on the House Environmental Matters Committee, is the Chair of the Natural Resources Subcommittee and is the Deputy Majority Whip.

On her 80th birthday, I join with her community, friends, and family in saluting her for devoting her time and talents to make our country a better place to live. This gracious lady has unselfishly dedicated herself to educational and humanitarian causes. On behalf of a grateful nation, I thank and congratulate Dr. Franklin.

HONORING THE ALFRED E. ZAMPELLA P.S. SCHOOL NO. 27 IN JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY ON BEING NAMED A ''HEART OF GOLD'' AWARD WINNER

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. ROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Alfred E. Zampella School (formerly Public School No. 27) in Jersey City, New Jersey. This renowned school is named after my good friend and constituent, Alfred ''Al'' E. Zampella, a lifelong resident of Jersey City and for 27 years, the Principal of Public School No. 27. As a former teacher and principal, Al was a guiding force in the lives of thousands of students as he encouraged them to remain in school and use their formal education to succeed in life.

Al retired in 1990 and on November 7, 1996, Public School No. 27 was formally dedicated as the Alfred E. Zampella P.S. No. 27 in his honor. Today the school continues the outstanding and acclaimed work started by Al Zampella, and the school recently received the prestigious ''Heart of Gold'' Award from Mission: Kindness International, Inc./Statewide Kindness Awareness Campaign for 53,926 ''Acts of Kindness'' performed by 1,040 students and teachers.

Among these generous ''Acts of Kindness'' were school projects and fundraisers to benefit UNICEF, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, March of Dimes, the Leukemia Foundation, the American Heart Association, and countless other programs made possible by the selfless participation and volunteerism of the students and teachers at the Alfred Zampella School. They are very deserving of our congratulations and recognition for their altruistic spirit.

I am very pleased to offer this well-deserved tribute to my good friend, Al, and to the students and faculty at the Alfred E. Zampella School P.S. No. 27 in Jersey City for the ''Acts of Kindness'' they performed in their school and community.

Not only is Al a member of many boards and organizations in Northern New Jersey, he also continues to serve the people of Jersey City as one of my staff assistants and Jersey City liaison. I am pleased to join with his beloved wife, Jaclyn; his sons Edward, Walter and Gary, and his six grandchildren in applauding the spirit of kindness started by this exceptional individual.

It is only fitting that the school named in his honor was awarded such a distinguished award. My very best wishes to all the students and faculty at the Alfred E. Zampella School P.S. No. 27.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 544. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on agreeing to H. Res. 502, providing for the consideration of H.R. 2771, Legislative Branch Appropriations for FY 2008.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JAMES PRATHER JONTZ

HON. JOE DONNELLY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam Speaker, in the 190 years since Indiana achieved statehood, many well-educated, aspiring individuals from the Ohio River to Lake Michigan have represented its citizens. Perhaps none of them came to Washington more dedicated to the ideal of representing the common man than James Prather Jontz. I rise today to honor his life and service to Indiana.

Jim was born in Indianapolis in 1951, graduated from Indiana University in less than three years, completed graduate work at Purdue University and was an instructor at Butler University. His political career was sparked by his opposition to a dam building project in Central Indiana, and at the age of 23, he became a member of the Indiana House of Representatives. After representing his district for ten years, he was elected to the Indiana Senate where he established a reputation for standing up for his convictions.

In 1986, Jim was elected to The United States House of Representatives where he served three terms. In Congress, Jim fought for his constituency's issues. Jim valued his own college education and he did what he could to promote college attainment in a state that long has trailed the national average on college attainment. He served on the House Agriculture Committee and worked to develop a new farm bill to benefit his district's farmers. He worked for our service members and national security needs by overseeing the transition of the Grissom Air Force Base to the Grissom Air Reserve Base.

During his tenure Jim sought and secured federal funding for the first steps of the Hoosier Heartland Corridor, one of Indiana's most important highway projects. This project was stalled in the construction phase for nearly 20 years, but, because of his efforts, it was designated as one of 21 national priority corridors. Today, land acquisition is proceeding for the completion of the final 40 miles of that corridor.

Jim might be best remembered for championing environmental causes. He worked to protect the Pacific Northwest's old-growth forests and to foster collaboration between organized labor and environmentalists. His work on behalf of our natural resources and environment drew national attention.

Following Jim's tenure in the House, he continued advocating for the environment while serving as President of Americans for Democratic Action from 1998 to 2002. He moved to Oregon to work with forest preservation groups. Jim's final project was leading Working Families Win, an effort to raise the minimum wage and improve health care for the uninsured. His dedication to his fellow Americans continued until his death earlier this year.

Jim Jontz raised the bar for civic engagement, both for his peers and his constituents. He raised awareness about many important issues. For the people of his district, he raised their expectations that one man can make a difference in so many areas of our society. Today, on behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I honor James Jontz for his years of unselfish dedication to his district, his state and his country.

IN MEMORY OF CONSTANCE GOINES

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 2007

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the life of Constance Goines. Mrs. Constance Goines, age 60, passed away Tuesday, June 19, 2007.

Mrs. Goines was the beloved principal of Van Zandt Guinn Elementary School, located in the 26th Congressional District of Texas. Her work was dedicated to creating a safe and welcoming atmosphere for students who came from struggling families but had a desire to learn in their hearts. Under her fine leadership, the campus developed a reputation for helping students perform at high academic levels despite their social challenges.

Her commitment to education, to students and to the entire community were evident throughout her life. It is my hope that she will be remembered for her compassion and that others will follow her lead.

Mrs. Constance Goines is survived by her husband of 33 years, Conley R. Goines of Fort Worth; a daughter, Kelly D. Mirtia of Fort Worth; and a brother, Larry G. English of Chicago.

It was an honor to represent Mrs. Constance Goines in Washington.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

The House passed H.R. 2771—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S8273–S8313

Measures Introduced: Three bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1682–1684, S. Res. 249, and S. Con. Res. 40. **Pages S8301–02**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 535, to establish an Unsolved Crimes Section in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, and an Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office in the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. (S. Rept. No. 110–88) **Page S8301**

Measures Passed:

Honoring Ruth Bell Graham: Senate agreed to S. Res. 249, honoring the life of Ruth Bell Graham. **Page S8311**

Burma Sanctions: Senate agreed to S. Res. 250, expressing the sense of the Senate condemning the military junta in Burma for its continued detention of Aung San Suu Kyi and other political prisoners. **Page S8311**

Honoring Charleston Firefighters: Senate agreed to S. Res. 251, honoring the firefighters and other public servants who responded to the fire in Charleston, South Carolina, on June 18, 2007. **Page S8311**

National Day of Human Trafficking Awareness: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 40, supporting the goals and ideals of observing the National Day of Human Trafficking Awareness on January 11 of each year to raise awareness of and opposition to human trafficking. **Pages S8311–12**

Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission: Senate passed S. 1099, to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to make individuals employed by the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission eligible to obtain Federal health insurance. **Page S8312**

Clean Energy Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding, the June 21, 2007 passage of H.R. 6, to move the United States towards greater energy independence and security, to increase the production of clean renewable fuels, to protect consumers from price gouging, to increase the energy efficiency of products, buildings, and vehicles, to promote research on and deploy greenhouse gas capture and storage options, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, that the following amendment be agreed to: **Page S8273**

Employee Free Choice Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 1 p.m., on Monday, June 25, 2007, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 800, to amend the National Labor Relations Act to establish an efficient system to enable employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to provide for mandatory injunctions for unfair labor practices during organizing efforts, and that the time until 7 p.m., be for debate with respect to the motion, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators Kennedy and Enzi, or their designees; provided further, that at 7 p.m., Senator Sessions be recognized to speak for up to 1 hour. **Page S8312**

Message From the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans as declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–19) **Page S8300**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Marylyn Andrea Howe, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2008.

Lonnie C. Moore, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2008.

Kerri Layne Briggs, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

Dell L. Dailey, of South Dakota, to be Coordinator for Counterterrorism, with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large. (Prior to this action, Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration.)

Reuben Jeffery III, of the District of Columbia, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic, Energy, and Agricultural Affairs). (Prior to this action, Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration.)

Lorne W. Craner, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of three years. (Prior to this action, Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration.)

Alan J. Patricof, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of three years. (Prior to this action, Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration.)

Jerome F. Kever, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2008.

Michael Schwartz, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2012.

Virgil M. Speakman, Jr., of Ohio, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2009. **Pages S8312–13**

Messages from the House: **Page S8300**

Measures Referred: **Pages S8300–01**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S8273, S8301**

Executive Communications: **Page S8301**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S8302–03**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S8303–10**

Additional Statements: **Page S8300**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S8310**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 2:16 p.m., until 1 p.m. on Monday, June 25, 2007. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S8312.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine a new vision for medical research relating to the fiscal year 2008 budget for the National Institutes of Health, after receiving testimony from Ruth L. Kirschstein, Acting Director, National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine, Lawrence A. Tabak, Director, National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, David Schwartz, Director, National Institute of Environmental Health and Sciences, Paul A. Sieving, Director, National Eye Institute, and Duane F. Alexander, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, all of the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 2826–2828, 2830–2843; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 174; and H. Res. 510–512 were introduced. **Pages H7010–11**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H7011–12**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Supplemental report on H.R. 2643, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008 (H. Rept. 110–187, Pt. 2);

H.R. 2829, making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year

ending September 30, 2008 (H. Rept. 110–207); and

H.R. 2286, to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure with respect to bail bond forfeitures (H. Rept. 110–208). **Page H7010**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Tauscher to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H6959**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of Guy Vander Jagt, former Member of Congress. **Page H6968**

Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008: The House passed H.R. 2771, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 176 nays, Roll No. 548. **Pages H6969–99**

Rejected the Kingston motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 181 ayes to 217 noes, Roll No. 547. **Pages H6997–99**

Agreed to:

Inglis (SC) amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 110–201) that prohibits funds from being used to purchase light bulbs unless the light bulbs have the "ENERGY STAR" or "Federal Energy Management Program" designation and **Pages H6991–93**

Flake amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 110–201) that reduces funding for the Government Printing Office—Congressional Printing and Binding by $3,200,000 (by a recorded vote of 218 ayes to 191 noes, Roll No. 545). **Pages H6993–94, H6996**

Rejected:

Jordan amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 110–201) that reduces appropriations in the bill by 4% across the board (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 546). **Pages H6994–96, H6996–97**

Agreed that the Clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes to H.R. 2764 and H.R. 2771 to reflect the actions of the House. **Page H7000**

H. Res. 502, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 222 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 544, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 217 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 543. **Pages H6960–69**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, June 25th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H7001**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed by unanimous consent to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, June 27th. **Page H7001**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed (H. Doc. 110–42). **Pages H7001–02**

Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University: Representatives Woolsey and LaHood. **Page H7002**

Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy: Representatives Ruppersberger, Cummings, Kline (MN), and Wicker. **Page H7002**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6967–68, H6968–69, H6996, H6996–97, H6998–99, H6999. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MERCURY EXPORT BAN ACT OF 2007

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials held a hearing on H.R. 1534, Mercury Export Ban Act of 2007. Testimony was heard from Alice C. Williams, Deputy Associate Administrator, Infrastructure and Environment, Office of Environmental Projects and Operations, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy; Cornel A. Holder, Administrator, Defense National Stockpile Center, Defense Logistics Agency, Department of Defense; James B. Gulliford, Assistant Administrator, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances, EPA; C. Mark Smith, Deputy Director, Office of Research and Standards, Director, Mercury Program, Department of Environmental Protection, State of Massachusetts; and public witnesses.

IMAGES KIDS SEE ON THE SCREEN

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet held a hearing entitled "Images Kids See on the Screen." Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HOMEOWNER DOWNPAYMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing entitled ''Homeowner Downpayment Assistance Programs and Related Issues.'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Development: Margaret Burns, Director, Office of Single Family Housing Program, FHA; and James Heist, Assistant Inspector General, Audits; William B. Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, GAO; and public witnesses.

FUTURE OF NATO

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Held a hearing on the Future of NATO: How Valuable an Asset? Testimony was heard from Daniel Fried, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, Department of State; and GEN Bantz J. Craddock, USA, Commander, U.S. European Command, Supreme Allied Command of Europe, Department of Defense.

HHS'S RESPONSE TO NATION'S EMERGENCY CARE CRISIS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Held a hearing on the Response of the Department of Health and Human Services to the Nation's Emergency Care Crisis. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Kevin Yeskey, M.D., Director, Office of Preparedness and Emergency Operations and Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Preparedness and Response; and Walter Koroshetz, M.D., Deputy Director, National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke, NIH; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science and Technology: Ordered reported the following measures: H.R. 2698, amended, Federal Aviation Research and Development Reauthorization Act of 2007; and H. Res. 487, Recognizing the contribution of modeling and simulation technology to the security and prosperity of the United States, and recognizing modeling and simulation as a National Critical Technology.

DCIA BRIEFING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to receive a DCIA briefing on a recent report. The Committee was briefed by Michael V. Hayden, Director, CIA.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D856)*

S. 676, to provide that the Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank or the Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank may serve on the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation. Signed on June 21, 2007 (Public Law 110–38)

S. 1537, to authorize the transfer of certain funds from the Senate Gift Shop Revolving Fund to the Senate Employee Child Care Center. Signed on June 21, 2007 (Public Law 110–39)

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of June 25 through June 30, 2007

Senate Chamber

On Monday, at 1 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 800, Employee Free Choice Act.

On Tuesday, at 11:30 a.m., Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 800, Employee Free Choice Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon; following which, Senate may vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 1639, Comprehensive Immigration Reform.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: June 27, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jill E. Sommers, of Kansas, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for the remainder of the term expiring April 13, 2009, and Bartholomew H. Chilton, of Delaware, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for the remainder of the term expiring April 13, 2008, 2 p.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Appropriations: June 26, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, business meeting to mark up proposed legislation making appropriations for Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, 2:30 p.m., SD–124.

June 26, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, business meeting to mark up proposed legislation making appropriations for Energy and Water Development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, 3 p.m., SD–192.

June 28, Full Committee, business meeting to mark up proposed legislation making appropriations for State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, and Energy and Water Development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, 2 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on Armed Services: June 26, to receive a closed briefing from the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO), 9:30 a.m., SR–222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: June 26, Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation and Community Development, to hold hearings to examine ending mortgage abuse, focusing on safeguarding homebuyers, 2:30 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: June 26, to continue hearings to examine health care and the budget, focusing on the Healthy Americans Act and other options for reform, 9:30 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: June 26, to hold hearings to examine the impact of media violence on children, 10 a.m., SR–253.

June 27, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 704, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit manipulation of caller identification information, S. 950, to develop and maintain an integrated system of coastal and ocean observations for the Nation's coasts, oceans, and Great Lakes, to improve warnings of tsunami, hurricanes, El Nino events, and other natural hazards, to enhance homeland security, to support maritime operations, to improve management of coastal and marine resources, S. 1650, to establish a digital and wireless network technology program, and S. 1661, to communicate United States travel policies and improve marketing and other activities designed to increase travel in the United States from abroad, and promotion lists in the United States Coast Guard, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

June 28, Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2008 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: June 26, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the preparedness of the federal land management agencies for the 2007 wildfire season and efforts to contain the costs of wildfire management activities, 10 a.m., SD–366.

June 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine S. 1171, to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act and Public Law 87–483 to authorize the construction and rehabilitation of water infrastructure in Northwestern New Mexico, to authorize the use of the reclamation fund to fund the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund, to authorize the conveyance of certain Reclamation land and infrastructure, to authorize the Commissioner of Reclamation to provide for the delivery of water, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: June 27, Subcommittee on Transportation Safety, Infrastructure Security, and Water Quality, to hold hearings to examine protecting water quality at America's beaches, 10 a.m., SD–406.

June 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine global warming issues in the power plant sector, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: June 27, to hold hearings to examine the Stealth Tax, focusing on how to stop the alternative minimum tax from sneaking up on unsuspecting taxpayers, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: June 27, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 11:15 a.m., S–116, Capitol.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: June 27, business meeting to consider S. 793, to provide for the expansion and improvement of traumatic brain injury programs, and S. 1011, to change the name of the National Institute on Drug Abuse to the National Institute on Diseases of Addiction and to change the name of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism to the National Institute on Alcohol Disorders and Health, original bills entitled, ''Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act'', ''Wired for Health Care Quality Act'', and other pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD–628.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: June 25, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to examine excessive speculation in the natural gas market, 11 a.m., SD–106.

June 27, Full Committee, to continue hearings to examine violent Islamist extremism, focusing on the European experience, 10 a.m., SD–342.

June 28, Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine financial management systems modernization at the Department of Homeland Security, focusing on systems and processes needed to support the Department's mission and operations, 3 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: June 28, to hold hearings to examine draft legislation regarding the regulation of class III gaming, 9:30 a.m., SR–485.

Committee on the Judiciary: June 27, Subcommittee on the Constitution, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the federal death penalty, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

June 28, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 1145, to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform, and S. 1060, to reauthorize the grant program for reentry of offenders into the community in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to improve reentry planning and implementation, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: June 26, to hold hearings to examine Smithsonian Institution governance reform, focusing on a report by the Smithsonian's Independent Review Committee, 10 a.m., SR–301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: June 26, business meeting to consider original bills entitled, ''Entrepreneurial Development Act of 2007'', ''Small Business Venture Capital Act of 2007'', and other pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: June 27, business meeting to mark up pending legislation; to be immediately followed by a full committee hearing to examine the nomination of Charles L. Hopkins, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Operations, Preparedness, Security and Law Enforcement), 9:30 a.m., SD–562.

Select Committee on Intelligence: June 26, closed business meeting to mark up S. 1547, to authorize appropriations

for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and S. 1548, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, 1:30 p.m., SH–219.

June 26, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

June 28, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee on Aging: June 27, to hold hearings to examine the relationship between doctors and the drug industry, 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

House

Committee on Appropriations, June 27, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, on the Capitol Visitor Center, 9 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, June 26, hearing on structure, process and tools for improving Department of Defense Management, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

June 26, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on findings of the Independent Review Group and an in-progress review of actions at Walter Reed, 1 p.m., 2218 Rayburn.

June 26, Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces, hearing on the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle Program, 4 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

June 27, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing to review the policies and procedures regarding the notification of next-of-kin of wounded and deceased service members, 10 a.m., 2218 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, June 26, hearing on Foreign Holdings of U.S. Debt: Is Our Economy Vulnerable? 2 p.m., 210 Cannon.

June 28, hearing on Medicare Advantage and the Federal Budget, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and Labor, June 28, Subcommittee on Higher Education, Lifelong Learning and Competitiveness hearing on Workforce Investment Act: Recommendations to Improve the Effectiveness of Job Training, 1:30 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, June 26, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Predatory Sales Practices in Medicare Advantage,'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, June 26, hearing entitled ''A Review of Investor Protection and Market Oversight with the five Commissioners of the Securities and Exchange Commission,'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, June 26, to markup the following measures: H.R. 176, Shirley A. Chisholm United States-Caribbean Educational Exchange Act of 2007; H.R. 1400, Iran Counter-Proliferation Act of 2007; Food Security and Agricultural Development Act of 2007; H.R. 2003, Ethiopia Democracy and Accountability Act of 2007; H. Res. 121, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of Japan should formally acknowledge, apologize, and accept historical responsibility in a clear and unequivocal manner for its Imperial Armed Force's coercion of young women into sexual slavery, known to the world as ''comfort women,'' during its colonial and wartime occupation of Asia and the Pacific Islands from the 1930s through the duration of World War II; H.R. 2798, To reauthorize the programs of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; H.R. 2293, To require the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a report on efforts to bring to justice the Palestinian terrorists who killed John Branchizio, Mark Parson, and John Marin Linde; the Library of Congress Public Diplomacy Collection Act of 2007; S. 377, U.S.-Poland Parliamentary Youth Exchange Act of 2007; H. Res. 208, Honoring Operation Smile of the 25th Anniversary year of its founding; H. Res. 287, To celebrate the 500th anniversary of the first use of the name ''America,'' H. Res. 294, Commending the Kingdom of Lesotho, on the occasion of International Women's Day, for the enactment of a law to improve the status of married women and ensure the access of married women to property rights; H. Res. 378, Honoring World Red Cross Red Crescent Day; H. Res. 380, Resolution commending Idaho on winning the bid to host the 2009 Special Olympics World Winter Games; H. Res. 426, Recognizing 2007 as the Year of the Rights of Internally Displaced Persons in Colombia, and offering support for efforts to ensure that the internally displace people of Colombia receive the assistance and protection they need to rebuild their lives successfully; H. Res. 427, Urging the Government of Canada to end the commercial seal hunt; H. Res. 457, Calling on the Russian Federation to withdraw its military forces, armaments, and ammunition stockpiles from the sovereign territory of the Republic of Moldova; H. Res. 467, Condemning the decision by the University and College Union of the United Kingdom to support a boycott of Israeli academia; H. Res. 482, Expressing support for the new power-sharing government in Northern Ireland; H. Res. 497, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately release from custody the children of Rebiya Kadeer and Canadian citizen Huseyin Celil and should refrain from further engaging in acts of cultural, linguistic, and religious suppression directed against the Uyghur people; H. Res. 500, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in opposition to efforts by major natural gas exporting countries to establish a cartel or other mechanism to manipulate the supply of natural gas to the world market for the purpose of setting an arbitrary and nonmarket price or as an instrument of political pressure; and H. Con. Res. 136, Expressing the sense of Congress regarding high level visits to the United States by democratically-elected officials of Taiwan; and H. Con. Res. 139, Expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should address the ongoing problem of untouchability in India, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 26, Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, hearing on Violence in Central America, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 27, full Committee, hearing on Iraq: Is the Escalation Working? 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 27, Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade, joint hearing on A.Q. Khan's Nuclear Wal-Mart: Out of Business or Under New Management? 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 28, Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, hearing entitled ''The Millennium Challenge Corporation in Africa: Promises Versus Progress,'' 2:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 28, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, with the Subcommittee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, and the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, joint hearing entitled ''Protection and Money: U.S. Companies, Their Employees, and Violence in Columbia,'' 10 a.m, 2172 Rayburn.

June 29, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight and the Subcommittee on Higher Education, Lifelong Learning and Competitiveness of the Committee on Education and Labor, joint hearing on International Students and Visiting Scholars: Trends, Barriers, and Implications for American Universities and U.S. Foreign Policy, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, June 27, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology, hearing entitled ''A Roadmap for Security? Examining the Science and Technology Directorate's Strategic Plan,'' 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

June 28, Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counterterrorism, hearing entitled ''US-VISIT Exit: Closing Gaps in Our Security,'' 1 p.m., 311 Cannon.

June 28, Subcommittee, on Intelligence, Information Sharing and Terrorism Risk Assessment, hearing entitled ''Over-Classification and Pseudo-Classification: Making DHS the Gold Standard for Designating Classified and Sensitive Homeland Security Information,'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, June 27, hearing on Implementation of the U.S. Capitol Police–Library of Congress Police Merger; and to consider pending Committee business, 11:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, June 25, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, oversight hearing on U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Response to Air Quality Arising from the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001: Were There Substantive Due Process Violations? 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

June 26, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on the National Football League's System for Compensating Retired Players: An Uneven Playing Field? 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

June 26, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, oversight hearing on Habeas Corpus and Detention at Guantanamo Bay, 2 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

June 26, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, hearing on Mandatory Minimum Sentencing Laws—the Issues, 9:30 a.m.; 2141 Rayburn.

June 28, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties, oversight hearing on the Impact of *Ledbetter* v. *Goodyear* on the Effective Enforcement of Civil Rights Laws, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, June 26, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, hearing on The Bird and The Bees: How Pollinators Help Maintain Healthy Ecosystems, 1 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 27, full Committee, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1239, National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2007; H.R. 1388, Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail Act; H.R. 1011, Virginia Ridge and Valley Act of 2007; H.R. 189, Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007; H.R. 761, To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Missouri River Basin Lewis and Clark Interpretive Trail and Visitor Center Foundation, Inc. certain Federal land associated with the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail in Nebraska, to be used as an historical interpretive site along the trail; H.R. 1285, Snoqualimie Pass Land Conveyance Act; H.R. 1205, Coral Reef Conservation Amendments Act of 2007; H.R. 2400, Ocean and Coastal Mapping Integration Act; H.R. 50, Multinational Species Conservation Funds Reauthorization Act of 2007; H.R. 465, Asian Elephant Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2007; H.R. 1834, National Ocean Exploration Program Act; H.R. 716, Santa Rosa Urban Water Reuse Plan Act; H.R. 31, Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District Wastewater and Recycled Water Facilities Act of 2007; H.R. 1503, Avra/Black Wash Reclamation and Riparian Restoration Project; H.R. 1526, Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program Authorization Act; H.R. 1337, To provide for a feasibility study of alternatives to augment the water supplies of the Central Oklahoma master Conservancy District and cities served by the district; and 1725, Rancho California Water District Recycled Water Reclamation Facility Act of 2007, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 28, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing on The Minerals Management Service's Proposed Five Year Program for Oil and Gas Leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 28, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, oversight hearing entitled ''Management by Exclusion: The Forest Service Use of Categorical Exclusions From NEPA,'' 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, June 26, Subcommittee on Domestic Policy, hearing on Adequacy of Labor Law Enforcement in New Orleans, 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

June 26, Subcommittee on Information Policy, Census, and National Archives, hearing on 2010 Census: Improving Local Government Participation in LUCA, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 28, full Committee, hearing on Waste, Fraud and Abuse at the Kaiserslauten Military Community Center, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, June 25, to consider H.R. 2643, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related

Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008; 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

June 26, to consider a measure Making Appropriations for Financial Services and General Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science and Technology, June 26, Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation, hearing on SBIR and STTR—How Are the Programs Managed Today? 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

June 27, full Committee, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 906, Global Change Research and Data Management Act of 2007; H.R. 1933, Department of Energy Carbon Capture and Storage Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 2007; H.R. 2773, Biofuels Research and Development Enhancement Act; and H.R. 2774, Solar Energy Research and Advancement Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

June 28, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on NASA's Earth Science and Applications Programs: Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Request and Issues, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, June 28, hearing on Assessing the Impact of the Copyright Royalty Board Decision to Increase Royalty Rates on Recording Artists and Webcasters, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, June 26, Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines and Hazardous Materials, hearing on Benefits of Intercity Passenger Rail, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

June 26, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 2722, Integrated Deepwater Reform Act; and H.R. 2830, Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2007, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, June 27, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on VA Internal Contracting Oversight Deficiencies, 10 a.m., 340 Cannon.

June 28, Subcommittee on Health, to mark up pending business, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

June 29, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, to mark up pending business, 9:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, June 26, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Safe and Sensible: Ensuring Kidney Patients Receive Safe and Appropriate Anemia Management Care, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, June 26, executive, to consider Member Requests, 5:30 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

June 26, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, executive, briefing on the Office of the Department of Defense Inspector General, 2:30 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

June 26, Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical, executive, hearing on Technical Programs, 4 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

June 27, full Committee, executive, briefing on Hot Spots, 8:45 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: June 25, to hold hearings to examine pipeline politics, focusing on conflict prevention and the security of supply and transit of oil and natural gas, 3 p.m., SD–419.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

1 p.m., Monday, June 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 800, Employee Free Choice Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, June 25

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E1386, E1398
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1389, E1391
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1398, E1400
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1379, E1384
Camp, Dave, Mich., E1399
Carnahan, Russ, Mo., E1397
Castor, Kathy, Fla., E1394
Clay, Wm. Lacy, Mo., E1382
Coble, Howard, N.C., E1383
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E1382
Donnelly, Joe, Ind., E1400
Ellsworth, Brad, Ind., E1386
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1379, E1382
Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E1379, E1380
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1381, E1389, E1391
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1398
Hobson, David L., Ohio, E1384
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E1382
Jackson, Jesse L., Jr., Ill., E1399
Jackson-Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1389, E1390, E1392, E1394
Johnson, Timothy V., Ill., E1395
Kilpatrick, Carolyn C., Mich., E1387
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E1383
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1384, E1385
LoBiondo, Frank A., N.J., E1383
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1393
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1388, E1395, E1396
Mica, John L., Fla., E1388
Miller, Brad, N.C., E1393
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1386
Mollohan, Alan B., W.Va., E1392
Murphy, Patrick J., Pa., E1381
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E1390, E1390, E1391, E1393, E1395, E1396, E1397, E1398, E1399, E1400
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E1380
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E1393
Pryce, Deborah, Ohio, E1384
Rahall, Nick J., II, W.Va., E1387
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1399
Regula, Ralph, Ohio, E1396
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E1400
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E1392
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E1387
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E1393
Sarbanes, John P., Md., E1380, E1388
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1390, E1391
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E1379
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E1390, E1391
Sires, Albio, N.J., E1395
Smith, Adrian, Nebr., E1390
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1397
Tiberi, Patrick J., Ohio, E1385
Udall, Tom, N.M., E1396
Weller, Jerry, Ill., E1397
Wexler, Robert, Fla., E1380
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1398

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.